Systematic Theology Complete

Lewis Sperry Chafer

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Lewis Sperry Chafer

Volume One

Prolegomena • Bibliology Theology Proper

Volume Two

Angelology • Anthropology Hamartiology

Volume Three

Soteriology

Volume Four

Ecclesiology • Eschatology Volume Five Christology

Volume Six

Pneumatology

Volume Eight

Biographical Sketch & Index by

Lewis Sperry Chafer D.D., Litt.D., Th.D.
Late President and Professor of Systematic Theology Dallas Theological Seminary

Grand Rapids, MI 49501

Systematic Theology by Lewis Sperry Chafer

Copyright ©1948, 1976 by Dallas Theological Seminary

Published by Kregel Publications, a division of Kregel, Inc., P.O. Box 2607, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501, with special permission of Dallas Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

Library of Congress Cataloging–in–Publication Data

Chafer, Lewis Sperry, 1871-1952.
[Systematic Theology]
Chafer systematic theology / by Lewis Sperry Chafer.
p. cm.
Originally published: Systematic theology. Dallas, TX.: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947-1948.
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

1. Theology, Doctrinal. I. Title. II. Title: Systematic theology

BT75.C28 1993 230’.044—dc20

ISBN 0-8254-2340-6

WITH DEEP AFFECTION THIS WORK ON

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IS DEDICATED TO

THE ALUMNI AND PRESENT AND FUTURE STUDENTS OF THE

DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Preface

(which every student should read with care)

Systematic Theology, the greatest of the sciences, has fallen upon evil days. Between the rejection and ridicule of it by the so-called progressives and the neglect and abridgment of it by the orthodox, it, as a potent influence, is approaching the point of extinction. It is a significant fact that of the upwards of two score accredited and notable works on Systematic Theology which have been produced in this and other countries, an exceedingly small portion is now in print and the demand for these works is negligible. The unchanging emphasis in the Scriptures upon doctrine, which subject is referred to in the New Testament more than forty times and is that to which a Christian is to “take heed” (1 Tim. 1:3; 4:6, 16; 2 Tim. 3:10, 16; 4:2, 3), stands as a silent rebuke, whether heeded or not, to all modern notions which belittle the importance of Dogmatic Theology, and also stands as a corrective to those who neglect any portion of it.

It is no secret that the average minister is not now reading Systematic Theology, nor will such writings be found to occupy a prominent place in his library. Shocking indeed this condition would have been to ministers of two generations ago—men whose position was respected in their day because of their deep knowledge of the doctrinal portions of the Bible and whose spoken ministries and writings have gone far toward the upbuilding of the Church of Christ.

The present situation is not one of passing moment. As well might a medical doctor discard his books on anatomy and therapeutics as for the preacher to discard his books on Systematic Theology; and since doctrine is the bone structure of the body of revealed truth, the neglect of it must result in a message characterized by uncertainties, inaccuracies, and immaturity. What is the specific field of learning that distinguishes the ministerial profession if it is not the knowledge of the Bible and its doctrines? To the preacher is committed a responsibility of surpassing import. Men of other professions are tireless in their attempts to discover the truths and to perfect themselves in the use of the forces belonging to their various callings,

though these be in the restricted field of material things. The preacher is called upon to deal with the things of God, the supernatural and eternal. His service is different from all others—different as to aims, different as to available forces and, of necessity, different as to adequate preparation. Few clergymen's libraries will include even one work on theology, but a medical doctor will assuredly possess a worthy work on anatomy. A form of modern thinking tends to treat all matters of doctrine with contempt.

No substitute will ever be found for the knowledge of the Word of God. That Word alone deals with things eternal and infinite, and it alone has power to convert the soul and to develop a God-honoring spiritual life. There is a limitless yet hidden spiritual content within the Bible which contributes much to its supernatural character. This spiritual content is never discerned by the natural (ψυχικὸς), or unregenerate man (1 Cor. 2:14), even though he has attained to the highest degree of learning or ecclesiastical authority. The natural capacities of the human mind do not function in the realm of spiritual things. The divine message is presented "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. 2:13), and the Spirit has been given to the regenerate that they might "know the things that are freely given to us of God." When, on the ground of scholarship, unregenerate men have been permitted to dictate to the church what she shall believe, she has descended from her supernatural character to the level of a human institution, and it is safe to conclude that men are unregenerate who deny the only ground upon which a soul may be saved.

Acquiring the knowledge of the spiritual content of the Bible is a life task. The great preachers who have moved the hearts of men with divine power have been saturated with Bible truths secured through a first-hand, daily study of its text. General facts of human learning may be acquired by the usual means, but spiritual truths are apprehended only as taught to the individual heart by the Spirit.

No student of the Scriptures should be satisfied to traffic only in the results of the study of other men. The field is inexhaustible and its treasures ever new. No worthy astronomer limits his attention to the findings of other men, but is himself ever gazing into the heavens both to verify and to discover; and no worthy theologian will be satisfied alone with the result of the research of other theologians, but will himself be ever searching the

Scriptures. However, a full-rounded introduction is needed and a method of study must be established if either the astronomer or the theologian expects to continue with ever increasing efficiency. In the case of the theologian, this responsibility of acquiring the introduction to the Bible and its true method of study, without question, rests upon the theological seminary. Too often the seminary has taken the attitude that the study of the English Bible for its spiritual content has no place in a theological curriculum, assuming that limited exegetical studies in portions of the Hebrew and Greek texts are sufficient. Exegesis belongs to the department of original languages and its importance cannot be overestimated, nor should its prosecution cease with the student's graduation. It is the province of exegetical research to aid in the study of the doctrinal, devotional, historical, prophetical, and practical aspects of divine revelation; but exegesis may, and not infrequently does, degenerate into a mere grammatical and philological study of the text with little attention given to the spiritual content of the Scriptures. Bible institutes may teach lay workers the Bible, but it is the prerogative of the theological seminary to produce authoritative and accurate exegetical expositors of the Scriptures. Regardless of the ideals held by many modern seminaries, the preacher is called to "preach the word," to be "apt to teach," to be one who avoids the "traditions of men," and to be one who is a right divider of the truth. Since the attaining to the knowledge of the Word of God is a life task, no seminary, no matter how true its aim, can hope to do more than to give the student an introduction to the whole text of the Bible, a method and habit of study with true ideals, and to impart a momentum for unceasing research in the Sacred Text itself. To this end every curriculum study should be focused. Studies in theology, original languages, and history should contribute to the one ideal, namely, *the knowledge of the Scriptures*. There are social and pastoral problems concerning which a preacher should be instructed, but these are secondary compared to his call to minister the truth of God. There is also far-reaching value in the knowledge of the history of theological opinion and familiarity with the contentions and conclusions of great men of former generations is essential, but, in vital importance, such knowledge and familiarity are not comparable with the understanding of the living Word of God and the true application of that Word to men today. Similarly, the study of evidences is an important discipline for the student of theology, but evidences do not embrace the

truth itself. The chemist who in his laboratory has throughout the day proved the values of various foods will doubtless be pleased to *partake* of food when the work of the day is done. So, also, a preacher should be aware of the scope and trend of the philosophy of his day, but he should understand as well that the one and only successful method of combating error is the positive declaration of the truth of God. A Spirit-filled, truth-imparting preacher will have little time or disposition to descend to mere controversy, but will give out the supernaturally efficacious message of God, against which no error can ever stand.

While it is true that the Bible is the source of the material which enters into Systematic Theology, it is equally true that the function of Systematic Theology is to unfold the Bible. In its natural state, gold is often passed over by those with undiscerning eyes. Likewise, the treasures of divine truth are observed only by those who are trained to recognize them. In his years of classroom discipline, the theological student should be taken over the entire field of doctrine that he may be prepared to continue his research in every portion of the Bible throughout his ministry, being prepared to proceed intelligently in every phase of the divine revelation. Apart from such a complete introduction to doctrine, no preacher will be able to hold truth in its right proportions, nor can it be assured that he or his auditors will not drift into the errors of unscriptural cults, or into modernistic unbelief. After covering in a general way the entire field of his profession, the physician or lawyer may serve the public as a specialist in some particular aspect of that profession; but the theologian should not specialize in any department of the truth. Doctrinal faddists have been the cause of untold harm in the church, and the only way of avoiding this danger, or that of securing preachers who will not be “tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine,” is to provide a required discipline in Systematic Theology which incorporates a complete consideration under a competent teacher of the essentials of each doctrine with due recognition of the relation of each doctrine to every other doctrine. Rationalism has ever been seeking admission into the Christian church, but it found little welcome so long as theological seminaries gave even an abridged Systematic Theology its rightful place. It is a short step indeed from the ignorance of doctrine to the rejection and ridicule of it, and it can be safely stated that there is no rejection of sound doctrine which is not based on ignorance.

While the seminary student needs as much today to major in Systematic Theology as ever, the trend, unfortunately, is to substitute philosophy, psychology, and sociology for theology. This may be somewhat accounted for by the fact that Biblical doctrine is a revelation and the substitutes are within the range of the thinking of the natural man.

In this age, as in no other, there is a specific message to be preached to every creature and, while there are leadership men who are God's gift to the Church, the obligation to witness rests upon every Christian alike. Too much recognition cannot be given to the uncounted multitudes of faithful witnesses who are discharging their commissions as Sunday School teachers, mission workers, personal soul-winners, and as living exponents of divine grace. This is the God-appointed New Testament evangelism. The latent evangelizing forces of a congregation of believers are beyond all human calculation; but they need to be trained for their task, and God has prescribed definitely that they should be trained. How else will they be accurate and skillful even in their limited sphere of service? That they are to be trained is indicated in Ephesians 4:11, 12. There it is stated that the gifted men—apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, especially the pastors and teachers—are appointed to the task of "perfecting the saints for the work of the ministry"; that is, the ministry which is committed to the saints. The revelation here is not only of the fact that the saints have a witnessing service to perform, but also of the fact that they are to be *equipped* for this service by the gifted men whom God has placed over them as their leaders. The word καταρτισμὸν, here translated *perfecting*, is a noun which is but once used in the New Testament and means *equipment* and refers to that preparation which all saints should have that they may be effective witnesses for Christ. The verb form of this word is found elsewhere in the New Testament, and with significant meaning. According to this passage (Eph. 4:11, 12), the pastor and teacher is responsible for the *equipment* of those given into his care. Although this equipment does involve methods of work, it includes much more, namely, an accurate knowledge of the truth.

But the pastor and teacher must be trained for his leadership task. Under existing conditions this preparation is committed to the professors in the theological seminary. Their responsibility is greater than that of other men inasmuch as the heavenly things transcend the things of earth. Observe this

stream flowing forth from its source: whatever truth and ideals the professor imparts to students in training they, in turn, will later impart to the larger groups over which they are given spiritual care. If a congregation is not actively engaged in soul-winning and missionary work, it is usually because of the fact that they have been deprived of the God-intended leadership to that end. If the pastor has no soul-winning passion, no missionary vision, is limited in his proficiency, and inaccurate as an exponent of the Word of God, his lack in these respects may generally be traced to the fact that he has been deprived of the God-intended, spiritual and vital training in the seminary. It may, therefore, be restated that the responsibility of the seminary professor is no less than superhuman. If this be true, no man is fitted to render faculty service in a seminary who is not himself awake to his responsibility and, in addition to that advanced training and accuracy in the truth which his position demands, is himself a worthy example of missionary zeal, evangelistic passion, and tireless soul-winning effort. What revival fires would be set burning and spiritual forces be released should the church demand the purification and perfection of her fountain sources of doctrinal teaching as well as the worthy illustration of spiritual vitality and soul-winning passion in the life and ministry of those who mold the character of her God-appointed leaders!

This is not an appeal for a lowering of worthy scholarship. The all-too-prevalent notion that scholarship and spiritual passion cannot exist together in one person was forever answered at the beginning of the Christian era in the case of the Apostle Paul, to say nothing of thousands of great preachers of the past who have attained to enviable scholarship without restricting their spiritual lives or restraining their passion of soul.

The question as to the evil effects of an abridged theology may be considered with a full recognition of the fact that an abridgment of doctrine in the seminary leaves the pastor disqualified by so much, and his limitation will be reflected in the stunting not only of his own spiritual life but of the spiritual life and activity of all who wait upon his ministry.

The criticism incorporated in this preface in no way pertains to the material which *is* included in existing works on Systematic Theology. The church owes an immeasurable debt to the great theologians for the work they have done. Attention is called only to certain major themes which strangely do not appear in works on Systematic Theology generally. If it be

claimed that, because thus omitted, these themes do not belong to Systematic Theology, it may be replied that men are not appointed to determine the material which enters into this science. Since, as acknowledged by theologians generally, Systematic Theology is the collecting, scientifically arranging, comparing, exhibiting, and defending of *all* facts from any and every source concerning God and His works, it is obvious there could be no valid reason offered for the omission of any vital doctrine from this science. Theologians have no permission from God to restrict the field of theology to the material found in the standards of their respective denominations or the more or less restricted teachings of the uninspired leaders who formulated those standards. The divine revelation in its entirety, and not merely the portions of it which harmonize with accepted dicta, challenges the student of doctrine.

Though interest in Systematic Theology has declined in past years, there has been a growing need for an unabridged, premillennial, dispensational work on theology. Such a work has long been a desideratum. This work proposes to take a step in the direction of the realization of that need.

Why unabridged? Simply because a part of anything is never equivalent to its whole. A lifelong investigation into works on Systematic Theology has resulted in the discovery that in the field of doctrine at least seven major themes are consistently neglected. Few readers, indeed, are in a position to detect what is left out of a work on theology. These omissions are: (1) the divine program of the ages; (2) the Church, the Body of Christ; (3) human conduct and the spiritual life; (4) Angelology; (5) typology; (6) prophecy; and (7) the present session of Christ in heaven. That the loss to the whole range of doctrine sustained by these omissions may be pointed out, it is necessary to indicate some of the important features of each doctrine.

I. The Divine Program of the Ages

While some phases of the divine program of the ages belong properly to Eschatology, and these will be noticed later under that heading, the subject exceeds the boundaries of Eschatology, and being, as it is, so vast, must be recognized as fundamental to the right understanding of the works of God in relation to this world.

The dispensational study of the Bible consists in the identification of certain well-defined time-periods which are divinely indicated, together with the revealed purpose of God relative to each. A recognition of the divinely indicated distinctions as to time-periods and the messages belonging to each is the very foundation of a science such as Systematic Theology, which proposes to discover and exhibit the truth relative to the works of God. No accounting is possible as to the extent of error which is prevalent because of the careless reading into one dispensation or age of that which belongs to another.

That God has a program of the ages is disclosed in many passages (cf. Deut. 30:1–10; Dan. 2:31–45; 7:1–28; 9:24–27; Hos. 3:4, 5; Matt. 23:37–25:46; Acts 15:13–18; Rom. 11:13–29; 2 Thess. 2:1–12; Rev. 2:1–22:21). Likewise, there are well-defined periods of time related to the divine purpose. The Apostle Paul writes of the period between Adam and Moses (Rom. 5:14); John speaks of the law as given by Moses, but of grace and truth as coming by Christ (John 1:17). Christ also speaks of "the times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24), which are evidently to be distinguished from Jewish "times and seasons" (Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1). Likewise, He spoke of a hitherto unannounced period between His two advents and indicated its distinctive features (Matt. 13:1–51), and predicted a yet future time of "great tribulation" and defined its character (Matt. 24:9–31). There are "last days" for Israel (Isa. 2:1–5) as well as "last days" for the Church (2 Tim. 3:1–5). The Apostle John anticipates a period of one thousand years and relates this to the reign of Christ, at which time the Church, His Bride, will reign with Him (Rev. 20:1–6). That Christ will sit on the throne of David and reign over the house of Jacob forever is declared by the angel Gabriel (Luke 1:31–33), and that there will be an ever abiding new heaven and new earth is as clearly revealed (Isa. 65:17; 66:22; 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1). In Hebrews 1:1, 2 a sharp contrast is drawn between "time past" when God spoke to the fathers by the prophets and "these last days" when He is speaking unto us by His Son. Similarly, it is clearly disclosed that there are *ages past* (Eph. 3:5; Col. 1:26), the *present age* (Rom. 12:2; Gal. 1:4), and the *age,* or *ages, to come* (Eph. 2:7; Heb. 6:5; note Eph. 1:10, where the future age is termed the *dispensation*—οἰκονμία—of the fullness—πλήρωμα—of times—καιρός).

The use of αἰῶνας in Hebrews. 1:2 and 11:3 with its almost universal reference to *time*, either bounded or unbounded, is of particular significance as bearing on the divine arrangements of time-periods. The former with ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας and the latter with κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας have been much disputed. Dean Alford states: "The main classes of interpreters are two. (1) Those who see in the word its ordinary meaning of 'an age of time': (2) those who do not recognize such meaning, but suppose it to have been merged in that of 'the world,' or 'the worlds.' To (1) belong the Greek Fathers; and some others. On the other hand, (2) is the view of the majority of Commentators" (*N.T. for English Readers*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 599). In several passages, including the two in question, Vincent declares αἰῶνας to refer to "the universe, the aggregate of the ages or periods, and their contents which are included in the duration of the world." The word, he states, "means a period of time. Otherwise it would be impossible to account for the plural, or such qualifying expressions as *this* age, or the age to *come*" (*Word Studies*, Vol. IV, p. 59).

Considering the accepted meaning of αἰῶνας, the natural interpretation of the passage in question is that God did by Christ arrange the successive periods, far beyond καιρός within χρόνος extending indeed to things eternal or from everlasting to everlasting. This interpretation held, according to Alford, by the Greek Fathers, though not free from difficulties, is of more than passing import to those who do discern the fact, force, and fruition of God's time-periods.

The student of the Scriptures who is devoted to his task will discover that God's great time-periods, characterized as they are by specific divine purposes, fall into a well-defined order, moving on with infinite certainty to the glorious completion which God has decreed. There is an order to the creative days. The age of the patriarchs is followed by the age of the judges, and that age, in turn, is followed by the age of the kings. The "times of the Gentiles," which terminate the age of the kings, continue to the Day of Jehovah, which extended period is followed by the Day of God, characterized as it is by the new heavens and the new earth which are not only to be holy to an infinite degree but are to abide forever.

God's program is as important to the theologian as the blueprint to the builder or the chart to the mariner. Without the knowledge of it, the preacher must drift aimlessly in doctrine and fail to a large degree in his

attempts to harmonize and utilize the Scriptures. Doubtless a spiritually minded person who does not know the divine program may discern isolated spiritual truths, much as one might enjoy a point of rare color in a painting without observing the picture itself or the specific contribution which that color makes to the whole.

In spite of its importance as one of the qualifying features of doctrine, Systematic Theology, as set forth generally in textbook, is without recognition of the divine program of the ages.

II. The Church, the Body of Christ

Ecclesiology, or the doctrine of the Church, incorporates three main divisions—(a) the true Church, the Body of Christ, (b) the organized or visible church, and (c) the walk and service of those who are saved in this dispensation. Though of tremendous importance, the first and third of these divisions are practically never treated in works of Systematic Theology, while the second, if mentioned at all, is usually restricted to peculiar features of some sect or branch of the visible church with specific reference to organization and ordinances.

The Book of Acts and the Epistles introduce the fact of a new classification of humanity termed the *Church* which group is, also, properly designated as a part of the *New Creation* since each individual within the group has experienced the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15).

The works of Systematic Theology generally have recognized the redeemed people of this age, but only as a supposed sequence or continuation in the progress of the divine purpose in Israel. They refer to “the Old Testament Church” and to “the New Testament Church” as together constituting component parts of one divine project, thus failing to recognize those distinctions between Israel and the Church which, being so radical in character, serve to indicate the widest possible difference between them—difference as to origin, difference as to character and responsibility, and difference as to destiny. There are at least twenty-four far-reaching distinctions yet to be observed between Israel and the Church, while there are about twelve major features common to both; but the obvious similarities do not set aside the differences. The fact that revelation

concerning both Israel and the Church includes the truth about God, holiness, sin, and redemption by blood, does not eliminate a far greater body of truth in which it is disclosed that Israelites become such by a natural birth while Christians become such by a spiritual birth; that Israelites were appointed to live and serve under a meritorious, legal system, while Christians live and serve under a gracious system; that Israelites, as a nation, have their citizenship now and their future destiny centered only in the earth, reaching on to the new earth which is yet to be, while Christians have their citizenship and future destiny centered only in heaven, extending on into the new heavens that are yet to be (for both earthly and heavenly blessings see Rev. 21:1–22:7; 2 Pet. 3:10–13; Heb. 1:10–12; Isa. 65:17; 66:22).

With respect to humanity, the time from Adam until now is generally conceded by those who accept the Scripture testimony to be about six millenniums, these being divided into three time-periods of about two millenniums each. In the period from Adam to Abraham there was one stock or kind of humanity on the earth—Gentile; in the period from Abraham to Christ there were two—Jew and Gentile; and in the period from Pentecost to the present hour there have been and are three—Jews, Gentiles, and the Church. In the coming and final millennium there will be, according to much prediction, but two stocks or kinds of people on the earth —the Jew and the Gentile—, and as has been observed, these, having been marvelously transformed, continue as inhabitants of the new earth wherein righteousness dwells. Thus it is seen that the present dispensation only is characterized by the presence on earth of a third grouping of humanity—the Church. Not only did Christ anticipate this body of people (Matt. 16:18), but they appear along with Israel (1) as cosharers in the purpose of His incarnation, (2) as the subjects of His ministry, (3) as the objects of His death and resurrection, (4) as the beneficiaries of His second advent, and (5) as related to Him in His kingdom reign. Of these aspects of truth, it may be observed:

(1) There were two independent and widely different purposes in the incarnation. (a) On the Messianic side and in relation to His office as Israel’s King, Christ was born of a virgin and came into this human relationship with indisputable kingly rights in order that He might fulfill the Davidic Covenant (2 Sam. 7:8–18; Ps. 89:20–37; Jer. 33:21, 22, 25, 26). To

the Virgin Mary the angel said, “And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end” (Luke 1:31–33); and as the rightful heir through human lineage, He will be the everlasting occupant of David’s earthly throne, and reign over the house of Jacob forever (Isa. 9:6, 7; Luke 1:33). (b) On the mediatorial and redemptive side and to fulfill the Abrahamic Covenant, it is equally true that by the incarnation the Mediator between God and man is provided with all the inexhaustible blessings which the theanthropic Mediator secures; and through the virgin birth the Kinsman-Redeemer is realized who, as typified by Boaz, is qualified to redeem the lost estate and claim His heavenly Bride —the Church.

While these two widely different objectives obtain in the incarnation, the general facts concerning the incarnation are common to both. When contemplating either the heavenly purpose in the Church or the earthly purpose in Israel, it should be observed that: (a) it was none other than the Second Person of the Godhead who came into this human relationship; (b) to do this He emptied Himself, becoming obedient to His Father’s will; (c) He took a human body, soul, and spirit; and (d) the union thus formed between the divine and human natures resulted in the incomparable theanthropic Person.

(2) Christ revealed two distinct lines of truth. In the first, He presented Himself as Israel’s Messiah and called upon that nation for their long predicted national repentance, in which He also declared the character of His earthly kingdom rule and Himself as the Fulfiller of the great Messianic purposes. At that time He said of Himself, “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. 15:24). In sending out His disciples He commanded them, saying, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. 10:5, 6). In the second, when Israel’s rejection of Him became apparent, He began to speak of His departure and second advent, and of a hitherto unannounced age which should intervene in which the gospel should be preached in all the world to Jew and Gentile alike, and His disciples, whose messages had before been restricted to Israel alone,

were then commissioned to declare the glad tidings to every creature. A slight comparison of His farewell address to Israel—"… hated of all nations" (Matt. 23:37–25:46)—with His farewell word to those who had believed on Him to the saving of their souls (John 13:1–17:26), will disclose the most evident distinctions between Israel and the Church. Such contrasts could be drawn from the Gospels almost indefinitely, and without these distinctions in mind only perplexity can characterize the one who reads with attention.

(3) In His death and resurrection the same two widely different objectives are discernible. To Israel His death was a stumbling block (1 Cor. 1:23), nor was His death any part of His office as King over Israel—"Long live the king!"; yet, in His death Israel had her share to the extent that He dealt finally with the sins committed aforetime, which sins had been only covered according to the provisions of the Old Testament atonement (Rom. 3:25). By His death the way was prepared for any individual Jew to be saved through faith in Him; and by His death a sufficient ground was secured whereon God will yet "take away" the sins of that nation at the time when "all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11:27). However, the nation Israel sustains no relation to the resurrection of Christ other than that which David foresaw, namely, that if Christ died He must be raised again from the dead in order that He might sit on David's throne (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:25–31). Over against this, it is revealed that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it (Eph. 5:25–27), and that His resurrection is the beginning of the New Creation of God, which includes the many sons whom He is bringing into glory (Heb. 2:10). In that New Creation relationship, the believer is *in* the resurrected Christ and the resurrected Christ is *in* the believer. This twofold unity establishes an identity of relationship which surpasses all human understanding. It is even likened by Christ to the unity which exists between the Persons of the Godhead (John 17:21–23). By the baptism of the Spirit, wrought, as it is for everyone, when one believes (1 Cor. 12:13), the saved one is joined to the Lord (1 Cor. 6:17; Gal. 3:27), and by that union with the resurrected Christ is made a partaker of His resurrection life (Col. 1:27), is translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. 1:13), is crucified, dead, and buried with Christ, and is raised to walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:2–4; Col. 3:1), is now seated with Christ in the heavenlies (Eph. 2:6), is a citizen of heaven (Phil. 3:20), is forgiven all

trespasses (Col. 2:13), is justified (Rom. 5:1), and blessed with every spiritual blessing (Eph. 1:3). This vast body of truth, which is but slightly indicated here, is not found in the Old Testament, nor are the Old Testament saints ever said to be related thus to the resurrected Christ. It is impossible for these great disclosures to be fitted into a theological system which does not distinguish the heavenly character of the Church as in contrast to the earthly character of Israel. This failure on the part of these systems of theology to discern the character of the true Church, related wholly, as it is, to the resurrected Christ, accounts for the usual omission from these theological writings of any extended treatment of the doctrine of Christ's resurrection and all related doctrines.

(4) The great events predicted for the close of the present age include the Day of Christ when the Church will be taken to be forever with the Lord—some by resurrection and some by translation (1 Cor. 15:35–53; 1 Thess. 4:13–17)—, and the Day of the Lord when Israel will be regathered, judged, and privileged to experience the fulfillment of all her earthly covenants in the land which has been given to her by the oath of Jehovah, which oath cannot be broken (Deut. 30:3–5; 2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:34–37; Jer. 23:5, 6; 31:35–37; 33:25, 26).

(5) In the coming kingdom of Messiah the distinction between Israel and the Church is still more obvious. Israel, as a nation, is seen through prophetic vision to be on the earth as subjects of the kingdom and in her kingdom glory, while the Church is said to be coreigning with Christ (Rev. 20:6). As His Bride and Consort, it is the rightful place of the Church to share in His reign.

Two revelations were given to the Apostle Paul: (1) That of salvation to infinite perfection for individual Jew and Gentile alike through faith in Christ and on the ground of His death and resurrection (Gal. 1:11, 12). That this salvation is an exercise of grace which far surpasses anything hitherto experienced in the Old Testament, is clearly revealed in 1 Peter 1:10, where it is stated, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you." (2) That of the new divine purpose in the outcalling of the Church (Eph. 3:6). This new purpose is not merely that Gentiles are to be blessed. Old Testament prophecy had long predicted Gentile blessings. The purpose consists in the fact that a new body of humanity was to be formed from both

Jews and Gentiles, a relationship in which neither Jew nor Gentile position is retained, but where Christ is all and in all (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11). The Apostle likewise records the former estate of Gentiles and Jews and the present estate of those who are now saved, whether of one group or the other. We read concerning the Gentile, “that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12). Of the Jew we read, “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. 9:4, 5). But of the Church we read, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved” (Eph. 1:3–6).

With the same fundamental distinction in view, the Apostle makes separate enumeration of the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church of God (1 Cor. 10:32); and again in Ephesians 2:11 he refers to the Gentiles as the *Uncircumcision*, and the Jews as the *Circumcision made with hands*; but in Colossians 2:11 he refers to the *Circumcision made without hands*. The latter designation indicates the supernatural standing and character of those who comprise the Body of Christ.

Though in its time established and imposed by Jehovah, Judaism did not merge into Christianity, nor does it now provide the slightest advantage to the individual Jew who would become a Christian. With reference to Christianity, Jews and Gentiles are now, alike, “under sin.” They need identically the same grace of God (Rom. 3:9), and that grace is offered to them on precisely the same terms (Rom. 10:12). Nicodemus, who was apparently a most perfect specimen of Judaism, was told by Christ that *he* must be born again, and the Apostle Paul prayed that the Israelites who had “a zeal for God” might be saved. They were at fault in that after the new and limitless privileges in grace had come through Christ (John 1:17), they

still clung to the old meritorious features of Judaism, “going about to establish their own righteousness” and not submitting themselves to the imputed righteousness of God (Rom. 10:1–3).

The one who cannot recognize that the Church is a new, heavenly purpose of God, absolutely disassociated from both Jew and Gentile (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11), but sees the Church only as an ever increasing company of redeemed people gathered alike from all ages of human history, will perhaps do well to ponder the following questions: Why the rent veil? Why Pentecost? Why the distinctive message of the Epistles? Why the “better” things of the Book of Hebrews? Why the Jewish branches broken off? Why the present headship and ministry of Christ in heaven? Why the present visitation to the Gentiles and not before? Why the present indwelling by the Spirit of all who believe? Why the baptism of the Spirit—unique in the New Testament? Why two companies of redeemed in the new Jerusalem? Why only earthly promises to Israel and only heavenly promises to the Church? Why should the divinely given rule of life be changed from law to grace? Why is Israel likened to the repudiated and yet to be restored wife of Jehovah, and the Church likened to the espoused bride of Christ? Why the two objectives in the incarnation and resurrection? Why the new day—the Day of Christ—with its rapture and resurrection of believers and with its rewards for service and suffering—a day never once mentioned in the Old Testament? Why the “mysteries” of the New Testament, including the Body of Christ? Why the New Creation, comprising, as it does, all those who by the Spirit are joined to the Lord and are forever in Christ? How could there be a Church, constructed as she is, until the death of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, the ascension of Christ, and the Day of Pentecost? How could the Church, in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, be any part of Israel in this or any other age?

Like the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, the doctrine of the true Church with her supernatural and exalted position and her heavenly destiny is largely omitted from theological writings only because these aspects of truth cannot be fitted into a Judaized system to which Systematic Theology has too often been committed. The stupendous spiritual loss of such an omission is only slightly reflected in the failure on the part of believers to understand their heavenly calling with its corresponding God-designed incentive to a holy life.

III. Human Conduct and the Spiritual Life

It is possible that the modern emphasis upon human conduct expressed in the phrase, “It matters little what you believe, it is the life that counts,” was, when first uttered, a protest against the omission of the theme of human conduct from works of Systematic Theology. True to its limitations, the world of practical men is more interested in a justification by *works* than it is in a justification by *faith*. Much of the Bible is hortatory, and the contemplation of the doctrine of human conduct belongs properly to a science which purports to discover, classify, and exhibit the great doctrines of the Bible. This particular theme includes: (1) human conduct in general and in all ages—past, present, and future; and (2) the peculiar and exalted walk and daily life of the Christian: (a) his motive, (b) his high standards, (c) his method in his warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil, (d) his sins, (e) his relationships, (f) his witness, (g) his sufferings and sacrifice, his life of faith and prayer, and (h) his contest for rewards.

1. Human Conduct in General and in All Ages.

From the beginning, God, in faithfulness, has disclosed to man the precise manner of life that He requires of him. What may be termed *inherent law* embodies all that a Creator expects and requires of His creature. It is well expressed by the phrase, “Be ye holy; for I am holy.” This law has been binding on that portion of humanity in all ages to whom no other law has been addressed. However, God has disclosed His specific will to particular groups of people in various ages. Identification of the particular responsibility God has imposed upon man in each age is not difficult. During much of human history man has sustained a meritorious or legal relation to God; that is, God’s declaration to man concerning conduct was, in substance, If you will do good, I will bless you (cf. Deut. 28:1–14), and if you will do evil, I will curse you (cf. Deut. 28:15–68). All governmental, social, and family affairs, of necessity, proceed upon the principle of the recognition of human merit. It is not difficult, therefore, for men generally to understand the legal aspect of divine government, but it is difficult apparently for them to understand the grace aspect of divine government. The fact that God, in sovereign grace, now either bestows, or assures, all His saving benefits before allowing the individual to do aught

for him seems perhaps too good to be true; but it is true, and, until this fact is recognized, the Christian will not be able to walk with God intelligently from the true grace-motive.

Though the Bible sets forth the divine requirements for human conduct in each age, there are three extended systems of divine government which in succession cover the period of human history from the time when the first written Scriptures were given to the end of the mediatorial reign of Christ, namely, (a) the Mosaic law, embodying the manner of life prescribed in the law age, which age existed from Moses to Christ, (b) the grace rule of life, embodying the manner of life prescribed for the present age, which age extends from the first to the second advent of Christ, and (c) the kingdom rule of life, embodying the manner of life prescribed for the yet future kingdom age, which age follows the second advent. Though too often confused, the divine government is different in each of these ages, being adapted perfectly to the relation which the people in their respective dispensations sustain to God. Each of these systems of human government is wholly complete in itself. The Mosaic law contained the commandments, the statutes, and the ordinances, and was an expression of God's will to Israel to whom alone it was addressed. In the teachings of grace addressed only to the Church, God has disclosed in full the manner of life which becomes those who are already perfected in Christ. The kingdom rule of conduct embodies that precise responsibility which will be required when Christ is reigning on the earth, when Satan is in the pit, and when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. It is most reasonable that there should be widely different precepts indicated for various groups of people so diverse in their relationships. Human obligation toward God could not be the same after the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and the Day of Pentecost, as it was before those events. In like manner, human obligation toward God cannot be the same after the removal of the Church to heaven, the return of Christ to reign, and the establishment of the kingdom of heaven over all the earth, as it was before.

As to the essential character of these three systems of human conduct, it may be observed that two are *legal* and one is *gracious*. Two simple tests are available in determining those precepts that are *legal* in distinction to those that are *gracious:* (a) that which is *legal* is demonstrated to be such because of accompanying meritorious conditions which determine the divine

blessings (cf. Ex. 20:12; Ps. 103:17, 18; Matt. 5:3–12; 6:14, 15); while that which is *gracious* is an appeal based upon divine blessings already bestowed (cf. Rom. 12:1, 2; Eph. 4:1–3, 32; Col. 3:1). There is much in common among these three great governing systems. Every one of the ten commandments, excepting the fourth, is restated in the grace system. The first commandment alone reappears in that system in one form or another upwards of fifty times, but when thus appearing, it, like other legal features, is always restated in order that it may conform precisely to the essential character of grace. (b) Again, that which is *legal* is demonstrated to be such by the fact that only human ability is appealed to; while that which is *gracious* is evidenced by two facts, that divine enablement is provided and its exercise is anticipated.

In general, the law system is set forth in the Old Testament (cf. Ex. 20:1–31:18); the grace teachings are revealed in portions of the Gospels, the Book of Acts, and the New Testament Epistles; while the kingdom system is set forth in the Old Testament predictions concerning the Messianic period, and in those portions of the synoptic Gospels which record the kingdom teachings of John the Baptist and of Christ. The present importance of these distinctions, especially those that are related to the Church, is obvious.

2. The Peculiar Walk and Daily Life of the Christian. Conforming to the general divisions of this subject as intimated above, it may be observed:

The *motive* which actuates the conduct and service of the one who is perfectly saved in Christ is of necessity radically different from any and every legal incentive. To the saved one, being perfected forever in Christ, made accepted in the Beloved, and now a recipient of every spiritual blessing, no meritorious appeal is appropriate; and the only motive for correct conduct remaining for such a one is that of *walking worthy of the calling wherewith he is called*. Living with a view to securing the favor of God, and living in the favor of God already secured in Christ, are two widely different motives. One is legal, the other is gracious, and the gracious manner of life is governed by divine beseechings which are adapted to those who are under grace (Rom. 12:1, 2; Eph. 4:1–3).

As to their demands, the *standards* of living for the Christian under grace far exceed those required of people in other dispensations. This is not to imply that one is more holy than the other, but rather to declare that one requires far more achievement than the other. The law said, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” but Christ said, “A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you” (John 13:34). The manner of life which becomes a child of God will be found to be superhuman in almost every particular. In fact, God does not have two standards, one for the earth and one for heaven. Being a citizen of heaven, the believer, though still on the earth, is appointed to live according to the high and holy ideals of his native country (cf. 2 Cor. 10:5; Gal. 5:16; Eph. 4:1, 30; 5:2; 1 Thess. 5:19; 1 Pet. 2:9; 1 John 1:7). This divine ideal is twofold: first, victory over evil in every form; and, second, the realization of all the will of God in Spirit-wrought character and service. Spirituality includes both of these achievements. To be divinely delivered from every form of evil is negative and, when realized, does not relieve the necessity of a positive, spiritual output in the Christian’s life to the glory of God. The spiritual life is the greatest New Testament theme next to that of salvation by grace. Every phase of this supernatural life is set forth in the doctrinal portions of the New Testament Epistles. The preacher *must* know these truths if he is to experience any measure of divine power either in his own life or in his ministry. Similarly, he *must* know this body of truth if he is to guide others in the path of holy living and intelligent service. Seminaries, generally, offer no instruction in this important field of doctrine; but, over against this, conventions for the specific study and deepening of the spiritual life have sprung up in various localities. These, it would seem, are, to some extent, a protest against the tragic failure of theological institutions to prepare pastors and teachers for one of the greatest ministries God has committed to them.

The Christian’s *method* in his warfare with the world, the flesh, and the devil is also a specific revelation. At the moment of salvation the believer enters upon a threefold conflict which is superhuman in its forces and far-reaching in its possibilities both as to tragic failure or glorious victory. The whole scope and character of the world-system directed, as it is, by its god, Satan, and offering its attractions and allurements, is faithfully and extensively portrayed in the New Testament. So, also, the doctrine of the

flesh (σάρξ), with its ever present enmity against the Spirit and all things spiritual, is as faithfully declared in order that the saved one may not only understand his new complex being, but know, as well, the way in which the life, in spite of the *flesh*, may become *spiritual* (πνευματικός) to the glory of God; and, likewise, the believer faces the arch-enemy of God who is a relentless, cruel foe, and who with superhuman strength and strategy is "walking about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." The only provision for victory in this threefold conflict is a simple confidence in the power of Another. This plan should not seem strange to one who has already discovered the marvelous results that are secured when the Lord has been trusted for salvation from his lost estate. It is faith that overcomes the world (1 John 5:4); it is confidence in the Spirit of God that overcomes the flesh (Gal. 5:16, 17); and it is faith that overcomes the evil one (Eph. 6:10–16; 1 John 4:4; cf. Jude 1:9).

It is not enough to enjoin Christians to be good. In the light of the superhuman manner of life belonging to their high calling, their own limitations, and the threefold conflict which they wage, their problem is one of "how to perform that which is good" (Rom. 7:18), and until the Apostle learned the precise features which govern the life of faith he knew only defeat (Rom. 7:15–24). The body of truth bearing on the life of victory by the Spirit is as extensive and its principles as divinely arranged as are the same features in the doctrine of salvation. In this body of truth, one is confronted with that particular aspect of Christ's death which is unto the judgment of the sin nature. This aspect of His death is the righteous foundation for all God's work in sanctification. This is not merely a question of deciding between what is right and what is wrong; it is distinctly a problem of claiming divine power in God's prescribed way to live according to the very standards of heaven. Let none suppose that these features of truth are known intuitively. On the contrary, they call for the most careful classroom instruction in addition to heart-searching prayer and far-reaching adjustments in his life if the pastor is to be himself a man of God and one who is intelligent in the directing of spiritual lives.

The character and cure of the *Christian's sin* is one of the most extensive doctrines in the Word of God including as it does, first, God's threefold preventative for the Christian's sin—the Word of God, the indwelling Spirit of God, and the interceding Christ in heaven; second, the peculiar effect of

the Christian's sin upon himself in the loss of fellowship with God, the loss of the peace of God, the loss of the power of God, and the loss of the joy of the Lord; and, third, the effect of the Christian's sin upon God Himself, and that relief from condemnation which Christ secures as Advocate in heaven. At length the New Testament presents both the ground of cure through a specific propitiation for the Christian's sin (1 John 2:2), and, by precept and example, the way by which a sinning saint may return to full fellowship with God—a doctrine embodying explicit directions harmonious with the Christian's saved estate, and which is as important, indeed, as is the life and service of the saints on earth.

The Christian sustains varied *relationships* which are each and every one set forth in the New Testament Epistles with specific instructions. He sustains a relationship to God the Father, to God the Son, to God the Holy Spirit, to Satan, to the world-system, to himself, to human governments, to the body of Christ, to the unregenerate, to ecclesiastical authorities, husbands to wives, wives to husbands, parents to children, children to parents, masters to servants, servants to masters, the strong to the weak, the weak to the strong.

The Christian is a citizen of heaven and after he is saved is detained here in this world in the capacity of a *witness*. He is a *pilgrim and stranger*, an *ambassador* from the court of heaven. In His High Priestly prayer Christ not only said that the saved ones are not of this world, even as He is not of the world, but that He has sent them into the world as the Father sent Him into the world. To them is committed the word of reconciliation and they are the ones to whom each great commission is addressed. After dying for lost men, there could be no greater desire or purpose in the heart of Christ than that this gospel should be proclaimed to those for whom He died. The pastor is a divinely appointed leader and teacher in the promotion of this enterprise. Missionary endeavor should be the primary activity of every church, the largest feature of its financial investments and prayer, and the never ceasing call to the best young men and young women of the congregation to go as heralds of the gospel to the ends of the earth. Naturally, the theological student who is going to the foreign field will be seeking instruction in missionary statesmanship, but the one who serves as pastor at home needs this instruction even more; for upon him devolves that leadership which

secures new lives for missionary service, and the prayer and financial support of those who go.

The Christian is called to *suffering* and *sacrifice* along with the experience of great peace and celestial joy. The suffering will be endured and the sacrifice be made with gladness just so far as the truth of God has reached his heart, and the truth will normally reach his heart only as it is brought to him by a faithful pastor deeply taught in the Word which God has given.

Similarly, efficacious *faith* and prevailing *prayer*, which should be the abiding experience of both pastor and people, come only through a knowledge of the Scriptures and obedience to them.

The doctrine of *rewards* to be bestowed at the judgment seat of Christ for faithfulness in life and service is a counterpart of the doctrine of divine grace, and no preacher or layman will be intelligent in his endeavor nor be possessed with one of the greatest divine incentives who is not actuated by these provisions and revelations.

The major aspects of the doctrine of human conduct and the spiritual life are thus briefly stated. It is all intensely practical and will naturally occupy a large place in the message of the faithful preacher. This theme incorporates more than a mere system of ethics. The whole field of human conduct is involved with its major age-characterizing systems of divine government, and added to this are the more specific features of the Christian's responsibility. Though belonging to God's revelation and though of surpassing importance, there is practically no recognition of the features of human conduct or of the spiritual life set forth in works on Systematic Theology generally and, by so much, uncounted numbers of preachers have been sent out from seminaries without adequate Scriptural preparation for one of the greatest tasks that confronts them.

IV. Angelology

According to divine revelation, the creative work of God falls naturally into three major undertakings and in the following order: (a) the angelic hosts, (b) material things, and (c) life upon the earth with man as its crowning feature. That angels are created beings is asserted in the Bible (Col. 1:16; Ps. 148:2–5), and though there are vast hosts of angels (Heb.

12:22; Matt. 26:53; Ps. 68:17; Rev. 5:11), they were all created at one and the same time, and all will abide numerically unchanged forever since they neither propagate nor die. As there are three major works in creation, there are likewise three distinct results: (a) the angels, or that which is wholly immaterial, (b) matter, or that which is wholly material, and (c) physical life on the earth, or that which combines both the immaterial and the material. Similarly, as there is an order of life below man, so there is an order of life above man.

Scripture alone unfolds dependable information relative to the angels. They are mentioned about 108 times in the Old Testament and 165 times in the New Testament, and each passage, it will be observed, constitutes a distinct contribution to this vast and important revelation. Although God has given to man no reciprocation in converse with the angels, they are evidently quite aware of the life and activities of men (Heb. 1:14), and the fact of their existence is none the less certain. The Bible discloses also that angels are subject to classification. There are notable angels whose names and ministries are recorded—Gabriel, Michael, the Cherubim, the Seraphim, principalities and powers, elect angels, and the holy angels, who are ever to be distinguished from the fallen angels of which group some are free, and some are bound in chains awaiting impending judgment.

The angels have been, and will be, present at certain events in history. They were present at creation (Job 38:6, 7), at the giving of the law (Gal. 3:19; Acts 7:53; Heb. 2:2), at the birth of Christ (Luke 2:13), at the resurrection (Matt. 28:2), at the ascension (Acts 1:10), and they will be present at the second coming of Christ (Matt. 25:31; 13:39; 24:31; 2 Thess. 1:7). Again, as to their activities they are limited in knowledge (Matt. 24:36), they are available for defense (Matt. 26:53), they separate the righteous from the wicked (Matt. 13:41, 49), they behold the divine rejoicing (Luke 15:10), they hear Christ’s confession of the faithful (Luke 12:8), they transport a soul from earth at death (Luke 16:22), they are ministering spirits (Heb. 1:14), they are to be judged by the saints (1 Cor. 6:3), they are not to be worshiped (Col. 2:18), women are to remain covered because of the angels (1 Cor. 11:10). Added to this is the extensive list of activities on the part of individual angels at various times and places reported in upwards of one hundred passages of Scripture.

This division of Systematic Theology is indeed vast, including, as it does, both satanology and demonology. It concerns the first creation of God and discloses a company of creatures higher than man in their sphere of existence (Heb. 2:7). The doctrine of sin, especially as to the origin and ending of evil and the present spiritual conflict, is traceable only in the sphere of truth belonging to satanology. Of more than a dozen standard works on Systematic Theology examined, the majority ignore the angels completely, while others give slight space to certain features of the subject. That a science purporting to discover and set forth the works of God could be so restricted as Systematic Theology is relative to Angelology is indeed difficult to understand.

Since Satan is the deceiver of the whole world, the truth about him, so far as his power may be exercised, will be veiled, distorted, and neglected; but, having explicit divine revelation by which to be guided, theologians, by seeming indifference, have no license to abet these forms of deception which involve spiritual tragedy of infinite and eternal import.

The divine program of the ages incorporates the stupendous fact of evil and accounts as much for its termination as it does for its beginning or its course through all time. When the doctrine of evil, as to its future, is examined with unprejudiced attention, truth will be discovered which will serve to abolish the Romanist conception of a world-conquering church, or the Protestant ideal of a world transformed by the gospel.

For want of a devout and scholarly presentation of the truth contained in satanology and demonology on the part of carefully trained preachers and teachers, even believers are left to join with the world in its ridicule and levity concerning the solemn revelation regarding Satan and the demons. What could be more arresting, penetrating, or convincing than the words of Christ: “Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” (Matt. 10:28). Even those who are minded to be serious are too often left to follow grotesque and unscriptural beliefs with their attending evils. There is abundant Scripture setting forth the essential facts regarding Satan—his origin, his first estate, his fall, his present estate, power and authority, his methods, his motives, his relationships, his past, present, and future activities, his judgments in their varied aspects, and his final destiny.

Likewise, there is abundant Scripture bearing on the demons—their origin, their number, their abode, their undertakings, and their final doom.

The immense and vital body of truth contained in satanology cannot be outlined here. A few questions may serve to indicate something of the extent of the theme: Who is Satan? From whence does he come? What was his original estate? For what specific purpose was he created? What one extended passage describes Satan's original state and appointments? What far-reaching truths are discovered by a complete exegesis of this passage? What Scripture records the details of Satan's sin? What is involved in each of the five "I will's" of Satan? Which one of these discloses his life motive? What was Satan's sin according to a literal translation of 1 Timothy 3:6? What are the world-wide results of Satan's power? What was the basis of Satan's claim to authority over humanity in the period between Adam and Christ? What did Christ accomplish by His death according to Colossians 2:14, 15? Was Satan's claim true as revealed in Luke 4:6, 7? What is his authority now? On what right does he now act? Over what realms does Satan now reign? What are the two aspects of the world represented by the word κόσμος How can God love one (John 3:16) and not love the other (1 John 2:15–17; James 4:4)? What precisely is the *world* which the believer must not love? Who is the god of the κόσμος? What is worldliness in a Christian? Is the world-system all evil in the sight of God? What does 1 John 2:16 add to this doctrine? Does war belong to the world-system? What is the victory that overcomes the world-system? By whose power is the victory gained? How much truth might Satan incorporate into a counterfeit system and yet offer no hope to the lost? What are Satan's future judgments? Where does he spend eternity? What is Satan's relation to God? What is his relation to the universe? What is his relation to believers? Who are the demons? From whence do they come? What is disclosed relative to their number? What important passages state the general features of demonology? Are demons active today? If so, what are they doing? What is their future judgment? Where do they spend eternity?

The man who of God is appointed to preach the Word can hardly escape the responsibility of declaring these features of truth. If the preacher must be excused on the ground that he was not taught these things in the seminary, then he confronts again immeasurable damage which is wrought by an abridged Systematic Theology. As well might an army officer be sent

to command a battle who does not know the character, location, equipment, or strength of the foe as for a preacher to take one step from the seminary who does not know God's explicit revelation regarding Satan and the demons.

V. Typology

Dr. Patrick Fairbairn begins his valuable treatise on the types with the following statement: "The Typology of Scripture has been one of the most neglected departments of theological science." This declaration is significant not only for the recognition of an inestimable loss to the Church of Christ, but for the fact that typology is, by this worthy theologian, given a rightful place in the science of Systematic Theology. Dr. Fairbairn does not assert that no attention has been given to typology in generations past. On the contrary, he goes on to show that from Origen's day to the present hour there have been those who have emphasized this theme, and that some have emphasized it beyond reason. The contention is that theology, as a science, has neglected this great field of revelation. Typology, like prophecy, has often suffered more from its friends than its foes. The fact that extremists have failed to distinguish between that which is typical and that which is merely allegorical, analogous, parallel, happy illustration, or resemblance, may have driven conservative theologians from the field. When truth is tortured by faddists and extremists, an added obligation is thereby imposed upon conservative scholarship to declare it in its right proportions. It is obvious that to neglect truth is a greater error than to overemphasize it or to misstate it; and typology, though abused by some, is, nevertheless, conspicuous by its absence from works on Systematic Theology. That typology is neglected is evident from the fact that of upwards of twenty works of Systematic Theology examined but one lists this subject in its index and this author has made but one slight reference to it in a footnote.

A type is a divinely purposed anticipation which illustrates its antitype. These two parts of one theme are related to each other by the fact that the same truth or principle is embodied in each. It is not the prerogative of the type to establish the truth of a doctrine; it rather enhances the force of the truth as set forth in the antitype. On the other hand, the antitype serves to

lift its type out of the commonplace into that which is inexhaustible and to invest it with riches and treasures hitherto unrevealed. The Passover-Lamb type floods the redeeming grace of Christ with richness of meaning, while the redemption itself invests the Passover-Lamb type with all its marvelous significance. While it is true that the type is not the reality, as is the antitype, the elements found in the type are, in the main, to be observed in the antitype. Thus the type may, and often does, guide specifically in the right understanding and structure of the antitype. The type is as much a work of God as is the antitype. Through the recognition of the relation between the type and antitype, like prophecy in its fulfillment, the supernatural continuity and plenary inspiration of the whole Bible is established. The field both in typology and prophecy is vast, there being upwards of one hundred legitimate types, fully one-half of which concern the Lord Jesus Christ alone, and there being even a greater field of prophecy wherein there are upwards of three hundred detailed predictions concerning Christ which were fulfilled by His first advent. There are three major factors which serve to exhibit the unity between the two Testaments: type and antitype, prophecy and its fulfillment, and continuity in the progress of narrative and doctrine. These factors, like woven threads running from one Testament into the other, bind them not only into one fabric, but serve to trace one design which, by its marvelous character, glorifies the Designer.

The two Greek words τύπος and ὑπόδειγμα serve in the New Testament to express the thought of that which is typical. Τύπος means an imprint which may serve as a mold or pattern, and that which is typical in the Old Testament is a mold or pattern of that which is antitypical in the New Testament. The root τύπος is translated by five English words (‘ensample,’ 1 Cor. 10:11; Phil. 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:7; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1 Pet. 5:3; ‘example,’ 1 Tim. 4:12; Heb. 8:5; ‘figure,’ Acts 7:43; Rom. 5:14; ‘pattern,’ Titus 2:7; ‘print of the nails,’ John 20:25). Δεῖγμα means a ‘specimen’ or ‘example,’ and when combined with ὑπό indicates that which is shown plainly under the eyes of men. Ὑπόδειγμα is translated by two English words (‘example’, John 13:15; Heb. 4:11; 8:5; James 5:10; and ‘pattern,’ Heb. 9:23). Types are generally to be classified as of *persons* (Rom. 5:14; cf. Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, Sarah, Ishmael, Isaac, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, etc.); of *events* (1 Cor. 10:11; cf. the preservation of Noah and his sons in the ark,

redemption from Egypt, the Passover memorial, the exodus, the passing through the Red Sea, the giving of manna, water drawn from the rock, the serpent lifted up, and all the sacrifices); a *thing* (Heb. 10:20; cf. the tabernacle, the laver, the Lamb, Jordan, a city, a nation); an *institution* (Heb. 9:11; cf. the Sabbath, sacrifice, priesthood, kingdom); a *ceremonial* (1 Cor. 5:7; cf. all the Old Testament appointments of service). It is impossible in this space to list the recognized types found in the Old Testament.

A true type is a prophecy of its antitype and, being thus designed of God, is not to be rated as so much human speculation, but as a vital part of inspiration itself. Naturally, Christ is the outstanding antitype since the supreme object of both the Old and New Testaments is "the testimony of Jesus."

In answer to the question as to how a type can be distinguished from an allegory or analogy, some rules have been advanced. Among these it is declared that nothing is to be deemed typical which is not sustained as such in the New Testament. This statement is subject to two criticisms: (a) In the light of 1 Corinthians 10:11, there is no definiteness to the boundaries of the words "all these things"; yet, whatever is included is there said to be *typical*. (b)There are many easily recognized types which are not directly sanctioned as such by any specific New Testament Scripture. Like the problem of primary and secondary application of the Truth, the recognition of a type must be left, in any case, to the discernment of a Spirit-guided judgment.

It is the prerogative of the science of Systematic Theology to discover, classify, exhibit, and defend the doctrines of the Scriptures, and the precise features of typology are yet uncertain largely because of the fact that theologians have given their attention to other things; but who will dare to estimate the restriction imposed on the theological student's own spiritual life and blessing and, through him, upon all to whom he ministers, when the types which are God's great pictures of truth are deleted from every course of study designed to prepare him for a fruitful and worthy ministry of the Word of God! It is not enough to give these themes a passing recognition in the study of evidences; the student should be so saturated with these marvels of God's message that the whole being is set aglow with that spiritual radiance which can never be dimmed.

VI. Prophecy

The comparative importance of predictive prophecy as related to other aspects of Bible truth is indicated by the fact that at least one-fifth of the Bible was, at the time it was written, an anticipation of the future. Of this extended material much has now been fulfilled, and much remains to be fulfilled. In each step of human progress it has pleased God to declare beforehand precisely what He was about to do. It might be supposed that such a demonstration of supernatural power would impress men; but they ever remain indifferent to this phenomenon. The divine announcement as to the future has usually been revealed as a message to those who were in closest relation to God. His word, "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" (Gen. 18:17), doubtless discloses one of the actuating motives of God in His prophetic revelation. That He still unveils His intentions as they are recorded in the Scriptures to those in close fellowship with Himself is made clear in John 16:12, 13. This context records the words of Christ to His disciples at the end of those memorable three and a half years in which they had been privileged to sit at His feet and learn of Him. After having completed these years of instruction, He said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: … he will shew you things to come". Thus the teachings of Christ are by Him divided into two general divisions, namely (a) those things the disciples could apprehend *before* they were enlightened by the Spirit of God, and (b) those things they might apprehend *after* they were thus enlightened. As an illustration of this division, it was evidenced they could not at that time receive any truth related to Christ's death since they did not then believe that He was going to die (Matt. 16:21, 22); but immediately *after* the coming of the Spirit, Peter declared: "… But those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled" (Acts 3:18). The context of John 16:12, 13 goes on to specify those aspects of truth which the disciples could not then receive, but which they would afterwards be able to grasp through the teaching ministry of the Spirit. Among these, and the first and only theme to be mentioned specifically, was, "He will shew you things to come". It is evident from the synoptic Gospels that He had spoken much in their presence of future things, but they did not apprehend His prophetic words any more clearly than they did His references to His death. Before Pentecost Peter doubtless joined with

the other disciples in the query, “Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” (Acts 1:6); but within a period of a very few days after Pentecost Peter was able to say, “And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began” (Acts 3:20, 21). It must, therefore, be concluded that the ability to understand “things to come” is restricted to those only who are in such relation to the Holy Spirit as to be taught by Him.

It is important to note, also, that though predictive prophecy was made clear to the early Church, that great body of truth along with other vital doctrines was lost to view during the Dark Ages and, though not emphasized by the Reformers, is becoming increasingly clear during these past two generations in particular as reverent and scholarly men study the prophetic Scriptures.

The theme of predictive prophecy is vast indeed. It is reasonable to suppose that there is as much to record concerning the future as there is to record concerning the past, and that the theologian who ignores the prophecies which are yet unfulfilled is, therefore, eliminating a large portion of the material which enters into the whole revealed program of God. Even past events will be interpreted with uncertainty by the one who does not apprehend God’s revealed program of future events; for God’s undertakings are an unbroken, indivisible purpose including all that is past and all that is future, and it is as perilous to interpret the past apart from the future as it is to interpret the future apart from the past. As a dividing point in time, the present moment is merely incidental. There was a time when some prophecies now fulfilled were not fulfilled, and there will be a time to come when prophecies now unfulfilled will be fulfilled. The divine program of events so faithfully set forth in the Scriptures of truth and as faithfully revealed to the attentive heart by the Spirit of truth is little concerned with an ever shifting and transitory *now*.

Eschatology, as treated by authors of works on Systematic Theology, has included little more than a brief reference to the resurrection of the body, the intermediate state, a future judgment, a restricted treatment of the second advent of Christ, and an equally restricted reference to heaven and hell. Over against this, it is here insisted that since no given moment of time

is a final point of division between things past and things future, Eschatology, being the orderly arrangement of “things to come”, should include *all* in the Bible which was predictive at the time it was uttered. When Eschatology is thus expanded, the science of Systematic Theology fulfills its worthy purpose, at least in this one division of it. No man has ever been given freedom at any time to eliminate any future work of God from the field of the science of Systematic Theology.

The following is a brief survey of the major features of fulfilled prophecy: the future of Noah’s sons, Israel’s bondage in Egypt, the future of Jacob’s sons, Israel in the land, Israel’s bondage, judgments on the surrounding nations, a partial restoration of Israel, the coming and ministry of John the Baptist, the birth of Christ, the offices of Christ, the ministries of Christ, the death of Christ, the burial of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, the ascension of Christ, the present age, the Day of Pentecost, the forming of the Church, the destruction of Jerusalem, the course and character of this age.

Similarly, a brief survey of the many features of unfulfilled prophecy is here given: the last days for the Church, the first resurrection, the rapture, the Church in heaven, her rewards, the marriage of the Lamb, the great tribulation on the earth, the man of sin, Israel’s last sufferings, the beginning of the Day of the Lord, the second coming of Christ, the battle of Armageddon, the destruction of ecclesiastical Babylon, the destruction of political Babylon, the binding of Satan, the regathering and judgment of sorrowing Israel, the judgment of the nations, the seating of Christ upon His throne, the resurrection of “tribulation saints”, millennial kingdom, the loosing of Satan and the last revolt, the doom of Satan, the great white throne, the destiny of the wicked, the destiny of the saved, the new heaven and the new earth. In addition to the above distinction between fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecy, the student who is preparing for the high calling of a preacher of the Word of God should also be given an introduction to prophecies as related to the two Testaments, the great time-periods, the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church of God, the great highways of prophecy, and the final consummation of all things toward which every divine movement is tending. Almost countless details of truth are included in this vast body of Scripture; but not more than every preacher must know if he is to fulfill his high and holy appointment as an expositor of the Word of God.

When predictive prophecy is slighted, a very considerable portion of the Bible with its sanctifying power is sacrificed; very much of the material which of God is designed to prove His unchanging faithfulness is lost; and the knowledge of His plan and purpose, which alone underlies intelligent cooperation with God in service, becomes impossible.

VII. Christ's Present Session in Heaven

The present session of Christ in heaven, the last of these major themes of doctrine to be considered, is more generally mentioned in works on Systematic Theology than the themes already presented; but when so introduced it is too often restricted to the space of a few paragraphs and the material embodied extends no further than a slight recognition of the fact of Christ's present intercession and advocacy and the relation the Holy Spirit sustains as Advocate on earth to the advocacy of Christ in heaven. The vital truth as to the measureless value to the believer of Christ's present session in heaven and the far-reaching ministry it becomes to the Church is not included in their brief discussion.

Ignoring almost wholly the forty-day postresurrection ministry of Christ with its demonstration of the fact that the resurrection body of Christ is adapted to life upon the earth as He will yet live here during a millennium of earth's peace, and with the briefest reference to the ascension without recognition of Christ's two entrances into heaven, and the riches of truth thus disclosed in His antitypical work as Fulfiller of the redemption type wherein the high priest presents blood in the Holy of holies and wherein the representative wave-sheaf is waved before Jehovah as prophetic of the first-fruits in the resurrection, these authors move directly on to a slight recognition of the fact that Christ is now seated upon His father's throne in heaven. The far-reaching distinction between Christ's own throne—the throne of David which is the throne of His glory, which throne He will occupy here on the earth—and the throne of His Father, on which He is now seated, is not generally observed by these authors.

No discussion of the present session of Christ will be adequate that does not include certain major revelations:

On the widest plane of His mediatorial ministry, Christ now seated in heaven is "expecting". The Greek ἐκδέχομαι conveys the meaning of one

awaiting the reception of something from another. The fact that Christ is now in the attitude of one who is *expecting* is disclosed in Hebrews 10:12, 13. While the realization of all that He thus expects is anticipated in Psalm 2:1–12; Daniel 2:44, 45; 2 Thessalonians 1:7–10, and Revelation 12:10 (in which passages it is stated that the whole world of humanity is to be given to Him and that He will rule them in uncompromising righteousness), it should be observed that the kingdoms of this world do not become the kingdom of Christ by virtue of human service and ministry, but by the sudden and mighty power of God and in the midst of humanity's rebellion against God on earth.

Upon His ascension it was given to Christ to become "head over all things to the church which is his body" (Eph. 1:19–23). Through His death and resurrection, He received an exaltation and a glorified name (Phil. 2:9, 10), an added joy (Heb. 12:2), an experience through suffering (Heb. 2:10), and to Him it was given of His Father to be "head over all things to the church". By this, as in other Scriptures, it is indicated that the Church had its beginning with the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Spirit. This Headship is not one of mere authority or ministry; it is rather the fact of an organic union between the Head—Christ, and the Body—the Church.

Beginning with His ascension, Christ undertook a threefold priestly ministry in heaven:

As the bestower of gifts (Eph. 4:7–16), and the director of their exercise (1 Cor. 12:4–11), and as typified by the Old Testament priest consecrating the sons of Levi (Ex. 29:1–9), Christ is ceaselessly active in heaven. In this connection, the whole field of Christian service is rightly introduced and the distinction is to be observed between the believer's threefold universal activity as *priest*, and his exercise of a *gift*.

As Intercessor, Christ continues His ministry in heaven which He began here on earth (John 17:1–26). This undertaking extends to His shepherdhood care of those whom He has saved. He ever liveth to make intercession for them, and for that reason He is able to save them evermore who come unto God by Him (Heb. 7:25). He does not pray for the world, but for those whom the Father hath given unto Him (John 17:9). The intercession of Christ has to do with the weakness, immaturity, and

limitations of the one for whom He prays. His intercession is said to secure their safekeeping forever.

As Advocate, and as the One who now appears for us in heaven (Heb. 9:24), Christ has to do with the Christian's actual *sin*. In event of sin in his life, the Christian has an advocate with the Father. An advocate is one who espouses the cause of another in the open courts, and there is abundant reason for Christ to advocate in behalf of the one who so constantly sins and whose sin must otherwise condemn him eternally. As Advocate, Christ pleads the efficacy of His own blood on behalf of the sinning child of God, and the thing He accomplishes is so perfect that, while thus advocating for the sinning Christian, Christ wins the title, "Jesus Christ the righteous".

Not only is the doctrine of the Christian's sin centered in the present heavenly ministry of Christ, but Christ's intercession with His advocacy forms the basis of the truth of the eternal security of all who are saved. A full understanding of the Scriptures bearing on the extensive theme of the Christian's sin, as to its effect upon himself, and upon God, is of primary importance to the minister in his own inner life, and to those whom he attempts to guide into intelligent Christian living.

In the light of 1 John 1:4–9; 2:1, 2, and 1 Corinthians 11:31, 32, it could not be doubted that there is special divine attention given to, and provisions made for, the specific sins which are committed by the children of God. The importance of such truth is recognized when it is seen in its vast extent, its practical bearing on spiritual power and godliness, and in the fact that it is as adapted to the needs of the sinning saint as salvation is adapted to those who are lost. Yet the recognition of the peculiar character of the Christian's sin with both its prevention and cure as divinely provided, along with the whole field of truth concerning Christ's present ministry in heaven, is woefully lacking in courses for ministerial training.

In this entire work on theology, quite in contrast to theological works generally, all historical matter is omitted from the immediate discussion. The student does not pursue the study of the history of doctrine as he advances. There is a constructive declaration of theology in its systematic form which is best not interrupted constantly with mere citation of past beliefs. In the plan followed in the Dallas Theological Seminary the student concludes his theological research with an extended course in the history of doctrine which aims to cover all historical aspects of this great science; and

thus at a time when all the data on any aspect of truth is in view he may hope to see it in its true historical light.

It is therefore contended that an unabridged treatment of theology is needed. To cover the ground completely, a doctrinal summarization has been added to this work in which more than a hundred doctrines not found in a systematic treatment of theology are analyzed.

Why a premillennial theology? So far as the author knows the present work is the only one approaching theology from an orderly and logical premillennial interpretation of the Scriptures. The supreme value of this interpretation will be observed, it is believed, as one pursues this work.

Why dispensational? Apart from a sane recognition of the great purposes and time-periods of God, no true understanding of the Bible has ever been received.

When Systematic Theology includes the premillennial and dispensational interpretations of the Bible, much added material is discovered and the work is greatly extended.

These pages represent what has been, and is, taught in the classrooms of the Dallas Theological Seminary. One volume of these eight should be covered each semester for six terms. The last two semesters are required for Volume VII.

The author is duly aware of the stupendous task laid upon him to forge for the first time, so far as he knows, a logical, complete system of theology conforming to the premillennial and dispensational interpretation of the Bible. The task completed, these eight volumes are released with true thanksgiving to God for the measure of success attained. Perhaps the way is blazed thus for a more worthy work of this character to be wrought. May God be pleased to use this effort to His own glory.

Appreciation

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Miner B. Stearns and to Dr. John F. Walvoord for their critical reading of the manuscript; so also to Dr. John H. Bennetch and to Mr. A. H. Dewey Duncan for invaluable critical work respecting the text in its final form; also to the late Mrs. Loraine Case Chafer and to Mrs. Casey Smith who have generously given superintending care to the manuscripts, and to a host of friends who, conscious of the all-but-superhuman task laid upon me, have sustained me with their prayers. Especial thanks is given to those friends who by voluntary gifts have made the financial side of the production of the books a possibility. To Mr. Richard D. Williams is extended appreciation for the drawing used for the frontispiece.

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER

Volume One

Prolegomena • Bibliology

Theology Proper Table of Contents

Prolegomena

CHAPTER I. PROLEGOMENA I. THE WORD *Theology* II. General Uses of the Word

1. Natural Theology 2. Revealed Theology
3. Biblical Theology
4. Theology Proper
5. Historical Theology
6. Dogmatic Theology
7. Speculative Theology
8. Old Testament Theology
9. New Testament Theology
10. Pauline, Johannine, Petrine Theologies 11. Practical Theology
12. Systematic or Thetic Theology

III. VARIOUS DEFINITIONS IV. Students of Theology

V. ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

1. The Inspiration and Authority of the Scriptures Are Assumed 2. The Laws of Methodology Are as Essential in the Science of Systematic Theology as in Any Other Science 3. Finite Limitations Must Be Recognized
4. Spiritual Illumination Is Necessary and Is Provided 5. Patient and Tireless Study Is Required
6. Faith
7. Systematic Theology Should Be Unabridged VI. EXISTING ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SCRIPTURES 1. Rationalism a. Extreme
   b. Moderate
2. Mysticism
   a. False Mysticism
   b. True Mysticism
3. Romanism
4. The Orthodox Protestant Faith

VII. The Major Divisions of Systematic Theology 1. Bibliology 2. Theology Proper
3. Angelology
4. Anthropology
5. Soteriology
6. Ecclesiology
7. Eschatology
8. Christology
9. Pneumatology
10. Doctrinal Summarization

Conclusion

Bibliology

Chapter II. Introduction to Bibliology I. The Supernatural Origin of the Bible
1. The Book of God 2. The Bible and Monotheism
3. The Doctrine of the Trinity
a. God the Father
b. God the Son
c. God the Spirit
4. Creation
5. Sin
6. The Cure of Evil according to the Bible 7. The Extent of Bible Revelation
8. The Ethics of the Bible
9. The Continuity of the Bible
10. Prophecy and Its Fulfillment
11. Types with Their Antitypes
12. The Bible as Literature
13. The Bible and Science
14. The Bible and Temporal Power
15. The Bible's Enduring Freshness

II. General Divisions of the Bible 1. The Structure of the Bible 2. Created Beings and Their Relationships
a. The Angels
b. The Gentiles

c. The Jews
d. The Christians

3. The Time Periods of the Bible
   a. Divisions Related to Humanity
      (1) The First Period
      (2) The Second Period
      (3) The Third Period
      (4) The Fourth Period
   b. Dispensations
      (1) The Dispensation of Innocence
      (2) The Dispensation of Conscience
      (3) The Dispensation of Human Government
      (4) The Dispensation of Promise
      (5) The Dispensation of Law
      (6) The Dispensation of Grace
      (7) The Dispensation of Kingdom Rule
   c. The Covenants
      (1) The Covenant of Redemption
      (2) The Covenant of Works
      (3) The Covenant of Grace
      (4) The Edenic Covenant
      (5) The Adamic Covenant
      (6) The Noahic Covenant
      (7) The Abrahamic Covenant
      (8) The Mosaic Covenant
      (9) The Palestinian Covenant
      (10) The Davidic Covenant
      (11) The New Covenant for the Church
      (12) The New Covenant for Israel
   d. The Prophetic Periods
      (1) From Adam to Abraham
      (2) From Abraham to Moses
      (3) From Moses to Daniel
      (4) From Daniel to Christ
      (5) From the First to the Second Advent of Christ (6) From the Beginning to the End of the Millennial Kingdom (7)

The Eternal State
e. The Various Aspects of the Earthly Kingdom (1) The Theocracy
(2) The Kingdom Promised
(3) The Kingdom Anticipated by Prophets
(4) The Kingdom Announced as “at Hand”
(5) The Mystery Form of the Kingdom
(6) The Kingdom to Be Reannounced by the 144,000 in Final Anticipation of the Messiah’s Return (7) The Kingdom in Manifestation
f. Divisions of the Scriptures Relative to the History of Israel in the Land g. Divisions of the Scriptures Relative to the Gentiles (1) As outside the Jewish Covenants and Commonwealth Privileges (2) As Receiving a Dispensation of World Rule at the Hour of Israel’s Last Dispersion (3) As Now Privileged to Receive the Gospel of Divine Grace (4) As Brought into Judgment at the End of Their Dispensation of World Rule (5) As Seen in Prophecy
(6) As Entering and Continuing in Israel’s Kingdom (7) As Partakers in the Glory of the Celestial City h. Divisions of the Scriptures Relative to the Church (1) As Seen in Types
(2) As Anticipated Directly in Prophecy
(3) As Being Called out from, and Yet Resident in, the World (4) As Distinct from Judaism
(5) As Caught up into Heaven by Resurrection and Translation (6) As Returning with Christ to His Earthly Reign (7) As Reigning with Christ on the Earth
(8) As Partakers in the Glory of the New Heaven 4. Main Divisions of Biblology

CHAPTER III. REVELATION I. Three Important Doctrines Distinguished 1. Revelation and Reason 2. Revelation and Inspiration
3. Revelation, Inspiration, and Illumination II. THE NATURE OF REVELATION 1. God Revealed through Nature 2. God Revealed through Providence

3. God Revealed through Preservation
4. God Revealed through Miracles
5. God Revealed by Direct Communication
6. God Revealed through the Incarnation
7. God Revealed through the Scriptures
a. Divine Revelation Is Varied in its Themes b. Divine Revelation Is Partial
c. Concerning the Facts Revealed, Divine Revelation Is Complete d. Divine Revelation Is Progressive
e. Divine Revelation Is Primarily unto Redemption f. Divine Revelation Is Final
g. Divine Revelation Is Accurate to the Point of Infinity CHAPTER IV. INSPIRATION I. The Fact and Importance of Inspiration
1. Christ versus the Apostles 2. Accommodation
3. Ignorance
4. Contradiction

II. THEORIES OF INSPIRATION 1. The Mechanical or Dictation Theory 2. Partial Inspiration
3. Degrees of Inspiration
4. The Concept and Not the Words Inspired
5. Natural Inspiration
6. Mystical Inspiration
7. Verbal, Plenary Inspiration

III. DUAL AUTHORSHIP IV. God's Word About God's Word

V. GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO VERBAL, PLENARY INSPIRATION CONCLUSION

CHAPTER V. CANONICITY AND AUTHORITY

I. THE SCRIPTURES AND AUTHORITATIVE BEING GOD-BREATHED II. THE SCRIPTURES ARE AUTHORITATIVE BEING WRITTEN BY CHOSEN MEN WHO WERE "BORNE ALONG" BY THE HOLY SPIRIT III. THE SCRIPTURES ARE AUTHORITATIVE BEING ACCREDITED BY THOSE WHO FIRST RECEIVED THEM IV. THE SCRIPTURES ARE AUTHORITATIVE BEING ATTESTED BY THE LORD JESUS CHRIST—THE SECOND PRESON OF THE GODHEAD V. THE SCRIPTURES ARE AUTHORITATIVE BEING RECEIVED, DELIVERED, AND ATTESTED BY THE PROPHETS 1. THE CONGREGATION'S RELATION TO THE SCRIPTURES 2. THE KING'S RELATION TO THE SCRIPTURES

3. The Officials' Relation to the Scriptures 4. The Levites' Relation to the Scriptures 5. The Prophets' Relation to the Scriptures VI. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being the word Employed by God the Holy Spirit VII. The Authority of the Bible is Seen in the fact that without the Slightest Deflection it vindicates and Satisfles its every Claim 1. Enduring Power 2. Imperial Power
3. Sanctifying Power
4. Revealing Power
5. Accuracy
6. Prevailing Power
7. Prophecy

Conclusion

Chapter VI. Illumination

I. Specific Forms of Spiritual darkness

1. Israel's Blindness 2. Gentile Darkness
3. Satanic Darkness
4. Carnal Blindness

II. The Illuminating work of the Spirit Chapter VII. Interpretation

I. The Purpose of the Bible as a whole

II. The Distinctive Character and Message of each book of the Bible III. To whom is a given Scripture Addressed?

IV. Consideration of the Context

V. Consideration of all Scripture Bearing on any given theme VI. Discovery of the exact Meaning of the Determinative words in the text VII. Necessity of Avoiding Personal Prejudices Chapter VIII. Animation

I. The Power of God's word upon the unsaved II. The Power of God's word upon the saved Chapter IX. Preservation

Theology Proper

Chapter X. Introduction to Theology Proper I. Intuition

II. Tradition

1. The Remote 2. The Present

III. Reason 1. The Intrinsic Value 2. The Achievements

IV. Revelation Naturalistic Theism

Chapter XI. Naturalistic Theistic Arguments I. The Cosmological Argument

II. The Teleological Argument

III. The Anthropological Argument

IV. The Ontological Argument

Conclusion

Chapter XII. Antitheistic Theories

I. Atheism

II. Agnosticism

III. Evolution

IV. Materialism

V. Polytheism

VI. Idealism and Realism

VII. Pantheism

VIII. Deism

IX. Positivism

X. Monism

XI. Dualism

XII. Pluralism

Conclusion

Biblical Theism

Chapter XIII. The Personality of God I. The Personality of God

Chapter XIV. The Attributes of God

I. Personality

1. Omniscience 2. Sensibility
   a. Holiness
   b. Justice

c. Love
d. Goodness
e. Truth
3. Will
a. Freedom
b. Omnipotence

II. Constitutional Attributes 1. Simplicity 2. Unity

3. Infinity
4. Eternity
5. Immutability
6. Omnipresence or Immensity
7. Sovereignty

Conclusion

Chapter XV. Divine Decrees

I. The Decree of God

1. Two Basic Problem a. The Moral Problem
(1) The Essential Nature of Sin
(2) The Permission of Sin
b. The Problem of the Will
2. Predestination
a. Election
b. Retribution
3. Objections to the Doctrine of Divine Decree a. The Justice of God
b. The Love of God
c. Predestination Predetermines that Men Shall Sin d. Predestination and the Means to Its Ends e. Predestination and Gospel Preaching
f. Predestination and Fatalism
g. Divine Decree and Human Suffering
4. Major Manifestations of the Divine Decree a. Creation
b. The Program of the Ages
c. Preservation
d. Providence

e. Prayer
f. Miracles
g. Grace

Conclusion

Chapter XVI. The Names of Deity

I. The Primary Names of Deity in the Old Testament 1. Jehovah 2. Elohim

3. Adon, Adonai

II. Compounds III. Old Testament Epithets

IV. New Testament Names of Deity

Conclusion

Trinitarianism

Chapter XVII. Introduction to Trinitarianism I. Preliminary Consideration

II. Three Dishonors

1. Christ 2. The Holy Spirit
3. The Scriptures

III. General Definition IV. The True Emphasis

Chapter XVIII. Proof of the Trainitarian Doctrine I. Reason

1. The Divine Attributes Are Eternal 2. Eternal Activity of the Attributes
3. The Attributes Require Both Agent and Object 4. God Is Sufficient in Himself
5. The Agent and Object Are Persons
6. Plurality in God Is a Trinity
7. The Bible Sustains Reason
   a. The Eternal Exercise of Love
   b. The Exercise of Mutual Glory
   c. The Exercise of Knowing
   d. The Exercise of Divine Disposition to Communion II. Revelation 1. The Doctrine of the Trinity as Set Forth in the Old Testament 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity as Set Forth in the New Testament a. The Trinity and the Names of God

b. The Trinity and the Attributes of God
c. The Trinity and the Works of God
(1) Creation of the Universe
(2) Creation of Man
(3) The Incarnation
(4) The Life and Ministry of Christ
(5) The Death of Chirst
(6) The Resurrection of Christ
(7) The Resurrection of All Mankind
(8) The Inspiration of the Scriptures
(9) The Minister’s Authority
(10) The Indwelling Presence
(11) The Work of Sanctification
(12) The Believer’s Safekeeping
d. The Trinity and the Worship of God
(1) By Angels
(2) By Saints
(3) The Benedictions

CHAPTER XIX. GOD THE FATHER I. Fatherhood over Creation

II. FATHERHOOD BY INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

III. THE FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST

IV. FATHERHOOD OVER ALL WHO BELIEVE

CHAPTER XX. GOD THE SON: HIS PREEXISTENCE

I. MAJOR PASSAGES ON PREEXISTENCE

II. THE ANGEL OF JEHOVAH

1. A Divine Person 2. Part of the Trinity

CHAPTER XXI. GOD THE SON: HIS NAMES I. Jehovah, Lord

II. ELOHIM, GOD

III. SON OF GOD, SON OF MAN

IV. LORD JESUS CHRIST

CHAPTER XXII. GOD THE SON: HIS DEITY

I. DIVINE ATTRIBUTES BELONG TO CHRIST

1. Eternity 2. Immutability
3. Omnipotence
4. Omniscience
5. Omnipresence
6. Other Major Attributes

II. The Prerogatives of Deity are Ascribed to Christ 1. He Is Creator of All Things 2. He Is Preserver of All Things
3. He Pardons Sin
4. Christ Will Raise the Dead
5. Christ Apportions the Rewards of Saints 6. The Judgment of the World Is Committed to Christ 7. That Worship Which Belongs Only to God Is Freely Rendered to Christ Objections

Chapter XXIII. God the Son: His Incarnation I. Who Became Incarnate?

II. How Did the Son Become Incarnate?

III. For What Purpose Did He Become Incarnate?
1. That He Might Manifest God to Man 2. That He Might Manifest Man to God
3. That He Might Be a Merciful and Faithful High Priest 4. That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil 5. That He Might Be Head over the New Creation 6. That He Might Sit on David's Throne
7. That He Might Be a Kinsman Redeemer

Conclusion

Chapter XXIV. God the Son: His Humanity

I. Christ's Humanity was Anticipated Before the Foundation of the World II. The Old Testament Expectation was of a Human Messiah 1. The Types 2. Prophecy

III. A Specific New Testament Prophecy IV. The Life of Christ on Earth
1. His Names 2. His Human Parentage
3. The Fact That He Possessed a Human Body, Soul, and Spirit 4. His Human Limitations

V. The Death and Resurrection of Christ VI. The Humanity of Christ is Seen In His Ascension and Session VII. The Humanity of Christ is evident in his Second adveni and Kingdom Reign Conclusion

Chapter XXV. God the Son: The Kenosis

I. "The Form of God"

II. The Condescension

III. "The Form of a Servant …The Likeness of Men"

Conclusion

Chapter XXVI. God the Son: The Hypostatic Union I. The Structure of the Doctrine

1. His Deity 2. His Humanity
3. The Complete Preservation of Each of His Two Natures without Confusion or Alteration of Them and Their Unity II. The Relationships 1. To the Father 2. To the Spirit
3. To Himself
4. To Angels Unfallen and Fallen
5. To Humanity
6. To Sin and the Sin Nature
   a. The Impeccability of Christ
7. To Those Who Are Saved

Conclusion

Chapter XXVII. God the Holy Spirit

I. The Personality of the Holy Spirit

II. The Deity of the Holy Spirit

1. The Holy Spirit Is Called God 2. The Holy Spirt Is Associated with God
3. The Attributes of God Are Predicated of the Holy Spirit 4. The Holy Spirit May Be Blasphemed

III. The Witness of the Old Testament 1. The Holy Spirt in Cosmical Undertakings 2. The Holy Spirit's Work in Things Governmental 3. The Holy Spirit in Relation to Individuals IV. The Witness of the New Testament V. His Titles

VI. His Relationships

1. To the Father 2. To the Son
3. To the World
4. To the Flesh
5. To the Devil
6. To Christians

7. To the Divine Purpose

VII. His Adorable Character Conclusion

PROLEGOMENA

Chapter I

PROLEGOMENA

I. The Word *Theology* THE TERM *theology*, according to its etymological features, is a compound of two Greek words—Θεός (*Theos*, 'God'), and λόγος (logos, 'speech' or 'expression'). Both Christ as the *Living Word*, and the Bible as the *Written Word* are the *Logos* of God. They are to God what expression is to thought and what speech is to reason. Theology is therefore a Θεο–λογία (*Theo-logia*) or discourse upon one specific subject, namely, *God*. However, since no consideration of God will be complete which does not contemplate His works and ways in the universe which He has created, as well as His Person, theology may be extended properly to include all material and immaterial realities that exist and the facts concerning them and contained in them. Though it is highly impractical to encumber the science of theology with extended discourse covering all the "ologies" of the universe, it remains true, nevertheless, that the basic fact underlying each and every science is its relation to the Creator of all things and His purpose in creation. Though not usually included in the science of theology, the other sciences which engage the thoughts of men would be both sanctified and exalted were they to be approached, as they should be, with that awe and reverence which recognizes in them the presence, power, and purpose of the Creator. Great injury has resulted, it is obvious, from the modern tendency to divorce all subjects which border on the natural from every divine relationship when, in reality, there is no basis upon which these "ologies" can rest other than that of the original purpose of the Creator.

Though not found in the Sacred Scriptures, the word *theology*, being the compound of two familiar Bible words, is Scriptural in character. In Romans 3:2 the words τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (*ta logia tou Theou*, 'the oracles of God') occur; in 1 Peter 4:11 the words λόγια θεοῦ (*logia Theou*, 'oracles of God') occur; and in Luke 8:21 the phrase τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (*ton logon tou Theou*, 'the word of God') appears.

II. General Uses of the Word

Within the whole encyclopedia of its import, the term *theology* is used with various restricted meanings. When recognition of the first exponent of a theological system is desired, the individual's name is combined in the term, as, *Augustinian Theology, Calvinistic Theology, Lutheran Theology, Arminian Theology*. When the source of its material is in view, specific terms are employed, as, *revealed Theology, natural Theology, Catholic Theology,* and *Evangelical Theology.* So, likewise, theology may be classified by the place of its origin, as, *Genevan Theology, Mercersburg Theology, Oxford Theology, New England Theology,* or *Oberlin Theology.* When the particular content of a given theology is in view it may be named accordingly, as, *Biblical Theology, Fundamental Theology, Historical Theology, Homiletical Theology, Ethical Theology, Practical Theology, or Pastoral Theology.* In like manner, various theologies may be classified by the method they employ, as, *Dogmatic Theology, Exegetical Theology, New Theology, Polemic Theology, Rational Theology,* or *Systematic Theology.*

Among these general classifications there are several forms of theology which call for particular definition.

1. Natural Theology. Natural Theology designates a science which is based only upon those facts concerning God and His universe which are revealed in nature.

2. Revealed Theology. This term designates a science which is based only on those facts concerning God and His universe which are revealed in the Scriptures of Truth.

3. Biblical Theology. Biblical Theology designates a science which aims to investigate the truth about God and His universe in its divinely ordered development and historical environment as set forth in the various books of the Bible. Biblical Theology is the exposition of the *doctrinal* and *ethical* content of the Bible. It is not a substitute for Doctrinal or Ethical Theology, but is their historical counterpart. It is the consideration of Biblical truth as originally given in its prophetic proclamation.

4. Theology Proper. By this term is designated a limited science which contemplates only the Person of God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and without reference to the works of each.

5. Historical Theology. A science which traces the historical development of doctrine and is concerned, as well, with the distinctly sectarian variations and the heretical departures from Biblical truth which have appeared during the Christian era.

6. Dogmatic Theology. Theological truth held with certainty.

7. Speculative Theology. Theological truth held in the abstract and apart from its practical import.

8. Old Testament Theology. So designated because it is restricted to the portion of Scripture indicated.

9. New Testament Theology. So designated because it is restricted to the portion of Scripture indicated.

10. Pauline, Johannine, and Petrine Theologies. So designated because they are restricted to the writings of the persons indicated.

11. Practical Theology. Concerned with the application of the truth to the hearts of men.

12. Systematic or Thetic Theology. A science which follows a humanly devised scheme or order of doctrinal development and which purports to incorporate into its system all the truth about God and His universe from any and every source. Systematic Theology may be distinguished from *Natural Theology* in that Natural Theology draws its material only from nature; from *Biblical Theology* in that Biblical Theology draws its material only from the Bible; and from *Theology Proper* in that Theology Proper is restricted to the consideration of the Person of God, excluding His works.

In defining Systematic or Thetic Theology, certain misleading and unwarranted terms have been employed. It has been declared to be “the science of religion”; but the term *religion* is in no sense a synonym of the Person of God and all His works. Likewise, it has been declared to be “the scientific treatment of those truths which are found in the Bible”; but this science, while drawing the major portion of its material from the Scriptures, does, nevertheless, draw its material from any and every source. Again, Systematic Theology has been defined as the orderly arrangement of

Christian doctrine; but as Christianity represents only a mere fraction of the whole field of truth relative to the Person of God and His universe, this definition is inadequate.

III. Various Definitions

Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander defines Systematic Theology as "the science of God … a summary of religious truth scientifically arranged, or as a philosophical digest of all religious knowledge" (*Biblical Theology*, I, 1).

Dr. A. H. Strong defines Systematic Theology as "the science of God and of the relations between God and the universe" (*Systematic Theology*, p. 1).

Dr. Charles Hodge declares Systematic Theology has for its object "to systematize the facts of the Bible, and ascertain the principles or general truths which those facts involve" (*Systematic Theology*, I, 18).

Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas states: "Science is the technical expression of the laws of nature; theology is the technical expression of the revelation of God. It is the province of theology to examine all the spiritual facts of revelation, to estimate their value, and to arrange them into a body of teaching. Doctrine thus corresponds with the generalisations of science" (*Principles of Theology,* p. xxi).

Dr. W. G. T. Shedd defines Systematic Theology as "a science that is concerned with both the Infinite and the Finite, with both God and the Universe. The material, therefore, which it includes is vaster than that of any other science. It is also the most necessary of all sciences" (*Dogmatic Theology,* I, 16).

Augustine denotes Theology to be "rational discussion respecting the deity" (Shedd, *ibid*., p. 18).

The following definition is submitted by the author: Systematic Theology may be defined as the collecting, scientifically arranging, comparing, exhibiting, and defending of all facts from any and every source concerning God and His works. It is *thetic* in that it follows a humanly devised thesis form and presents and verifies truth as *truth*.

IV. Students of Theology

The individual who engages in the pursuit of the science of Systematic Theology is properly a θεολόγος (*Theologos*) or 'theologian.' Should the Greek term θεολόγος be used actively as indicated by its accent, it would denote one who speaks for God, but should it be used passively it would refer to one to whom God speaks. That both of these conceptions inhere in the accepted use of the term *theologian* is obvious. However, of necessity, certain requirements are laid upon the theologian and certain qualifications must be found in him if he is to make any worthy progress in the task committed to him.

V. Essential Requirements

1. The Inspiration and Authority of the Scriptures are Assumed. Though as an apologist the theologian may be called upon, as occasion may demand, to defend specific truths which belong to the domain of his distinctive science, and though among the doctrines which he defends is that of the authority and trustworthiness of the Sacred Writings, he is not primarily engaged with the critical task of proving the inspiration and divine character of the Scriptures, but rather in arranging and exhibiting the positive truth the inspired Scriptures set forth. The Bible being the chief source of all the material which enters into his science, the theologian is called upon to arrange the God-given material in its logical and scientific order. He is a Biblicist, namely, one who not only regards the Bible as the sole rule of faith and practice, but as the only dependable source of information in realms wherein divine revelation speaks. As a chemist will make no advance in his science if he doubts or rejects the essential character of the elements which he compounds, so a theologian must fail who does not accept the trustworthiness of the Word of God. It is the work of the reverent critic to discover and defend the essential character of the divine revelation; but to the theologian is committed the task of systematizing and declaring that divine revelation as it is given.

Because of the fact that the science of Systematic Theology must proceed upon the certitude that the Scriptures are the Oracles of God, this modern, rationalistic age with its doubts as to verbal inspiration, revelation, and Biblical authority, is not concerned with the science of Systematic Theology and is even turning from it with contempt. Granting the fact of

the divine revelation, the science of Systematic Theology is both possible and required, and at once is discovered to exceed all other sciences as the Creator exceeds His creation.

2. The Laws of Methodology are as Essential in the Science of Systematic Theology as in Any Other Science. The theologian creates none of his materials any more than the botanist creates the flowers or the astronomer orders the stars. It is given to the theologian, as to other scientists, to recognize the character of his material and to give to it an orderly arrangement. He should not misrepresent or change the truth committed to him, even by so much as a disproportionate emphasis. If it is to exist at all, scientism, of necessity, repels untruth, part truth, and every form of unfounded prejudice or preconceived notion. The importance of ascertaining and holding the truth in its absolute purity and right proportions cannot be overestimated. This end can be secured only by a systematic method, a scientific attitude, and extended labor.

As the meaning of the truths of Scripture is best expressed in the original languages, it is essential that the theologian shall be an exegete in these languages and thus informed as fully as possible concerning the precise character of the message of God with which he is to deal. It is irrational for any scientist to disregard or underestimate the essential value of any portion of the material with which his science is concerned. In like manner, the science of Systematic Theology will be incomplete and misleading to the extent that it disregards or misinterprets any portion of the divine revelation. The worthy student of Systematic Theology, were he not qualified for the higher and more inclusive title of *theologian*, would be entitled to recognition as a *superscientist*, which he is.

Of the two methods of dealing with the truth of God's Word—*deduction*, by which a theme is expanded into its details of expression, a method belonging largely to the sermonic field, and *induction*, by which various declarations upon a subject are reduced to one harmonious and all-inclusive statement—induction is distinctly the theological method. Inductions are either *imperfect* or *perfect. Imperfect* inductions result when *some* but not all the teachings of the Scripture are made the basis of a doctrinal statement. A *perfect* induction is formed when all the teachings of the Scripture, according to their precise meaning, are made the basis of a doctrinal

statement. It is evident that to finite minds the perfect induction is more or less ideal, and the fact that varying and imperfect inductions are secured accounts, in some measure, for the wide divergence in doctrinal belief among men of equal sincerity.

3. Finite Limitations Must Be Recognized. Were it not for the fact that God has made a suitable revelation of Himself to men and that He expects them to give attention to it, it would seem to be unwarranted presumption for the finite mind to seek to comprehend that which is infinite. The theologian should never lose sight of the fact that he, as no other scientist, is called upon to deal with things supernatural, with things which transcend the boundaries of time and space where no unaided human thought can penetrate, and with unseen beings, including the three Persons of the Godhead and the angels. Confronted with such subjects as these, he should ever be in quietude of holy reverence, as was Moses before the burning bush, and ever impressed with the futility of dependence upon mere human opinion, as well as of the disastrous consequences which such dependence may induce. In the simplest of terms, God has spoken of Himself, and of things infinite and eternal. The Bible is that message and, while man cannot originate any similar truth, he, though finite, is privileged by the gracious illumination of the Spirit to receive, with some degree of understanding, the revelation concerning things which are infinite.

4. Spiritual Illumination is Necessary and is Provided. While, as has been stated, the Bible is couched in the simplest of terms, its message, in many particulars, transcends the range of human understanding; but divine provision is made whereby these human limitations may be overcome. The Spirit of God is given to every saved person as an indwelling *Paraclete*, thus providing a limitless resource both for understanding and teachableness. Christ wrought thus in the hearts of the two who walked with Him on the Emmaus road. The text declares that He not only opened the Scriptures to them but that He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures (Luke 24:27–32, 45). Likewise, the second *Paraclete* would minister in behalf of all in whom He dwells. A vital condition, however, is imposed which involves the question of peronal piety and surrender to the will and mind of God. It is in those only who “walk not

after the flesh, but after the Spirit" that the whole will of God is wrought (Rom. 8:4), and it is the spiritual Christian who discerns all things (1 Cor. 2:15). Thus, there is introduced into the pursuit of the science of Systematic Theology a pedagogical law which is foreign to other laws of research, namely, that divine illumination, by which alone the revelation may be comprehended, is made to depend on a state of heart which is not only yielded to God, but is ever ready to be conformed to the Word He has spoken. Though the historical and hortatory portions of the Bible are comprehensible to the unregenerate man and the unspiritual Christian, the doctrines are, to a large degree, sealed to them; and as Systematic Theology has largely to do with doctrine, that vast science is closed to multitudes who are not lacking in education and culture, but who are lacking in that inward personal adjustment to God, which alone insures a spiritual understanding. The church is ever in peril—and never more so than now—of the disaster which must follow when she allows men of distinction in the sphere of human attainments, who are unregenerate or unspiritual, to dictate as to what her beliefs shall be. It therefore naturally follows that in addition to the prerequisite discipline of mind, every student of Systematic Theology should, before entering this limitless supernatural field of research, give indisputable evidence that he has been born of God, by which birth he has become possessed of the Holy Spirit, the divine Teacher, and that he is yielded to the mind and will of God, not alone as to truth itself but as to personal piety. Apart from such preparation, study in this science will be to little or no purpose. However, should a student lacking this essential preparation be allowed to graduate and go forth with the man-imposed authority to preach, the results would be no less than a calamity on an infinite plane and he himself would be in danger of the unrevoked anathema of God (Gal. 1:7–9).

5. Patient and Tireless Study is Required. As one might venture farther and farther on a shoreless sea with no hope of ever reaching its outer boundaries, so the theologian is ever confronted with limitless material in the realm of the doctrines of the Scriptures. It has been customary for the theologian to spend at least three years in classroom introduction to the science of Systematic Theology and under the instruction of those who through patient study and experience are able to guide him in this

introductory research. However, the study of Bible doctrine is a life undertaking and ever makes its claims upon time and strength. Happy indeed is the student who secures a full rounded introduction to the vast science of Systematic Theology, but thrice blessed is he who with unrelenting purpose pursues his study to the end of his days on earth. Nothing need be said here of the tragedy which is enacted by a student of Systematic Theology who, for one reason or another, has failed to be introduced to the field of his science, and who therefore continues to preach only on the lower plane of human conduct and never, for lack of requisite understanding, expounds a soul-transforming doctrine of the Scripture.

Many generations have passed since the pulpit has held lower ideals of doctrinal preaching than it holds today. Nevertheless, the human heart is unchanged and God's remedy for sin-sick and unspiritual souls is the same, and the servant of God who would minister to these needs with true efficiency will discover the importance of unceasing study that he may himself prove to be unto God a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth (2 Tim. 2:15).

6. Faith. As has been stated, the student of Systematic Theology is called to enter the field of things supernatural. His research is almost wholly restricted to the one Book which is God-breathed and the power to comprehend the message which this Book presents is gained only as he is enabled and taught by the Spirit of God. Not only are these things true; but his high and holy service as exponent of this Book, whether by word of mouth or by worthy embodiment of its truths into his daily life, will be advantageous and effective only as he ministers that Word in the power of God. The Bible is not understood nor received by unregenerate men (1 Cor. 2:14), nor can its deeper revelations be grasped by carnal Christians (1 Cor. 3:1–3). No more decisive statement could be made on this qualifying truth than is found in Hebrews 11:3, "Through faith we understand." Due importance should be given to the value of native mental powers and to the virtue of unceasing diligence, but these standing alone avail but little in a science which is supernatural in all its parts. Over the door entrance of no other science is it written as it is over the door of Systematic Theology, "Only men of that *faith* which has secured their regeneration and led them on to a complete self-dedication to God need seek to enter here." No

pedagogical law is more unyielding than that set forth in the words, “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine” (John 7:17), and “He that is spiritual judgeth [discerneth] all things” (1 Cor. 2:15). Again, “The same anointing teacheth you of all things” (1 John 2:27).

7. Systematic Theology Should Be Unabridged. Like every true science, Systematic Theology is interdependent and interrelated in all its parts. The astronomer or chemist would not attempt to organize his materials or to reach dependable conclusions with a third of the elements or facts pertaining to his science unaccounted for. Nor should the theologian expect to reach any true estimation of his various doctrines when vast fields of the divine revelation have been eliminated from his consideration. Theologians, more than any other scientists, are apt to be bound by tradition or mere sectarian prejudice. The field of investigation is no less than the entire Bible, which field extends beyond the boundaries of creeds and that limited body of truth which was recovered in the Reformation. Published systems of theology too often omit the dispensational program of God; the Pauline revelation concerning the Church which is Christ’s Body; the entire field of life truth; Angelology with satanology and demonology; prophecy, which alone occupies more than one-fifth of the text of the Scriptures; typology; and the present ministry of Christ in heaven. Considering the interdependent and interrelated character of theological doctrine, the theologian, having eliminated all or any part of this great field of revelation, cannot hope to hold truth in its right perspective or to give to it its right emphasis. The aim of every theologian should be to hold the entire divine revelation in a true balance of all its parts and free from fads and inaccuracies.

VI. Existing Attitudes Toward the Scriptures

While there are many attitudes on the part of men toward the Bible, these may be presented in four general classifications.

1. Rationalism. The rationalistic attitude toward the Scriptures is subject to a twofold division: a. Extreme. Extreme rationalism denies any divine revelation and represents the beliefs or unbeliefs of infidels, atheists, and agnostics. Though the extreme rationalists were numerous in past

generations, their number is greatly increasing at the present time and is destined to increase to the end of the age (Luke 18:8; 2 Tim. 3:13).

b. Moderate. Moderate rationalism admits a revelation, but accepts only such parts of the Bible as personal reason approves. The reasons why the moderate rationalist rejects parts of the text of the Scriptures may be based on the supposed findings of higher criticism or upon mere personal prejudice. To these men the Bible becomes no more than a book of errors from which each and every one is free to eliminate any portion he chooses to reject, or to honor as being divinely authoritative in any portion he chooses to receive. The moderate rationalistic attitude toward the Scriptures is that held by the so-called *modernists* of today and includes all classes of liberals from those who merely deny verbal and plenary inspiration to those who reject the whole text of the Scriptures as being a divine revelation.

2. Mysticism. Mysticism is subject to a twofold classification: a. False Mysticism. The theory that divine revelation is not limited to the written Word of God, but that God bestows added truth to souls that are sufficiently quickened by the Spirit of God to receive it. Mystics of this class contend that, by self-effacement and devotion to God, individuals may attain to immediate, direct, and conscious realization of the person and presence of God and thus to all truth in Him. False mysticism includes all those systems which teach identity between God and human life—Pantheism, Theosophy, and Greek philosophy. In it are included practically all the holiness movements of the day; also, Spiritism, Seventh Day Adventism, New Thought, Christian Science, Swedenborgianism, Mormonism, and Millennial Dawnism. The founders and promoters of many of these cults make claim to special revelation from God upon which their system is built. With far less complication with error and untruth a false mysticism is discernible in the beliefs and practices of the Friends or Quakers. In presenting their doctrine of the “inner light,” they say that, having the indwelling Spirit, the individual Christian is in contact with the same One who inspired and gave the Scriptures and that the Spirit is not only able to impart added truth beyond that already given in the Bible, but that He is appointed by Christ to do so according to John 16:12, 13, “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth.” The church

generally has believed that this promise is fulfilled in two ways: (a) by the ability given to the men to whom Christ spoke whereby they were able to write the New Testament Scriptures; and (b) by the ministry of the Spirit in teaching the apostles and all in every age who are yielded to Him, the truth now contained in the Bible.

No voice could speak with more authority for the Quakers than Robert Barclay whose *Apology* was published in 1867. He states: "Moreover, these divine inward revelations, which we make absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith, neither do nor can ever contradict the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or right and sound reason. Yet from hence it will not follow, that these divine revelations are to be subjected to the examination, either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or of the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule or touchstone: for this divine revelation and inward illumination, is that which is evident and clear of itself" (Barclay's *Apology,* pp. 13–14).

In earlier times this form of mysticism was voiced in the teachings of Francis de Sales, Thomas à Kempis, Madam Guyon, Archbishop Fénelon, and Upham. Montanus advanced these conceptions as early as the second century. They were later sustained by Tertullian and became a vital issue among the Reformers. The extreme spiritual mysticism is known as *Quietism,* which proposes death to self, disregards the attractions of heaven or the pains of hell, and ceases from petitions in prayer or thanksgiving lest self be encouraged. Likewise, those forms of spirituallife teachings are to be included which impose upon the Christian a duty of self-crucifixion in place of the recognition of the fact that self was crucified with Christ, and that the values of His death are now to be received by faith in that which was accomplished on the cross rather than by any human accomplishment. The Word of God teaches that the spiritual life is wrought by the Spirit in the heart of the yielded believer, and the Spirit is made righteously free to annul the works of the flesh on the ground of the fact that Christ died unto the sin nature, and not on the ground of human achievement in the way of self-effacement or self-crucifixion.

b. True Mysticism. True Mysticism contends that all believers are indwelt by the Spirit and thus are in a position to be enlightened directly by Him, but that there is one complete revelation given, and that the illuminating work

of the Spirit will be confined to the unveiling of the Scriptures to the mind and heart. False mysticism ignores the statement found in Jude 1:3 that there is a faith or system of belief "once delivered unto the saints," and that when the Spirit is promised to "guide into all truth" (John 16:13), it is only the truth contained in the Scriptures (cf. 1Cor. 2:9, 10). There is a unique knowledge of the mysteries or sacred secrets of God accorded to those who are taught by the Spirit of God, but these sacred secrets are already contained in the text of the Bible.

3. ROMANISM. One of the greatest errors of the Church of Rome is that of making the church, and not the Bible, the immediate and final authority in all matters of divine revelation. Her claim is that the church's authority is restricted to matters of faith and moral conduct, and is not found in the fields of science, art, and history. She argues that there were many things which Christ and the apostles taught which were not recorded in the Bible (John 20:30, 31 and 21:25), but these, it is asserted, have been preserved by the church and are as binding as are those precepts which are written. It is also assumed by the Church of Rome that the voice of her pope is the voice of God, and to his declaration the same obedience should be given as to God Himself. These communications through the supposed vicar of Christ thus become, to the Romanist, as authoritative as are the unrecorded words of Christ and the apostles, which the Roman Church claims to have conserved, or, as authoritative as the written words of Scripture. That the Church of Rome deems the decisions and rules of the church to be infallible and authoritative above the written Word of God is proven by many of her decisions and judgments.

In reply to these unfounded claims, it may be observed that the church has preserved nothing of spiritual value, nor have her traditions added any vital element to that now preserved by God in the Holy Scriptures. Truth did have its saving and sanctifying power in the early church before any word of the New Testament was written, but the saving and sanctifying truth was incorporated into the Bible and, beyond this, the traditions of Rome accomplish nothing but multiplied errors and misleading contradictions.

The theologian is here confronted with the fact and scope of *tradition*. He should examine the Scriptures on this point with care (2 Thess. 2:15;

3:6; Gal. 1:14), and remember that Christ came into the world at a time when the Word of God was encrusted with the "traditions of men" to the point that the authority of God was, to a large degree, annulled. Christ disregarded the traditions of men and for this was condemned by the religious leaders of His day.

4. The Orthodox Protestant Faith. Certain well-defined articles of faith concerning the Scriptures have been and are held by the orthodox Protestants: a. The Bible is the infallible Word of God.

b. The Bible is the only rule of faith and practice.

c. Human reason and knowledge should be wholly subject to the Scriptures.

d. There is no inner light or added revelation ever given beyond what is contained in the Bible. The ungoverned character and danger of the doctrine of individual divine revelation, being without standards by which to test various claims, is obvious; and its susceptibility to gross error is demonstrated on every hand by the claims of those who hold these views. The Spirit does guide the individual in matters of conduct and service, but not in the formulating of doctrine which might be superimposed upon the Word of God.

e. No authority relative to the forming of truth has ever been committed to the church or to men beyond that given to the New Testament writers.

VII. The Major Divisions of Systematic Theology

1. Bibliology. A consideration of the essential facts concerning the Bible.

2. Theology Proper. A consideration of the facts concerning God—Father, Son, and Spirit, apart from their works.

3. Angelology. A consideration of the facts concerning the angels, unfallen and fallen.

4. Anthropology. A consideration of the facts concerning man.

5. Soteriology. A consideration of the facts concerning salvation.

6. Ecclesiology. A consideration of the facts concerning the Church.

7. Eschatology. A consideration of all in the Scripture which was predictive at the time it was written.

8. Christology. A consideration of all the Scripture concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.

9. Pneumatology. A consideration of the Scriptures concerning the Holy Spirit.

10. Doctrinal Summarization. An analysis of each major doctrine in its individual character including various important tenets which, because of their independent character, do not appear even in an unabridged treatment of Systematic Theology.

Conclusion

The study of Systematic Theology has its limitations because of the incapacities of the finite mind; yet its study is both profitable and necessary for all who would be filled with the knowledge, of God and His will, and who, because of that knowledge, would walk worthy of the Lord. Human thought has no objective comparable to the Person of God. As John Dick has said (*Lectures on Theology*, p. 6): "To know this mighty Being, as far as he may be known, is the noblest aim of the human understanding; to love him, the most worthy exercise of our affections; and to serve him the most honourable and delightful purpose to which we can devote our time and talents."

In his address to theological students, Dr. Dick states (*ibid*., p. 7): Theology is not one of those recondite subjects, which it is left to the curious to investigate, and in the contemplation of which, speculative and reflecting men may spend their hours of leisure and solitude. Its claim to universal attention is manifest from the succinct account which has now been given of its nature. Its instructions are addressed to persons of every description, to the learned, and to the unlearned, to the retired student, and him who is engaged in the bustling scenes of life. It is interesting to all, as furnishing the knowledge of God, and his Son, which is the source of eternal life. But in your case, there is a particular reason, besides a regard to your personal welfare, why it should not only engage a share of your thoughts, but be made the principal object of your inquiries. Theology is your profession, as medicine, is that of a physician, and law of a barrister. It should be your ambition to excel in it, not, however, from the same motives which stimulate the diligence of the men of other professions, the desire of fame, or the prospect of gain, but with a view to the faithful and honourable discharge of the duties of the office with which you expect one day to be intrusted. "These men are the servants of the most High God, who shew unto us the way of salvation."

Thrice solemn is the responsibility laid on the student of Systematic Theology to know what may be known of the vast field of divine revelation: (a) It is the desire of God that all may come to the knowledge of Himself. (b) This Knowledge is essential if the manner of life which will adorn the doctrine that we profess is to be lived. (c) This knowledge is essential, being, as it is, the distinctive message committed to those who would "preach the word."

Bibliology

Chapter II

Introduction to Bibliology

SINCE SYSTEMATIC, or Thetic, Theology is the collecting, scientifically arranging, comparing, exhibiting, and defending of all facts from any and every source concerning God and His works, and since the Bible in its original writings is by its own worthy claims and by every test devout minds may apply to it the inerrant Word of God, it follows that, if any progress is to be made in this science, the theologian must be a *Biblicist*—one who is not only a Biblical scholar but also a *believer* in the divine character of each and every portion of the text of the Bible. Primarily, the theologian is appointed to systematize the truth contained in the Bible and to view it as the divinely inspired Word which God has addressed to man. Therefore, such investigations as men may conduct in the field of proof or disproof that the Bible is God's inerrant message to man are, for the most part, extratheological and to be classified as pertaining to Biblical criticism rather than Systematic Theology. The student who in spite of the claims of the Bible to be the Word of God is yet groping for added light on that aspect of truth, cannot even begin the study of Sysematic Theology. So-called Christian Science as a pretended rationale and quite apart from its reversal and abandonment of all that is distinctly Christian, could promote no science nor could it share in that which true science has achieved. How could surgery be advanced by a system which predicates a fantastic notion that even denies the existence of a corporal human body? Systematic Theology designs to construct a science or order out of the Biblical revelation and on the basis that it is ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ('the Word of God'), and, as surgery must proceed on the basis of belief in the existence of the mortal body, so, and in like manner, Systematic Theology must proceed on the basis of the belief that the Bible is, in all its parts, God's own Word to man.

While the word *bible* means 'book,' the words *The Bible* distinguish the supreme, incomparable Book. It does surpass all other books as to authority, antiquity, literature, and popularity, yet its peculiar supremacy is seen in the

fact that it discloses the truth concerning the infinite God, infinite holiness, infinite sin, and infinite redemption. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that the Bible is itself infinite, and such it proves itself to be, for no human mind has fully comprehended its message or measured its values. Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (‘Every Scripture [is] God-breathed’—2 Tim. 3:16) is the claim of the Bible for itself and this oracle or dictum is no more open to question than is πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός (‘a Spirit God [is]’—John 4:24), ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν (‘God love is’—1 John 4:8), or ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν (‘God light is’—1 John 1:5). It is here asserted that the Bible claims for itself that on the original parchments every sentence, word, line, mark, point, penstroke, jot, or tittle was placed there in complete agreement with the divine purpose and will. Thus the omnipotent and omniscient God caused the message to be formed as the precise reproduction of His Word. The original text was not only divine as to its origin, but was infinitely perfect as to its form. It is both necessary and reasonable that God’s Book—the Book of which He is the Author and which brings the revelation and discipline of heaven down to earth—shall, in its original form, be inerrant in all its parts. It is called *Sacred Scriptures* by way of eminence (John 7:42; 5:39; 2 Tim. 3:15).

Systematic Theology is not an end in itself; its purpose is to classify and clarify the truth set forth in the Scriptures. It should become a grand contribution to the theologian’s understanding of the Bible itself.

Consideration will be given in this introduction to (1) the supernatural origin of the Scriptures, and (2) to their general structure:

I. The Supernatural Origin of the Bible

The Bible is a phenomenon which is explainable in but one way—it is the Word of God. It is not such a book as man would write if he *could*, or could write if he *would*. Other religious systems too have their eccentric deviations from the usual course of human procedure, which deviations are not many, and of slight importance; and these, indeed, are to be expected since man is ever determined to believe in a God, or gods, whether his belief is based on facts or not. Bishop Hampden, writing of the good that is recognizable in false religions, states: “Thus we find, even in those superstitions which are most revolting to common sense, some countervailing truths which have both softened and recommended the

associated mass of error, otherwise too grossly repulsive for the heart of man ever to have admitted" (*Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, pp. 132, 133, cited by Rogers, *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, p. 4). But such touches of human nature and its feeble aspirations are incomparable with the vast array of supernatural characteristics which the Bible exhibits.

The student of truth will ever be called upon to recognize counter claims which are both *extra*-Biblical and *intra*-Biblical. That which is extra-Biblical embraces the whole field of humanly devised religions and philosophical speculations. The intra-Biblical embraces all cults and partial statements of divine truth which, though professing to build their systems on the Scriptures, do, nevertheless, by false emphasis or neglect of truth, succeed in arriving at a confusion of doctrine which is akin to and perhaps more misleading than unmixed error.

The *tout ensemble* of the superhuman character of the Bible presents an almost inexhaustible array of considerations which, if observed with candor, compel one to conclude that this Book could not be a human product.

Though no exhaustive listing is possible, a few of the many superhuman traits of the Bible are here enumerated.

1. The Book of God. By this title it is intended to call attention to the claim everywhere present in the Bible, that it is God's message to man and not man's message to his fellow men, much less man's message to God. To declare the Bible to be *theocentric*, which it asserts for itself, is to declare it to be *anthropoexcentric*. In this Book, God is set forth as Creator and Lord of all. It is the revelation of Himself, the record or what He has done and will do, and, at the same time, the disclosure of the fact that every created thing is subject to Him and discovers its highest advantage and destiny only as it is conformed to His will. Every word of the Bible is the outworking of such sublime declarations as,"There is no God like thee, in heaven above, or on earth beneath" (1 Kings 8:23), and, again, "Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all" (1 Chron. 29:11). "The LORD, the LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth" (Ex. 34:6) "His tender mercies are over all his works"

(Ps. 145:9). Thus God is exhibited as exercising an all-pervading and absolute authority over physical, moral , and spiritual realms and as directing things to the end that they may redound to His glory. This divine purpose is being wrought out by human agents and their activities constitute human history; but, when their work is completed, the history of the world will be the history of that original plan of God. Contrary to man's nature, the Bible tends altogether to the glory of God and aims at none other than His honor. According to the Word of God and to human experience, man, apart from divine illumination, is wholly unable to receive or understand the truth about God. Who among blinded humanity is the fiction writer capable of originating the conceptions of the triune God of all eternity that are spread on the pages of the Scriptures? Who among men has designed the peculiar and perfect balance of the parts each Person of the Godhead takes in redemption, or the divine character in its consistent and unalterable display of infinite holiness and infinite love—the divine judgments, the divine valuation of all things including the angelic hosts and evil spirits? Who among men has been not only able to conceive of such a fabrication of interdependent notions, but has been able to make them express themselves perfectly in an ongoing history which, being fortuitous, is, after all, only sham—a hypocritical, disingenuous counterfeit of truth? How absurd is the assumption that unaided man could write the Bible if he chose to do so! But if man did not originate the Bible, God did, and because of that fact its authority must be recognized.

2. The Bible and Monotheism. Closely akin, indeed, is this subject to that which has gone before. The fact that God is supreme implies that there is none other to compare with Him; yet almost universally humanity has practiced, with a contumacy which is far from accidental, the abominations of idolatry. The Jewish people, from whom on the human side the Scriptures came, sustain no immunity to this tendency. From the days of the golden calf on through succeeding centuries the Israelites were ever reverting to idolatry and this in spite of abundant revelation and chastisement. The history of the church is stained by the worship of graven images assimilated from heathenism. How earnestly the New Testament warns believers to shun idolatry and the worship of angels! In the light of these facts, how could it be supposed that men—even Israel—apart from

divine direction could originate a treatise which, with an eye single to God's glory, brands idolatry as one of the first and most offensive crimes and insults against God? The Bible is not such a book as man would have written if he could.

3. The Doctrine of the Trinity. While sustaining monotheism without modification, the Bible does present the fact that God subsists in three Persons or modes of being. This distinction lies between two extremes: on the one hand, that three separate and distinct Persons are merely associated as to purpose and achievement; or, on the other hand, that one Person merely operates in three different characterizing fields of activity, the Biblical doctrine of the Trinity being that God is *one* in essence, yet three identified Persons. Doubtless this is one of the greatest of mysteries. The doctrine reaches beyond the range of human understanding, though it is a fundamental in the divine revelation.

When considered separately, the individual Persons of the Godhead present the same indisputable evidence as to the supernatural origin of the Bible.

a. God the Father: Vast indeed is the field of Scripture which sets forth the distinctive activities and responsibilities which are predicated of the First Person. He is said to be the Father of all creation, the Father of the eternal Son—the Second Person—, and the Father of all who believe unto the salvation of their souls. This revelation extends to all the details of the Fatherhood relationship and includes the giving of the Son that the grace of God may be revealed. No human mind could originate the conception of God the Father as He is revealed in the Bible.

b. God the Son: The record concerning the Second Person, who, according to the Word of God, is the Son from all eternity, who is ever the manifestation of the Father, and who, though now subject to the Father, is the Creator of material things, the Redeemer and final Judge of all mankind, offers the most extensive and immeasurable evidence of the divine origin of the Scriptures. The Person and work of the Son of God with His humiliation and glory is the dominant theme of the Bible; yet the Son, in turn, dedicates Himself to the glory of the Father. The perfections of the Son can never be compared to, or even comprehended by, the wisest of men. If, after all, this

limitless disclosure concerning the Son is only fiction, is it not a reasonable challenge—even to the unregenerate mind—that this supposed author should be discovered, and, on the basis of the truism that the thing created cannot be greater than the one who created it, be worshiped and reverenced above all that is called God?

c. God the Spirit: The Holy Spirit who is presented in revelation as equal in every particular to the Father and the Son, is, nevertheless, and for the furtherance of the present divine undertakings, portrayed as being subject to both the Father and the Son. In like manner, His service is seen to be the complement and administration of the work of the Father and the Son.

Thus the triune God has disclosed Himself to man in terms which man, even when aided by the Spirit, can but feebly comprehend; and how puerile is the intimation that these revelations are the product of men who without exception since the days of Adam are depraved, degenerate, and unable even to receive or know the things of God apart from divine illumination! Such a conception proposes nothing short of the assumption that man originates the idea of God, and that the Creator is a product of the creature.

4. Creation. With no ability to receive the things of God or to know them, man is unable to give intelligent consent to the dictum that all existing things were created from nothing by the immediate fiat of God (Heb. 11:3). Recognizing, however, that all existing things must have a beginning, he proceeds to construct his own solution of the problem of origin. The best he has done is represented by the theories of evolution, which theories, because of their inconsistencies and unproved hypotheses, are somewhat worse than no solution at all. Is man who so fails to discover any reasonable solution of this problem at the same time to be credited with the authorship of the Genesis account of creation, which account is the one basis whereon all subsequent revelation proceeds?

5. Sin. Among many subjects upon which man could have no unprejudiced information, the fact of sin and its evil character is obviously one of the foremost. Yet if it be contended that the Bible—the only source of reliable information on this theme—is not of divine origin, there is no alternative other than the supposition that man, as supposed author of the Scriptures, has sat in judgment on himself and is able to comprehend what

everywhere he demonstrates himself to be unable to comprehend, namely, the sinfulness of sin. And the problem does not involve one human author, but at least forty human authors who had their share in the actual writing of the Word of God. All of the forty men see eye to eye on this vast theme concerning which man could know nothing apart from revelation.

6. The Cure of Evil According to the Bible. If fallen man does not naturally know his sinfulness, much less does he have native capacity whereby he can know the divine remedy which is not only revealed to man in the Word of God but has demonstrated its efficacy in every instance in which man has met its terms and claimed its values. This redemption not only provides a perfect salvation for the individual believer, but extends to the new heaven and new earth with sin dismissed forever. It is conceivable that man might dream of a utopia, but what human being could devise the plan of salvation and cause it to be successful in every instance without exception? How could man devise a plan which discredits human merit, which secures the saving power of God, and which tendeth ever to the glory of God and the disillusionment of human vanity? Why should man in his fictitious utopia be concerned that it shall be wrought out only in that manner which preserves the infinite holiness of the One who redeems? It is only *after* man is redeemed that he can even feebly apprehend the mighty workings of divine grace in the salvation of the lost. Yet if one hesitates to receive the Bible as God's Word, he is left with no other choice than to believe that man is the author of redemption and that it has no more saving value than a fallen man can impart to it.

7. The Extent of Bible Revelation. Like a telescope, the Bible reaches beyond the stars and penetrates the heights of heaven and the depths of hell. Like a microscope, it discovers the minutest details of God's plan and purpose as well as the hidden secrets of the human heart. Like a stereoscope, it has the capacity to place things in their right relation the one to the other, manifesting the true perspective of the divine intent in the universe. So far as human knowledge goes, the Bible deals as freely with things unknown as it does with the known. It speaks with utmost freedom and assurance of things altogether outside the range of human life and experience—of things eternal as well as of time. There is a border beyond

which the human mind, basing its conclusions on experience, cannot go; yet the human authors of the Bible do not hesitate when they reach that boundary, but move majestically on into unknown realms with intrepidity. By what other means than through the Bible may one gaze into eternity either backward or forward? Yet the theory that the Bible does not originate in God alone, imposes the necessity of believing that restricted and temporal creatures of the earth have themselves arisen to the sublime conceptions of eternity and of heaven as well as to the eternal Being of God, and are able to sit in judgment over the eternal destiny of all things. Man could not write such a Book if he would.

8. The Ethics of the Bible. The religions of the heathen concern themselves but little with morals. Their priests speak next to nothing of a life that is pure and true. On the contrary, these religions are often promoters of the lowest vice. It is certain they know nothing of ethics which are the result of, and subordinate to, doctrine. The Bible has introduced something which is foreign to all the moral schemes and systems the world has ever produced. Whether it be the Mosaic Law, the Christian exhortation, or the kingdom standards of rectitude, each becomes an obligation resting upon those to whom it is addressed because of the estate in which each group of people is placed in the sovereign goodness of God. In the Bible, ethics are based on doctrine and become its legitimate fruitage. In no instance is this principle so operative as in the case of the Christian, who, because of his position *in Christ*, is called upon to walk worthy of that high calling. The ethics of the Bible are as supernatural in their origin and holy character as is the estate into which the elect of God are brought.

The Bible presents an unqualified exposure of man’s ethical failure as well as the judgments which rest upon him. Man’s depraved nature and his inevitable deflection from that which is right strongly preclude the theory that he is the originator of so high a morality as that found in the Word of God; and since on the human side the Bible is the product of Jewish authors, it is pertinent to observe that the men of that nation, even in the face of all their privileges, were little better in their moral rectitude than the men of other nations. Added to this is the fact that the Bible standard of holy living is the testimony of many human authors from every walk of life and over many centuries. How, it may be inquired, could human nature

have given spontaneously such a depressing and hopeless description of itself as is contained in the dogmatic statements of the Bible on this subject? There every soul of man is charged with complete failure. The Word of God declares: "The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Ps. 14:2, 3). They are "by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Eph. 2:3). How could incarnate bigotry and depravity become the author and champion of those principles of holiness resident only in heaven?

Still another feature of this general subject, which, however, is only remotely related to the problem of morals, inquires how Jews who were steeped in Judaism could have originated such a Book as the New Testament. There is hardly a feature of Christianity which the Jew does not naturally resist. What could be more repulsive to a Jew than the sentiment, "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him" (Rom. 10:12)? Was not Judaism from God and was it not practiced for fifteen hundred years under the divine favor? Because of these indisputable facts, the Jew clutched the elements of Judaism to his heart, and still clutches them. The gospel abruptly broke in upon this religious monopoly and its consequent isolation. Not only had Jewish writers of the Old Testament recorded all the infamies of their own nation and recognized the divine chastisements so justly sent upon them, but now as worthy writers as any of the Old Testament authors are seen to turn from Judaism altogether and to espouse a system which contradicts or supersedes Judaism at almost every vital point. These are problems that should not be passed over lightly by those who question the divine origin of the Scriptures and are compelled, therefore, to account for these oracles as a human product.

9. THE CONTINUITY OF THE BIBLE. The continuity of the message of the Bible is absolute in its completeness. It is bound together by historical sequence, type and antitype, prophecy and its fulfillment, and by the anticipation, presentation, realization, and exaltation of the most perfect Person who ever walked the earth and whose glories are the effulgence of heaven. Yet the perfection of this continuity is sustained against what to

man would be insuperable impediments; for the Bible is a collection of sixty-six books which have been written by over forty different authors—kings, peasants, philosophers, fishermen, physicians, statesmen, scholars, poets, and plowmen—who lived their lives in various countries and experienced no conference or agreement one with another, and over a period of not less than sixteen hundred years of human history. Because of these obstacles to continuity, the Bible would be naturally the most heterogeneous, incommensurable, inconsonant, and contradictory collection of human opinions the world has ever seen; but, on the contrary, it is just what it is designed to be, namely, a homogeneous, uninterrupted, harmonious, and orderly account of the whole history of God's dealings with man.

Nor should it be unobserved that other sacred books are the product of one man and therefore involve no problem of continuity such as developed when the writings of forty disassociated men are blended into one perfect whole. Each of the three great monotheistic religions has its written oracles. However, Judaism and Christianity share in this that their writings are a compilation of the writings of various human authors. The book which contains the tenets of Islam is the work of the founder of Islam. It proclaims itself to be the words of God; not, however, written by the hand of the prophet but taken by dictation from his mouth as a so-called revelation. It begins and ends in the person of its first teacher. From these records none of his followers dares take away or add to. Man at best is an ephemeron. His life is circumscribed to his own day and generation and his views are usually correspondingly provincial. By just such men, equally limited in themselves, God has caused a library to be formed into one volume with its incomparable continuity. This Book containing many books has not gained the idiosyncratic impress of many minds. Its harmony is not that of trumpets in unison, but rather orchestration where, though absolutely in tune, the instruments are perfectly distinguished. On what ground could this plenary continuity be explained if it be asserted that the Bible is any less than the Word of God?

10. Prophecy and Its Fulfillment. It has always pleased God to preannounce the thing He is going to do and history records the realization of the prediction. A very great number of prophecies were made by Old

Testament writers concerning the coming Messiah and these were declared hundreds, and in some instances thousands, of years before Christ came. Those predictions which in the divine purpose were to be fulfilled at Christ's first advent were literally fulfilled at that time. Many more yet remain to be fulfilled when He comes again, and, it is reasonable to believe, these will be fulfilled with the same precision. Were but two vaticinations made and fulfilled, such as the virgin birth of Christ, to occur in Bethlehem of Judea, the supernatural character of the Scriptures would be proved by the history which records their accomplishment; but when these predictions run into thousands which concern the Persons of the Godhead, angels, nations, families, individuals, and destinies, and each and every one is exactly executed in its prescribed time and place, the evidence is incontestable as to the divine character of the Scriptures. A fiction writer might present an imaginary situation concerning a supposed time and place and in that time and place cause his fictitious character to make a sham prediction. This, in turn, to be followed by a chapter purporting to be at a later time and recording a pretended fulfillment of the sham prediction. Such, indeed, would exhaust the predictive powers of man. The prophecies of the Bible are fulfilled in every instance by actual history. The Bible itself indicates that the acid test of all prophecy is its literal fulfillment. Nor is the intervening time of small importance. Based on obvious conditions, a man might make a fortunate guess as to the turn of events on the day that follows; but the Bible prophecy disregards the element of time. The fact that the twenty-second Psalm is a preview of Christ's death cannot be refuted, and no one can controvert the record of the Bible that a full millennium falls between the prophecy and its fulfillment. Who would be prepared to believe that hundreds of predictions which are fulfilled on the pages of history and extending over thousands of years of intervening time are the work of unaided men? Yet there is no other alternative for the one who questions the divine origin of the Scriptures.

11. Types with Their Antitypes. A type is a divinely framed delineation which portrays its antitype. It is God's own illustration of His truth drawn by His own hand. The type and the antitype are related to each other by the fact that the connecting truth or principle is embodied in each. It is not the prerogative of the type to establish the truth of a doctrine; it rather enhances

the force of the truth as set forth in the antitype. On the other hand, the antitype serves to lift the type out of the commonplace into that which is transcendental, and to invest it with riches and treasures hitherto unrevealed. The Passover-Lamb type floods the redeeming grace of Christ with richness of meaning, while the redemption itself invests the Passover-Lamb type with all its marvelous significance. The continuity of the Scriptures, prophecy and its fulfillment, and types with their antitypes, are the three major factors which not only serve to exhibit the unity of the two Testaments and, like woven threads running from one Testament to the other, bind them into one fabric, but serve to trace the design which by its marvelous character glorifies the Designer. A true type is the counterpart of its antitype, and, being specifically devised by God, is a vital part of revelation and inspiration. Even if the human mind could conceive the marvels of the antitype (which it could never do), it could not draw the pattern found in the type nor invent the manifold details—often incorporating many particulars and expansive circumstances which are a part of ancient history. Thus typology as incorporated in the Bible demonstrates the Bible to be such a book as man could not write if he would. It is divine in its origin as it is superhuman in its character.

12. The Bible as Literature. As a means for the transmitting of thought, the reducing of a language to writing is an achievement of surpassing importance. It is reasonable and to be expected that God, in communicating with man, would put His message into written form. How else could it be either pondered or preserved? It is equally to be expected that the literature thus created, regardless of secondary causes and agencies, would be worthy of the divine Author. This aspect of the Bible's priority even the unregenerate may profitably consider. As might be anticipated, the observations of all the scholarship of the world in general, whether sympathetic or unsympathetic, have agreed upon the one conclusion that, as literature, the Bible is paramount. It is evident, however—and this is not sufficiently considered—, that this supremacy of the literature of the Bible cannot be attributed to its human authors. With few exceptions, they were common men of their times who had received no preparatory discipline for the task they assumed. In this connection it is observable that the intruding first personal pronoun (with notable exceptions which are required for the

clarity of the truth—cf. Rom. 7:15–25) is absent from these writings. The personal opinions of the human authors on the material they present are of little importance. Had the exceptional literary value of their writings been due to their own ability, it is inconceivable that all of these forty or more authors would have failed to leave some other enduring messages than those embodied in the Bible. In fact, the Jewish nation, from which source these human authors of the Scriptures are almost wholly drawn, has no ancient literature of importance outside this Sacred Book. The intellectual and moral qualifications of the Jew of early days for this authorship may be measured by the Talmud and the Talmudic writings. To the same end, the later writings of the Jew may be also estimated by a comparison of the canonical Gospels with the apocryphal gospels; the latter tending to hinder rather than help in the knowledge of Christ. A similar contrast may be extended to the writings of the Early Church fathers or to those of such men of holy design and purpose as the Reformers or the Puritans in contrast with the Epistles of the New Testament. No message other than the Bible has ever been written by any man in all past ages that has secured any reasonable recognition as being more than is normally human, or that could sustain any claim to a place in the Divine Library. Each age has witnessed the dismissal of the vast portion of its literature into oblivion, but the Bible abides. It is literally true that books may come and books may go, but the Bible goes on forever. Outside the range of Jewish and Christian literature, the Koran would probably receive first consideration; yet "we feel the justice," says Castenove, "of Möhler's dictum, 'That without Moses, and the prophets, and Christ, Mahomet is simply inconceivable—for the essential purport of the Koran is derived from the Old and New Testaments' " ("Mahomedanism," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, cited by Henry Rogers, *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, 5th ed., p. 266).

The devout individual is, to some degree, unable to judge the Bible in the limited field of its literary claims. To him, the words are invested with entrancing, spiritual realities of meaning which at once lift the effect of the message upon the heart far above the range of mere reaction to unusual literary style. What individual gifted with spiritual understanding has not felt, with a good degree of justification, that common words, when used in the Bible, often become incomparably vital? Among people of culture, how general a limited appreciation of the Sacred Text is! What public writer or

speaker from the demagogue to the divine has not learned to depend on the mysterious, unfailing impressions of even a brief quotation from God's Word?

No unaided human writer has ever been able to imitate the simplicity of the Bible language. The greatest truths God has spoken to man are couched in the language of children. To illustrate: Seven monosyllables, not one of which exceeds three letters, serve to state the two most vital relationships which the saved sustain to the resurrected Christ. These are: "ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). Similarly, no human skill in condensation could ever compare with declarations found in the Scriptures. No "short story" writer ever produced a thrilling narrative comparable to that found in Luke 15:11–32. The four Gospels, like all other books of the New Testament, are inexhaustible in the ever unfolding truth they convey; yet the text itself is restricted to the point of inimitable brevity. On the other hand, the Bible message is never hurried, cramped, or unreadable. In fact, the narrative at times seems unnecessarily explicit (cf. Matt. 25:34–45).

Unlike the usual writings of men, the Bible employs a purely dramatic form. It affirms certain facts or incidents without prejudicial comment. Human authors seem hopelessly unable to let simple facts speak for themselves, nor are they willing to credit the reader with the requisite sagacity to draw his own conclusions. What novelist has been able to refrain from those extended introductions of their characters which assay to analyze every motive and, to that extent, predetermine the reader's deductions? When has biography been so written that the reader retained any latitude whatever in the evaluation of character based on the subject in action? The biographer's *opinion* and not the subject's *life* is too often exhibited. In the Bible, however, the human author's analyzing and moralizing efforts are excluded and the complicated field of the application of truth by the Spirit of God is not disarranged. Not a few Bible readers resent every man-made heading in the Sacred Text, only because of that reasonable desire to be allowed to draw their own conclusions directly from the Scripture through the enlightening power of its Author—the Spirit of God.

Without offering the usual barriers found in the literary productions of men, the Bible fascinates the child and entrances the sage. It, as no other book has ever done or could do, has made its appeal to all races and peoples

regardless of national bias; which appeal is demonstrated by the fact that the Bible, or portions of it, and to meet the urgent need, has been translated into about one thousand languages and dialects and the output and distribution of these has reached to about forty million copies in a year. This is a striking reversal of Voltaire's prediction, made one hundred and fifty years ago, that within one hundred years from the time he spoke the Bible would be obsolete. The impulse to translate the Bible into other languages is itself inexplicable. This impulse has served to extend the knowledge of God's Word and has gone far in stirring the feeble incentive on the part of men to translate other ancient writings. And what, indeed, can be said of the prodigious volume and exalted character of literature, music, and art which the Bible has provoked? The Bible itself represents in magnitude not a three hundredth part of the extant Greek and Roman literature; yet it has attracted to, and concentrated upon, itself more thought and produced more works, explanatory, illustrative, apologetic—upon its text, its exegesis, its doctrines, its history, its geography, its ethnology, its chronology, and its evidences—than all the Greek and Roman literature combined. Likewise, what can be said of the quotations from the Bible by almost every class of authors in the world? What other book has served to develop, fix, and preserve the languages into which it is translated, or to retard changes and corruption of speech, as has the Bible?

From no angle of approach to its literary properties is the Bible seen to be such a book as man could have written if he would. It is, therefore, the Word of God.

13. The Bible and Science. No small problem is confronted when an attempt is made to state scientific truth according to the understanding of one age in a way that will at the same time be acceptable in all succeeding ages. Science is ever shifting and subject to its own revisions, if not complete revolutions. It reflects with a good degree of accuracy the progress from generation to generation of human knowledge. In the field of science, no human author has been able to avoid the fate of obsolescence in later periods; yet the Divine Records have been so framed that there is no conflict with true science in this or any age of human history. It is impossible for human authors to write as the Bible is written in matters of science. It is no argument against the Bible that it employs commonly used

terms such as “the ends of the earth,” “the four corners of the earth,” or “the sun going down.” It would be no more understandable to say “the earth is rising” than to say “the sun is setting.” The latter is the thing which, to human vision, occurs. In fact, what term could be used other than that which describes what man sees with his eyes? The Bible is justified in the use of generally used terms, especially since no other terms have ever been proposed, nor could better ones be discovered. God alone could execute the superhuman task of writing a book which, though dispensing facts concerning nature, even from its creation to its final glories, nevertheless avoids a conflict with ignorance and bigotry as these have existed in endless variety from the dawn of human history.

14. The Bible and Temporal Power. The Jewish system of government was a theocracy. God was monarch over all. It was not an alliance of spiritual forces and interests with the state; it was a complete incorporation of the two into one divine purpose. Though in the New Testament believers are enjoined to be subject to, and pray for, those who in civic authority are over them, the government is, as divinely ordained in the present period, known as “the times of the Gentiles,” in the hands of men; and there is no inherent unity possible between the church which is of God and the state which is in the hands of men. The instructions are clear that Christians are not to aspire to temporal power or to depend on civil authority for the furtherance of spiritual ends. The early church was true to the New Testament and her phenomenal progress was made by persuasion and love. It is natural and normal for men to resort to such coercive power as is available to achieve their ends. And history records no movement other than Christianity which has secured its designs by the appeal to heart and mind. Indeed, it is one of the deflections of the Church of Rome that she departed from this spiritual ideal. The intention to surmount human opposition and defeat the forces of evil by reliance upon divine power could never have originated in the human heart. Thus it is to be seen that the Bible is supernatural in its character and could not be the product of men.

15. The Bible’s Enduring Freshness. As no other literature in the world, the Bible invites and sustains a ceaseless rereading. Its pages are ever flashing new gems of truth to those most familiar with it, and its

uplifting moral appeal, like its pathos, never fails to move the sensitive soul. Of no other book than the Bible could it be said truthfully that its message is perennially fresh and effective, and this, in turn, demonstrates the divine character and origin of the Bible.

Great men of all generations, both devout and otherwise, have striven to give expression to their convictions concerning the uniqueness of the Bible. When the Bible is thus contemplated, surpassing eloquence has been stimulated by the eminence of the theme. Among these statements, the following is from Theodore Parker:

> This collection of books has taken such hold of the world as no other. The literature of Greece, which goes up like incense from that land of temples and heroic deeds, has not half the influence of this book from a nation despised alike in ancient and in modern times. … It goes equally to the cottage of the plain man and the palace of the king. It is woven into the literature of the scholar, and colours the talk of the streets. It enters men's closets, mingles in all the grief and cheerfulness of life. The Bible attends men in sickness, when the fever of the world is on them. … It is the better part of our sermons; it lifts man above himself. Our best of uttered prayers are in its storied speech, wherewith our fathers and the patriarchs prayed. The timid man, about to wake from his dream of life, looks through the glass of Scripture, and his eye grows bright; he does not fear to stand alone, to tread the way unknown and distant, to take the death angel by the hand, and bid farewell to wife and babes and home. … Some thousand famous writers come up in this century to be forgotten in the next. But the silver cord of the Bible is not loosed, nor its golden bowl broken, as Time chronicles his tens of centuries passed by.—Cited by Henry Rogers, *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, p. 338

The divine origin of the Bible in all its parts is attested by unnumbered facts and features, but enough has been here presented to refute every claim that the phenomenon which the Bible presents can with any show of reason be attributed to man. The conclusion is that, being everywhere discovered to be a truthful message, it is what it claims to be, the Word of God.

II. General Divisions of the Bible

1. The Structure of the Bible. The message of the Bible is complete. It incorporates its every chapter and verse into its perfect unity, and all its parts are interdependent. The mastery of any part necessitates the mastery of the whole. If disproportionate emphasis is tolerated or fads in doctrines indulged, but little progress can be made in its accurate understanding. The sixty-six books, which by divine arrangement make up this incomparable whole, are divided into two major parts—the Old Testament and the New

Testament—, and these Testaments lend themselves to the unfolding of two paramount divine purposes—that which is earthly and that which is heavenly. The books of the Old Testament are classified as *historical*—Genesis to Esther—, *poetical*—Job to Song of Solomon—, and *prophetical*—Isaiah to Malachi. The New Testament books are classified as *historical*—Matthew to Acts—, *epistolary*—Romans to Jude—, and *prophetical*—Revelation. As bearing on the Person of Christ—He who is the central theme of all the Scriptures—, the Old Testament is classified as *preparation;* the four Gospels as *manifestation;* the Acts as *propagation;* the Epistles as *explanation;* and the Revelation as *consummation*. The essential analysis of each book, each chapter, and each verse, belongs to other disciplines in the student's training than Systematic Theology.

2. Created Beings and Their Relationships. The Bible is God's one and only Book. It contains all His revelation to man throughout all ages of human history. It exhibits the origin, present estate, and destiny of four classes of rational beings in the universe, namely, angels, Gentiles, Jews, and Christians. It is germane to true Biblical interpretation to observe the fact that these rational beings continue what they are throughout their history.

a. The Angels. The angels are created beings (Ps. 148:2–5; Col. 1:16), their abode is in heaven (Matt. 24:36), their activity is both on earth and in heaven (Ps. 103:20; Luke 15:10; Heb. 1:14), and their destiny is in the celestial city (Heb. 12:22; Rev. 21:12). They remain angels throughout their existence, they neither propagate nor do they die. There is no reason for confusing the angels with any other creatures of God's universe. Even though they fall, as in the case of Satan and the demons, they are still classed as angels (Matt. 25:41).

b. The Gentiles. As to their original stock, the Gentiles had their origin in Adam and their natural headship is in him. They are partakers in the fall, and though they are subjects of prophecy which declares that they will yet share, as a subordinate people, with Israel in her coming kingdom glory (Isa. 2:4; 60:3, 5, 12; 62:2; Acts 15:17), they, as to their estate in the period from Adam to Christ, are under the manifold indictment "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the

covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12). With the death, resurrection, ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Spirit, the door of gospel privilege was opened unto the Gentiles (Acts 10:48; 11:17, 18; 13:47, 48), and out of them God is now calling an elect company (Acts 15:14). In the period of time bounded by Jewish captivity to Babylon, on the one hand, and the yet future restoration of Palestine and Jerusalem to the Jews, on the other hand, a dispensation of world rule is committed to the Gentiles which characterizes this period as "the times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24). This people, likewise designated as "the nations," go on in their history and are seen both in the prophetic picture of the millennium (Isa. 60:3, 5, 12; 62:2; Acts 15:17) and that of the new earth and as having right of entrance into the city which is to be (Rev. 21:24, 26).

c. The Jews. By the call of Abraham and all that Jehovah wrought in him, a new race or stock was begun which, under unalterable divine covenants and promises, continues forever. So different is this race as to distinctive characteristics that all other people are antipodal to them, *i.e.*, they are classified as "the Gentiles" or "the nations" as in dissimilarity to the Jewish nation. Such a divine preference for Israel cannot be understood apart from the records given in the Bible as to Jehovah's eternal purpose in them. The importance in God's sight of the earthly people and all that is related to them is indicated by the fact that about five-sixths of the Bible bears directly or indirectly upon them. In spite of all their sin and failure, the purpose of God for them cannot be broken (cf. Jer. 31:31–37). Their destiny is traceable on into the millennium and the new earth which follows. However, in the present age, bounded as it is by the two advents of Christ, all progress in the national and earthly program for Israel is in abeyance and individual Jews are given the same privilege as the individual Gentiles of the exercise of personal faith in Christ as Savior and out of those thus redeemed, both Jews and Gentiles, the heavenly people are being called. It is clearly indicated throughout the prophetic Scriptures that when the present purpose is accomplished God will, in all faithfulness, return to the full completion of His earthly promises in Israel (Acts 15:14–18; Rom. 11:24–27).

d. The Christians. An extensive body of Scripture declares directly or indirectly that the present age is unforeseen and intercalary in its character,

and in it a new humanity appears on the earth with an incomparable new headship in the resurrected Christ, which Company is being formed by the regenerating power of the Spirit. It is likewise revealed that there is now "no difference" between Jews and Gentiles generally either as to their need of salvation (Rom. 3:9) or as to the specific message to be preached to them (Rom. 10:12). It is seen, also, that in this new Body wherein Jews and Gentiles are united by a common salvation, the middle wall of partition—the age-long enmity between Jew and Gentile—is broken down, itself having been "slain" by Christ on the cross, thus making peace (Eph. 2:14–18). In fact, all former distinctions are lost, those thus saved having come upon new ground where there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but where Christ is all in all (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11). The New Testament also records that the individual Christian, being indwelt by Christ, now possesses eternal life and its hope of glory (Col. 1:27), and, being in Christ, is possessed with the perfect standing of Christ, since all that Christ is—even the righteousness of God—is imputed unto him. The Christian is thus already constituted a heavenly citizen (Phil. 3:20) and, being raised with Christ (Col. 3:1–3), and seated with Christ (Eph. 2:6), belongs to another sphere—so definitely, indeed, that Christ can say of such: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John 17:14, 16; cf. 15:18, 19). It is likewise to be observed that since this spiritual birth and heavenly position *in Christ* are supernatural, they are, of necessity, wrought by God alone, and that human cooperation is excluded; the only responsibility imposed on the human side being that of *faith* which trusts in the only One who is able to save. To this heavenly people, who are the New Creation of God (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15), is committed, not in any corporate sense but only as individuals, a twofold responsibility, namely, (a) to adorn by a Christlike life the doctrine which they represent by the very nature of their salvation, and (b) to be His witnesses to the uttermost parts of the earth. It is similarly believed that the Scriptures which direct the Christian in his holy walk and service are adapted to the fact that he is not now striving to secure a standing with God, but is already "accepted in the beloved" (Eph. 1:6), and has attained unto every spiritual blessing (Eph. 1:3; Col. 2:10). It is evident that no human resource could enable any person to arise to the fulfillment of these heaven-high responsibilities and that God, anticipating the believer's inability to walk worthy of the calling wherewith he is called, has freely bestowed His

empowering Spirit to indwell each one who is saved. Of this same heavenly Company it is declared that they, when their elect number is complete, will be removed from this earth. The bodies of those that have died will be raised and living saints will be translated (1 Cor. 15:20–57; 1 Thess. 4:13–18). In glory, the individuals who comprise this Company will be judged as to their rewards for service (1 Cor. 3:9–15; 9:18–27; 2 Cor. 5:10, 11), the corporate Church will be married to Christ (Rev. 19:7–9), and then return *with* Him to share as His consort in His reign (Luke 12:35, 36; Jude 1:14, 15; Rev. 19:11–16). This New Creation people, like the angels, Israel, and the Gentiles, may be traced on into the eternity to come (Heb. 12:22–24; Rev. 21:1–22:5). But, it will be remembered, the Christian possesses no land (Ex. 20:12; Matt. 5:5); no house (Matt. 23:38; Acts 15:16), though of the household of God; no earthly capital or city (Isa. 2:1–4; Ps. 137:5, 6); no earthly throne (Luke 1:31–33); no earthly kingdom (Acts 1:6, 7); no king to whom he is subject (Matt. 2:2), though Christians may speak of Christ as "the King" (1 Tim. 1:17; 6:15); and no altar other than the cross of Christ (Heb. 13:10–14).

3. The Time Periods of the Bible. Several of its important divisions are observable when all time from its beginning to its end is traced through the Scriptures. Some of these divisions are:

a. Divsions Realatyed to Humanity.

(1) *The First Period* of human history, or from Adam to Abraham, is characterized by the presence on the earth of but one stock or people—the Gentiles.

(2) *The Second Period* covering 2,000 years of human history, or from Abraham to Christ, is characterized by the presence on the earth of two divisions of humanity—the Gentile and the Jew.

(3) *The Third Period* of human history, or from the first advent of Christ to His second advent, is characterized by the presence on the earth of three divisions of humanity-the Gentile, the Jew, and the Christian.

(4) *The Fourth Period* declared to be a thousand years (Rev. 20:1–9), or from Christ's second advent to the great white throne judgment and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, is characterized by the presence of but two classes of humanity on the earth—the Jew and the Gentile.

b. Dispensations. As a time measurement, a dispensation is a period which is identified by its relation to some particular purpose of God—a purpose to be accomplished within that period. The earlier dispensations, being so far removed in point of time from the present, are not as clearly defined as are the later dispensations. For this reason, Bible expositors are not always agreed regarding the precise features of the more remote periods. Some obvious dispensational divisions are:

(1) *The Dispensation of Innocence,* which extended from the creation to the fall of Adam. The time is unrevealed; Adam's divine commission in that period and his failure indicate the course and end of the divine intention within that era.

(2) *The Dispensation of Conscience,* which extended from Adam's fall to the flood, in which age conscience was, apparently, the dominating feature of human life on the earth and the basis of man's relationship with God.

(3) *The Dispensation of Human Government,* which extended from the flood to the call of Abraham, is characterized by the committing of self-government to men, and is terminated by the introduction of a new divine purpose.

(4) *The Dispensation of Promise,* which is continued from the call of Abraham to the giving and acceptance of the Mosaic Law at Sinai. During this age the divine promise alone sustains Abraham and his posterity. While Hebrews 11:13, 39 refer to Old Testament saints generally in that no major Old Testament promise was realized during its own period, these passages are specifically true of those who lived within the age of promise. That Abraham lived by divine promise is a theme of both Testaments.

(5) *The Dispensation of the Law,* which extended from the giving of the Law of Jehovah by Moses and its acceptance by Israel at Sinai (Ex. 19:3–31:18). It continued as the authoritative government of God over His people Israel and thus characterized that age until it ended with the death of Christ. A very brief portion of that age (probably seven years which Christ declared would be shortened—Matt. 24:21, 22), which is Daniel's seventieth week (Dan. 9:24–27), yet remains to run its course.

(6) *The Dispensation of Grace,* which extends from the death of Christ until His return to receive His Bride. It is an age characterized by grace in the sense that in this age God, who has always acted in grace toward any and all of the human family whom He has blessed, is now making a specific

heavenly demonstration of His grace by and through the whole company of Jews and Gentiles who are saved by grace through faith in Christ. These are a heavenly people who, because their citizenship is in heaven, are removed both by resurrection and translation from the earth when their elect number is completed. As stated above, a brief period follows the removal of the Church from the earth, which period is not related to the present era and is not characterized by a demonstration of divine grace, but rather by God's judgments upon a Christ-rejecting world. This age is also a period in which man is tested under grace.

(7) *The Dispensation of Kingdom Rule,* which continues from the second advent of Christ on for a thousand years and ends with the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. It is characterized by the facts that Satan is bound, the covenants of Israel are fulfilled, creation is delivered from its bondage, and the Lord Himself will reign over the earth and on the throne of His father David.

c. The Covenants. God has entered into various covenants. These, too, are well defined:

(1) *The Covenant of Redemption* (Titus 1:2; Heb. 13:20) into which, it is usually thought by theologians, the Persons of the Godhead entered before all time and in which each assumed that part in the great plan of redemption which is their present portion as disclosed in the Word of God. In this covenant the Father gives the Son, the Son offers Himself without spot to the Father as an efficacious sacrifice, and the Spirit administers and empowers unto the execution of this covenant in all its parts. This covenant rests upon but slight revelation. It is rather sustained largely by the fact that it seems both reasonable and inevitable.

(2) *The Covenant of Works,* which is the theologian's designation for those blessings God has offered men and conditioned on human merit. Before the fall, Adam was related to God by a covenant of works. Until he is saved, man is under an inherent obligation to be in character like his Creator and to do His will.

(3) *The Covenant of Grace,* which is the term used by theologians to indicate all aspects of divine grace toward man in all ages. The exercise of divine grace is rendered righteously possible by the satisfaction to divine judgments which is provided in the death of Christ. The phrase *Covenant of*

Grace is not found in the Bible and, as often presented by human teachers, is far from a Scriptural conception.

(4) *The Edenic Covenant* (Gen. 1:28–30; 2:16, 17), which is Jehovah's declaration incorporating seven features that conditioned the life of unfallen man on the earth.

(5) *The Adamic Covenant* (Gen. 3:14–19), which is also in seven parts and conditions man's life on the earth after the fall. Much that is in this covenant is perpetual throughout all generations until the curse is lifted from creation (Rom. 8:19–23).

(6) *The Noahic Covenant* (Gen. 8:20–9:27), which, again, is in seven particulars and discloses the divine intent respecting human government and posterity in all succeeding generations beginning with Noah.

(7) *The Abrahamic Covenant* (Gen. 12:1–3; 13:14–17; 15:1–18; 17:1–8), which, likewise, is in seven divisions or divine objectives. This covenant guarantees everlasting blessings upon Abraham, his seed, and all the families of the earth.

(8) *The Mosaic Covenant* (Ex. 20:1–31:18) which is in three parts, namely, the commandments, the judgments, and the ordinances which, in turn, directed the moral, social, and religious life of Israel and imposed penalties for every failure. The Mosaic Covenant is a covenant of works. Its blessings were made to depend on human faithfulness. It also provided the remedial sacrifices by which the sin and failure of those under the covenant could be cared for and they restored to right relations with God.

(9) *The Palestinian Covenant* (Deut. 30:1–9), which is in seven particulars and discloses what Jehovah will yet do in regathering, blessing, and restoring Israel to her own land.

(10) *The Davidic Covenant* (2 Sam. 7:5–19), which secures three paramount advantages to Israel through the Davidic House, namely, an everlasting throne, an everlasting kingdom, and an everlasting King to sit on David's throne.

(11) *The New Covenant for the Church* (Luke 22:20), which incorporates every promise of saving and keeping grace for those of the present age who believe. Its many blessings are either possessions or positions *in Christ*.

(12) *The New Covenant for Israel* (Jer. 31:31–34; Heb. 8:7–12), which covenant is "new" in the sense that it supersedes as a rule of life the Mosaic Covenant that Israel broke, but it does not alter or conflict with the

Palestinian Covenant, the Abrahamic Covenant, or the Davidic Covenant. Its blessings are fourfold and all yet future, though assured unconditionally on the unfailing faithfulness of God.

d. The Prophetic Periods.

(1) *From Adam to Abraham,* in which period Enoch prophesied concerning the second advent of Christ (Jude 1:14, 15), and Noah prophesied in regard to his sons (Gen. 9:24–27).

(2) *From Abraham to Moses,* in which time word is committed to Abraham, which he evidently passed on to others, with respect to his seed (Gen. 15:13), and Jacob foretold the future of his posterity (Gen. 49:1–27).

(3) *From Moses to Daniel,* during which time the major portion of Old Testament prophecy was written and much of it fulfilled. Attention should be given to Deuteronomy 28:1–33:29 as the seed plot of prediction concerning all future blessings for Israel.

(4) *From Daniel to Christ,* a division of time in which Jehovah reveals through Daniel the beginning, course, and end of Gentile rule as well as future divine purposes in Israel. This specific era includes the writings of Daniel, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. To this age, and as an important part of it, should be added all predictions concerning the great tribulation since that time of so great distress is the seventieth week of Daniel's prophecy and, therefore, a most vital and inseparable part of it, regardless of the fact that centuries which are of a parenthetical nature are thrust in between.

(5) *From the First to the Second Advent of Christ,* which period gathers up all New Testament prophecy both by Christ and the apostles.

(6) *From the Beginning to the End of the Millennial Kingdom,* in which dispensation it is revealed that "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (Joel 2:28).

(7) *The Eternal State,* which will be the fulfilling of much prediction, though there is no anticipation recorded that any will then prophesy; in fact, it is declared that prophecy shall then "fail" (1 Cor. 13:8).

e. The Various Aspects of the Earthly Kingdom.

(1) *The Theocracy,* in which the divine rule over Israel is provided in and through the judges (Judges 2:16, 18; 1 Sam. 8:7; Acts 13:19, 20).

(2) *The Kingdom Promised,* in that God enters into unconditional covenant with David as to the unalterable perpetuity of his house, his kingdom, and his throne (2 Sam. 7:5–19; Ps. 89:20–37).

(3) *The Kingdom Anticipated by Prophets,* on which theme there is an extensive body of Scripture embracing the major portion of Old Testament preview. Apart from the immediate evil of their times and the proclamation of judgment upon surrounding nations, the prophets of the Old Testament dwelt much upon the Person of their expected Messiah, the glory and blessing of their coming kingdom, and the place the Gentiles are to occupy in that kingdom. In the midst of these predictions there is a clear recognition of the apostasy of Israel and the chastisement that was to fall on the Davidic house; but not without the assurance that the Davidic Covenant cannot be broken because of the faithfulness of Jehovah (2 Sam. 7:5–19; Ps. 89:20–37). That chastisement was to take the form of a world-wide scattering of Israel—where they are found today—and which is to be followed by the regathering of that people into their own land when their Messiah returns (cf. Deut. 28:63–68; 30:1–10). These prophecies began to be fulfilled in connection with the last captivity to Babylon six hundred years before Christ and mark the beginning of the period which Christ termed "the times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24), and which must continue until the regathering of Israel at the return of Christ, and bears the unmistakable sign that Jerusalem is "trodden down of the Gentiles." Within this extended Gentile dispensation are other aspects of the kingdom rule on the earth which recognize the presence and authority of Gentile administration.

(4) *The Kingdom Announced as "At Hand,"* but rejected by Israel. The kingdom which is so large a part of Old Testament expectation, in its announcement and rejection occupies much of the synoptic Gospels. The major part of Christ's precross ministry is concisely described in John 1:11, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." Israel's King was to come to them "meek, and sitting upon an ass" (Zech. 9:9; Matt. 21:5). This explicit prediction as to the manner of Christ's offer of Himself as Israel's King at His first advent, is not to be confused with His resistless coming as their Messiah in power and great glory at His second advent (Matt. 24:29–31; Rev. 19:15, 16). By His rejection in the days of His first advent, Israel was made guilty of the overt act of the crucifixion of her King, thus extending the centuries of the chastisement. However, the

sacrifice was provided in the death of Christ which answered all the demands of divine holiness against sin and opened a door of blessing to all people of the earth (Rom. 11:25–27).

(5) *The Mystery Form of the Kingdom,* as outlined by Christ in the seven parables of Matthew 13:1–52, continues throughout this age. According to its New Testament usage, the word *mystery* refers to a truth which has hitherto been unrevealed. The present dispensation is characterized by the accomplishment of a divine purpose which is rightly termed a *mystery*. All else is being conformed to this purpose. Ephesians 3:1–6 declares this purpose and there it is seen to be the outcalling into one new Body of both Jews and Gentiles, who, each and every one, are made new creatures by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit. The kingdom of heaven is God's rule in the earth and He is now ruling in this the "times of the Gentiles" only in so far as the realization of the New Testament mysteries may require. This is the extent of the kingdom in mystery form (Matt. 13:11).

(6) *The Kingdom to Be Reannounced by the 144,000 in Final Anticipation of the Messiah's Return.* When about to leave this world and in connection with events which would accompany His second advent, Christ declared, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world [οἰκουμένῃ] for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. 24:14; cf. Rev. 7:4–9).

(7) *The Kingdom in Manifestation,* or that age following the second advent of Christ when all prophecies and covenants concerning Jews and Gentiles in the glorified earth will be fulfilled. This era is usually designated as the millennium because of the revelation that it will be for one thousand years (Rev. 20:1–6).

f. Divisions of the Scripitures Relative to the History of Israel in the Land. In the light of the Palestinian Covenant which guarantees to Israel an everlasting possession of the land pledged to Abraham and his seed, it is essential to observe that, according to prophecy and as chastisements, the Israelites were to be three times dispossessed of their land and three times restored to it. It is equally important to note that they are now in the third dispossession of the land and awaiting their restoration to it when their Messiah returns. Having been restored thus, they will go out no more again forever. Since prophecy is much affected by the position Israel occupies at any given time

in relation to her land, this division of the Bible's message is of paramount importance.

g. Divisions of the Scriptures Relative to the Gentiles. The far-reaching import of revelation concerning various Gentile positions is second only to that of Israel. They are seen:

(1) *As Outside the Jewish Covenants and Commonwealth Privileges,* which is their estate from Adam to Christ (Eph. 2:12);

(2) *As Receiving a Dispensation of World Rule at the Hour of Israel's Last Dispersion* (Dan. 2:36–44);

(3) *As Now Privileged to Receive the Gospel of Divine Grace,* and, as individuals, to be saved into the new natural headship and heavenly glory of Christ (Acts 10:45; 11:17, 18; 13:47, 48);

(4) *As Brought into Judgment at the End of Their Dispensation of World Rule* and with respect to their treatment of Israel (Matt. 25: 31–46);

(5) *As Seen in Prophecy* as those who are to participate as a subordinate people in Israel's kingdom (Isa. 2:4; 60:3, 5, 12; 62:2; Acts 15:17);

(6) *As Entering and Continuing in Israel's Kingdom* (Matt. 25: 34); and,

(7) *As Partakers in the Glory of the Celestial City,* after the creation of the new heavens and the new earth (Rev. 21:24–26).

h. Divisions of the Scriptures Relative to the Church. Though, as to her earthly history, the Church is restricted to the present age, she may be recognized:

(1) *As Seen in Types* portrayed by certain brides of the Old Testament;

(2) *As Anticipated Directly in Prophecy* (Matt. 16:18);

(3) *As Being Called Out from, and Yet Resident in, the World,* which is true of the Church in the present dispensation (Acts 15:14; Rom. 11:25);

(4) *As Distinct from Judaism.* In the right divisions of the Scripture, nothing is more fundamental or determining than the distinction between Judaism and Christianity. As judged by the proportion of space given to it, Judaism occupies the major portion of the Bible including practically all of the Old Testament and much of the New Testament. The Bible presents both of these great systems, and it is easily one of the greatest mistakes of theologians to suppose that these are one and the same. It is true there are certain features common to both, such as God, man, sin, and redemption; but there are vast differences between them and these differences must be observed. Some of these are listed in Chapters III and XI of Volume IV;

(5) *As Caught Up into Heaven by Resurrection and Translation* and there rewarded and married to Christ (1 Thess. 4:13–18; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 19:7–9);

(6) *As Returning with Christ to His Earthly Reign* (Jude 1:14, 15; Rev. 19:11–16);

(7) *As Reigning with Christ on the Earth* (Rev. 20:6); and,

(8) *As Partakers in the Glory of the New Heaven* and as so related to the celestial city as to give to it the characterizing title, “the bride, the Lamb’s wife.”

4. Main Divisions of Bibliology. Bibliology falls naturally into seven divisions, namely, (1) revelation, (2) inspiration, (3) authority, (4) illumination, (5) interpretation, (6) animation, and (7) preservation.

Chapter III

REVELATION

IN ITS THEOLOGICAL usage, the term *revelation* is restricted to the divine act of communicating to man what otherwise man would not know. This extraordinary form of revelation, since it originates with God, is, of necessity, largely dependent on supernatural agencies and means. Nothing could be more advantageous to man, nor is there aught more certain than the fact that God has spoken to man. The satanic question, "Hath God said?" (Gen. 3:1)—ever the substance of human rationalism and doubt as to divine revelation—is engendered by the "father of lies" and is foreign to natural intuition of man.

Having made man in His own image and having endowed man with the capacity to commune with Himself, it is reasonable to expect that this competency in man would be exercised; that in due time God would disclose to man truth concerning Himself and His purposes, also man's true place in the divine plan of creation—his relation to God, to eternity, to time, to virtue, to sin, to redemption, as well as to all other beings in this universe in which man's life is cast. Adam, created as he was at the zero point of all knowledge and experience which accrues to man through the process of living, had much to learn even within the sphere of that which is unfallen. God, we are told, came down and talked with Adam in the cool of the day. But if unfallen man needed the impartation of knowledge, how much more does fallen man, whose whole being is darkened, need to be taught of God! To the latter must be given the added truth regarding sin and redemption. God has spoken. To this end the Bible has been written, and the revelation to man of that great body of truth which man could not acquire for himself and which the Bible discloses is its sublime and supreme purpose.

I. Three Important Doctrines Distinguished

1. REVELATION AND REASON. Systematic Theology does draw its material from both revelation and reason, though the portion supplied by reason is uncertain as to its authority and, at best, restricted to the point of insignificance. Reason, as here considered, indicates the intellectual and

moral faculties of man exercised in the pursuit of truth and apart from supernatural aid. A right evaluation of reason is too often lacking. Certain men have held that, without divine guidance or assistance, man can attain to all truth which is essential to his well-being here and hereafter. In all discussions bearing on this problem, reason must be wholly divorced from revelation if it is to be seen in its actual limitations. Such a separation is exceedingly difficult to consummate, since revelation has penetrated to an immeasurable degree into the very warp and woof of civilization. Because of this penetration, some nations are designated *Christian*. Man's true estate under reason and when isolated from revelation is partially demonstrated by the lowest forms of heathenism; but even the heathen are universally convinced of the fact of a Supreme Being and, because of that conviction, are looking for evidence which, in their estimation, expresses His favor or His displeasure. Since Adam walked and talked with God—which revelation he, no doubt, communicated to his posterity—, no man on earth could be entirely void of divine revelation. Though possessed of some slight measure of such revelation, heathen philosophy is a deplorable disclosure of the limitations of human reason. Never have these systems been able to perfect a code of moral duty nor could they discover any authority for their faulty precepts. Similarly, the light of nature and the aid of reason have been too feeble to dispel uncertainties concerning the life beyond the grave. Speaking of future rewards and punishments, Plato said: "The truth is to determine or establish any thing certain about these matters, in the midst of so many doubts and disputations, is the work of God only." And Socrates causes one of his characters to say concerning the future lite, "I am of the same opinion with you, that, in this life, it is either absolutely impossible, or extremely difficult, to arrive at a clear knowledge in this matter" (cited by Dick, *Theology*, p. 15). It is not the ancient philosopher but rather the modern unbeliever who contends for the sufficiency of human reason and who ridicules the claims of revelation.

Within the circumscribed boundaries of that which is human, reason is paramount; yet, as compared with divine revelation, it is both fallible and finite.

2. Revelation and Inspiration. Revelation and inspiration are each in themselves cardinal Bible doctrines and are often confounded. This

confusion is perhaps due, to a large degree, to the fact that revelation and inspiration must concur, or converge to one point, in securing that infallible, divine Oracle which the Bible unhesitatingly asserts itself to be. It is, by its own claims, not only a *revealed* body of truth, but is the *only* revealed body of truth. It is a supernatural interposition into the affairs of men. This claim, of necessity, implies two divine operations, namely, *revelation*, which is the direct divine influence which communicates truth from God to man; and *inspiration*, which is the direct divine influence which secures an accurate transference of truth into language which others may understand.

While these two divine operations do often concur, it is equally true that they often function separately. By revelation of the purest character Joseph was warned of God in a dream that he should flee into Egypt with Mary and the infant Jesus. It is not asserted, however, that he was inspired to record the revelation for the benefit of others. In fact, multitudes heard the voice of God when they heard the gracious revelations which were the substance of Christ's preaching; but none of these, save the chosen disciples, were called upon to undertake the functions of inspired writers.

On the other hand, inspired men presented facts with that accuracy which only inspiration could secure, which facts were not, strictly speaking, revelations. The human authors of the Bible often recorded things they themselves saw or said, in which case there would be no need of direct revelation.

This distinction is further disclosed by the fact that though some men are agreed that the Bible does present a revelation from God they are disagreed concerning the solution of various problems as to how the revelation from God could be transmitted without error through men who in themselves were fallible and even lacking in much of the educational culture of their day. These and other differentiations between revelation and inspiration will naturally be more clearly seen as the consideration of these separate doctrines proceeds.

3. Revelation, Inspiration, and Illumination. A clear distinction between revelation and inspiration, on the one hand, and illumination, on the other, is also essential; the last named being that influence or ministry of the Holy Spirit which enables all who are in right relation with God to understand the Scriptures. Of Christ it is written that He "opened" their

understanding of the Scriptures (Luke 24:32, 45) Christ Himself promised that when the Spirit came He would “guide” into all truth. Likewise, Paul writes, “We have received … the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God” (1 Cor. 2:12). And John states of the Spirit that He “teacheth you of all things” (1 John 2:27). However, it is obvious that illumination, being the divine unfolding of Scripture already given, does not contemplate the exalted responsibility of adding to those Scriptures; nor does illumination contemplate an inspired and infallible transmission into language of that which the Spirit teaches.

Inspiration, by which revelation finds an infallible expression, is confounded by both the Romanists and the rationalists. The Romanists pursue this course that they may maintain their assumption that the Church of Rome, both primitive and present, holds an extra-Biblical authoritative dogma which is equal to that of the Bible—and superior to the Bible, judging from their conclusions whenever a difference between the Bible and the Romish dogma arises. This is a palpable arrogation; for proofs which establish an authoritative, inspired Bible are more than sufficient, while the proofs for an authoritative, inspired church are nil. The rationalist, in pursuit of reason, confounds illumination, or the general influence of the Spirit on all regenerate hearts, with the extraordinary achievements of revelation and inspiration. This they do, even when admitting a specific divine revelation, by attributing to the human authors of the Bible all the variability, uncertainty, and deficiency which characterizes the best of men even when acting under the enabling power of the Spirit.

The experience of Balaam, of King Saul, and of Caiaphas, in declaring a divine revelation is proof that inspiration does not necessarily imply spiritual illumination. And, on the other hand, the fact that the uncounted host of those who are blessed by spiritual illumination do not receive revelation or exercise the functions of inspiration is proof sufficient to disarm the claim of the rationalist.

It is significant that in one passage, namely, 1 Corinthians 2:9–13, there is reference to *revelation* in verse 10, to *illumination* in verse 12, and to *inspiration* in verse 13.

Finally, both revelation and inspiration may be distinguished from illumination in that the last named is promised to all believers; that it admits of degrees, since it increases or decreases; that it depends not on sovereign

choice but rather on personal adjustment to the Spirit of God; and without it none is ever able to come to personal salvation (1 Cor. 2:14), or the knowledge of God's revealed truth.

II. The Nature of Revelation

From the first disclosure of Himself to man in the Garden of Eden to the heavenly consummation when the redeemed shall know even as they are known and when that which is in part shall be done away by the advent of that which in the realm of spiritual understanding is "perfect" (1 Cor. 13:9–12)—even though in times past He has "suffered all nations to walk in their own ways" (Acts 14:15–17)—, God has never left Himself "without a witness." He has wrought with unfailing faithfulness to the end that men might see beyond their native horizon and apprehend to some degree the facts and features of a larger sphere. God has sought by every available means to manifest Himself, His works, His will, and His purpose. To this end, He has by His Spirit moved men to desire this knowledge. This divine moving of the hearts of men in general is thus expressed by the Apostle Paul to the Athenians: "that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us" (Acts 17:27); while the more exalted and specific feature of His own deepest desire, in which all the redeemed may share, is thus expressed by the same Apostle: "that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death" (Phil. 3:10). Since "the chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever," man is not restricted in the sphere of his own being to that in which he was placed by creation. The way is open for him to move on into realms celestial and to know, even now, something of the exalted privilege of "fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ," to possess eternal life, and to anticipate a final conformity to Christ. Divine revelation is the making known to man of all he must come to know,—which lies between the zero point at which he began his career as a creature and the finality of understanding because of which he, being redeemed, may hold uninterrupted communion with God in heaven and respond intelligently to the things of God in eternal realms. In general, a divine revelation is accomplished whenever any manifestation of God is discerned

or any evidence of His presence, purpose, or power is communicated. Such manifestations are discoverable all the way from the grand spectacle of creation down to the least experience of the lowliest human creature. So stupendous, far-reaching, and complex is this body of truth that any attempt to delineate or classify it will of necessity be incomplete.

It is the common practice of theologians to subdivide revelation into two principal divisions, namely, that which is *general* and that which is *specific*, or that which is *natural* and that which is *supernatural*, or that which is *original* and that which is *soteriological*. The former of each of these twofold categories incorporates that revelation which is communicated through nature and history, while the latter incorporates all that which comes as an intervention into the natural course of things, and which is supernatural both as to source and mode.

For a more comprehensive elucidation, divine revelation is here particularized under seven modes—(a) God revealed through *nature*, (b) God revealed through *providence*, (c) God revealed through *preservation*, (d) God revealed through *miracles*, (e) God revealed by *direct communication*, (f) God revealed through the *incarnation*, and (g) God revealed through the *Scriptures*.

1. God Revealed Through Nature. The transcendent earthly glory which awaited unfallen man when created could have had no meaning to him apart from the realization that all he beheld was a work of his Creator, and, to that extent, a revelation of the Creator's wisdom, power,and glory. But even such a display as man saw before the curse fell upon it (Gen. 3:18, 19; Rom. 8:19–21) was augmented immeasurably by the presence of, and communion with, God. Nature's revelation was impressive in itself, but needed then, as now, to be completed by a close and personal intimacy with God. On the relation of the natural and supernatural aspects of revelation in Eden, Dr. B. B. Warfield writes: "The impression is strong that what is meant to be conveyed to us is that man dwelt with God in Eden, and enjoyed with Him immediate and not merely mediate communion. In that case, we may understand that if man had not fallen, he would have continued to enjoy immediate intercourse with God, and that the cessation of this immediate intercourse is due to sin" (*Revelation and Inspiration*, p. 8).

The Bible definitely points to nature as a practical revelation of God. We read: “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun. Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof” (Ps. 19:1–6). Similarly, nature’s revelation, with its restricted value, is declared in Romans 1:19–23. The reason advanced in this passage as to why God’s wrath is revealed from heaven against unrighteous men who hold down, or resist, the truth (vs. 18) is said to be “Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.” That which may be known of God through nature has been revealed to all men alike, even invisible things including His eternal power and Godhead. Hence, failing to recognize God as thus revealed and to glorify Him, and turning to idolatry is, on man’s part, without excuse and merits the just recompense which God has imposed. It should be observed in this connection that nature’s revelation presents nothing of the great need and fact of redemption. The heathen world, apart from specific revelation, comes to a feeble recognition of a Supreme Being; but nature does not disclose the truth that “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Until informed as to God’s saving grace in Christ Jesus, the heathen would be possessed with an excuse for his ignorance concerning redemption; but there is no intimation that this ignorance will commend him to God’s saving grace.

All naturalistic theistic arguments as to the existence of God are based on the revelation concerning God which nature affords. These (yet to be considered under *Theology Proper*) are none other than an effort on man's part to reason from nature back to its cause, and since such reasoning is justified, man is "without excuse."

2. God Revealed Through Providence. Providence is the execution in all its details of the divine program of the ages. That such a program exists is not only reasonable to the last degree, but is abundantly set forth in the Scriptures (Deut. 30:1–10; Dan. 2:31–45; 7:1–28; 9:24–27; Hosea 3:4, 5; Matt. 23:37–25:46; Acts 15:13–18; Rom. 11:13–29; 2 Thess. 2:1–12; Rev. 2:1–22:21). The far-flung purposes of God which sweep the ages from eternity past to eternity to come are also perfect in their minutest detail, even embracing the falling sparrow and numbering the hairs of the head. In the discerning of the providence of God, only spiritual vision avails. The restricted perception of the unregenerate, who have not God in all their thoughts, is well expressed in the familiar words, "Chance and change are busy ever," which words, though a part of a Christian hymn, have no place in a Christian's relation to God. To a child of God the unfailing providence of God is better expressed in the Word of God: "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28).

The doctrine of divine providence is not without its problems. It cannot be otherwise so long as sin and suffering are in the world. A larger understanding as to the divine purposes and the necessary means God employs to reach these ends offers much in the direction of a solution of these difficulties. God's revelation of Himself through providence is limitless. History is *His Story,* and on the pages of Scripture He has so related Himself to future events, both by covenants and prediction, that assurance is given that there will be a perfect consummation of all things and the end will justify the means used to secure it.

3. God Revealed Through Preservation. The New Testament is specific in its declarations concerning the relation which the Second Person in the Godhead sustains to this material universe. It is written of Him as Creator: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are

in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him" (Col. 1:16). "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands" (Heb. 1:10). It is also stated that this One who by the Word of His power called all things into existence (Heb. 11:3), does by the same word of power cause them to hold together, or continue as they were: "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist" ('hold together'—Col. 1:17); "And upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3). Christ is also the bestower and sustainer of life (John 1:4; 5:26; Acts 17:25; 1 Cor. 15:45). He it is who gives eternal life (John 10:10, 28), and is Himself that life which He gives (Col. 1:27; 1 John 5:12). As the sap of the vine sustains the branch, so the divine life is ever the vital force in the Christian. It is true that "in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). God is likewise revealed in the care which He exercises in the preservation of each individual, especially those who trust Him. This truth is expressed in two New Testament passages: "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? … for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:31–33). "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:19).

In the Old Testament the title *Almighty God* ('El Shaddai') conveys the truth that God sustains His people. The term indicates more than that God is a God of strength. That He is; but the title includes the impartation of His strength as a child draws succor from the mother's breast. The word *shad* as combined in 'El Shaddai,' means *breast*, and supports the conception of a mother's nourishment imparted to her child.

Thus it is seen that God is revealed through His preservation of all things in general, and His people in particular.

4. God Revealed Through Miracles. Whatever may be relevant to the fullest understanding of all that miracles disclose, it is certain that they serve to reveal God to man. This is no less true in one Testament than it is in the other. The supernatural character of a miracle discloses the divine power, as well as the purpose, of the One by whom it is wrought. Aside

from the good which was accomplished, the miracles of Christ served to prove that He was God manifest in the flesh (Matt. 11:2–6). The person and power of Satan is also revealed through supernatural works (2 Cor. 11:14; Rev. 13:1–18).

5. God Revealed by Direct Communication. God has spoken to man. This fact presents two different problems, namely, that of God who speaks, and that of man who hears. On the divine side, it is evident that God, who created all the human faculties, is abundantly able to deliver His message to the mind of man. On the human side, men were caused to know with certitude that a message had been given to them from God, and, because of this conviction, they were bold in its delivery to others.

The revelation of God through direct intercourse with men is a far-reaching aspect of this great theme. It includes theophanies, visions, dreams, and the direct *mouth-to-mouth* communication with which Jehovah honored Moses as He honored no other prophet (Num. 12:8; Deut. 34:10); though He did speak directly to Adam, Cain, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and many others. That impenetrable mystery as to how the writers of the Bible received their messages from God, though belonging to the present discussion, will be considered more at length under the doctrine of inspiration.

In contemplating the fact of direct, divine revelation, almost limitless variety as to detail of mode and method is confronted. This is reasonable. God being a Person, and not an automaton, will naturally adapt Himself to the individuals and to the situations involved. The variety of the divine mode of approach to men extends from the theophanies in which Jehovah, or the Angel of Jehovah who is the Second Person of the Godhead, appears and speaks to individuals—and that manner of direct communication continues from the first theophanies of the Old Testament to the Lord's appearance to Paul on the Damascus road and to John on the Isle of Patmos—to the simplest and most unobtrusive impression by which one is divinely influenced to act or speak. How natural and wholly within the range of the experience of God's saints is the word of Abraham's servant: "I being in the way, the Lord led me" (Gen. 24:27)! And, indeed, such leading is the portion of all who are regenerate. We read, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. 8:14).

Not always did God require those to whom He spoke to put His words into written form. This is particularly true during those centuries from Adam to Moses when little Scripture was written and when God immediately directed the ways of various individuals. What divine communications preceded the actions of Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18–20), the words of Laban (Gen. 24:50), or those of Balaam (Num. 24:3–9) are not revealed. Inspired men eventually recorded the messages God gave to the men of old and thus the record is preserved (Jude 1:14, 15 presents the only existing report of the words of Enoch).

In every case a message from God is authoritative and, therefore, is not to be deemed of less importance because of the fact that it came by a dream or vision rather than by a *face-to-face* conversation with God. Divine revelation is supernatural and the message given is the pure Word of God. The false prophets "prophesy out of their own hearts" (Ezek. 13:2–17; cf. Jer. 14:14; 23:16, 26). Evidently there was that in the true revelation which convinced the messenger of the divine authority of his message, and the false prophet is everywhere held to be as fully conscious that his words were without divine authority.

Closely akin to that form of revelation which is direct and personal is the experience of all who commune with God in prayer or recognize His voice speaking to them through the Scriptures. God does reveal Himself and His will to those who wait on Him. It is written: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him" (James 1:5).

6. God Revealed Through the Incarnation. There is much Scripture bearing on this aspect of divine revelation and only a portion may be cited here.

By becoming flesh and dwelling "among us" (John 1:14), the Lord Jesus Christ, "who is … God" (Rom. 9:5), was, is, and evermore shall be, "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16). To Peter, who had said "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Christ replied, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 16:16, 17). Isaiah had declared, "And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed" (Isa. 40:5); and John records, "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father" (John 1:14). Likewise, we are told, "No man hath

seen God at any time," that is, in His divine essence or triune Being, but "the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John 1:18). That declaration contemplated the power and wisdom of God, since it is written, "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:24). As the eternal Λόγος ('Logos') of God, the Lord Jesus Christ has ever been the expression, or manifestation, of God—the *living* Word of God, as the Bible is the *written* Word of God. Of the Λόγος it is written, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God… And the Word was made flesh … and we beheld his glory" (John 1:1, 2, 14). As a word is the expression of a thought, so the Λόγος is to the Godhead. The living Word is ever the Manifester. He was the Angel of Jehovah as seen in all the theophanies, and is the final Revealer of God. He said: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." Though God "at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets," He hath "in these last days spoken unto us by his Son" (Heb. 1:1, 2). Christ is the voice of God speaking to men, and that is a direct, uncomplicated revelation of God. When beholding or hearing the Son, men are enabled to know what God is like. This revelation is complete, wanting nothing; for we are told that, "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9). But there are specific aspects in which the Λόγος is the expression of the Godhead to men. He revealed the *power* of God to the extent that Nicodemus could say, "No man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him" (John 3:2); and the *wisdom* of God to the extent that those who heard Him reported, "Never man spake like this man" (John 7:46); and the *glory* of God to the extent that John could say, "We beheld his glory" (John 1:14); and the *life* of God to the extent that, again, John could say, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you" (1 John 1:1–3). But above and beyond all these attributes of God which the Λόγος manifested, is the revelation of the *love* of God; which love, though conspicuous in every act of Christ throughout His earthly ministry, was, notwithstanding, especially

and finally revealed through His death. “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.” “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:8), and “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us” (1 John 3:16).

God could not draw nearer, nor could He disclose more clearly the wonders of His Person, the perfections of His purpose, nor the depths of His love and grace, than He has done in the incarnation, which in the scope of its purpose embraced the life, teachings, example, death, and resurrection of the eternal Son, the Second Person of the Godhead. The multitudes of His day heard and were blessed by His gracious words, and thus, though not called of God to write under inspiration what they heard, did, nevertheless, receive a large measure of divine revelation. The inestimable value of that revelation which came by the incarnation, along with other forms of manifestation, has been preserved for all generations on the pages of the inspired and inerrant Scriptures.

7. God Revealed Through the Scriptures. Of the modes of revelation named above, there is, of necessity, some overlapping and some interdependence. There could be no extended or accurate apprehension of that revelation which nature affords apart from the divine interpretation of it which the Bible provides. There could be no providence apart from preservation, nor preservation apart from providence and these, in turn, can be seen in their true light only as they are set forth on the pages of God’s Word. Miracles are a revelation of God to those who witness them, but the record of them in the Bible extends the value of their testimony to all in all generations who read the divine chronicles of them. What God has said to men directly could easily be forgotten or perverted, but the substance and purity of those *face-to-face* messages have been preserved in the divine record of them. Similarly, the value of the incarnation revelation, while existing quite apart from any written annals, has become a message of infinite riches extending to all the knowledge of God and the way into, and assurance of, eternal life. The life and death of Christ are indisputable facts of history, but the divine blessing is assured to all those who believe the *record* God has given concerning His Son (1 John 5:9–12).

It may be concluded, then, that the Bible is a specific and essential feature of all divine revelation. It, however, presents certain important features:

a. Divine Revelation is Varied in Its Themes. It embraces that which is doctrinal, devotional, historical, prophetical, and practical.

b. Divine Revelation is Partial. It is written, "The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law" (Deut. 29:29).

c. Concerning the Facts Revealed Divine Revelation is Complete. As to the Son, He is the πλήρωμα (*plērōma*, 'fulness') of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9), and as to the final salvation of all who believe, they are πεπληρωμένοι (*peplērōmenoi*, 'complete') in Him (Col. 2:10). Though complete in Him now, they are yet to be conformed to His image (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2).

d. Divine Revelation is Progressive. Its plan of procedure is expressed by the words, "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark 4:28). Each book of the Bible avails itself of the accumulated truth that has gone before, and the last book is like a vast union station into which all the great highways of revelation and prediction converge and terminate. No complete understanding of revealed truth can be gained apart from its consummation in that book, and that book, in turn, cannot be understood apart from the apprehension of all that has gone before. The last book of the Bible is the Revelation supreme.

e. Divine Revelation is Primarily Unto Redemption. Its progress of doctrine develops hand in hand with the doctrine of redemption. God has spoken to the end that man may be "wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. 3:15). God has caused a record concerning His Son to be written and men who believe that record are saved, and those who do not believe that record are lost (1 John 5:9–12).

f. Divine Revelation is Final. It incorporates the truth "which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 1:3). From it naught is to be taken, nor to it is anything to be added.

g. Divine Revelation is Accurate to the Point of Infinity. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" and is God's word *written*.

Chapter IV

INSPIRATION

THE THEOLOGICAL use of the term *inspiration* is a reference to that controlling influence which God exerted over the human authors by whom the Old and New Testament were written. It has to do with the reception of the divine message and the accuracy with which it is transcribed. Whatever concerns the origin of the message itself belongs, as has been seen, to the larger field of revelation. Since by a revelation God has spoken and the divinely given capacity of man to receive a message from God has been exercised, all human thought and action is now subject to that stabilizing message which God has given. In place of man's native agnosticism, born of his fallen human limitations, a God-given Revelation is bequeathed to man in a permanent, written form which not only expands the field of man's knowledge into the realms of infinity, but serves ever as a corrective of those fallible, shifting fancies and theories which human ignorance unceasingly engenders. Happy, indeed, is the regenerate man who listens attentively and submissively to the Word of God. The divine message serves to give form and substance to every doctrine and to none more effectively than to that of *inspiration*. A babel of voices, hopelessly discordant in their relation to each other and unified only in the one feature that they are opposed to the sublime doctrine of inspiration which the Bible sets forth, has characterized every generation of recent centuries. An examination of many books that have been written in the past century and which treat of the doctrine of inspiration discloses the fact that whether of one generation or another each author, in turn, reveals the occurrence that, at the time of his writing, an irreconcilable conflict was on which had reached, what seemed to him to be, a crisis between those who defend and those who oppose the long-accepted beliefs touching the inspiration of the Scriptures. This is revealing; indicating, as it does, the pertinacious opposition which the natural man—scholar though he may be—exerts against all things supernatural.

Without doubt it is the supernatural element, which constitutes the very warp and woof of the Bible doctrine of inspiration, that not only gives to it its distinctive and exalted character but also repels the spiritually darkened mind of the unregenerate man—a darkness which is in no way relieved by

human learning. The scholar who finds it easier to believe that, when inanimate matter by accident became “complex enough and in appropriate collection, living organisms may have emerged,” and that those organisms, in turn, “developed by inherent spontaneity into rational human beings,” than to believe that God created man in His own image and likeness—and only because there is a superficial show of supposedly *natural* processes in the former which relieves the burden of the obvious supernatural element which is the very substance of the latter—, such a scholar will resent the teaching that God has spoken to man and that this message has been, under the guidance of God, transcribed into infallible writings.

Devout men—some of great scholarship—have always agreed in the main as to the inerrant and supernatural qualities of the Bible. This belief has become distinguished as “the traditional view,” or “the doctrine of the church.” This harmony of belief on the part of devout men is not the concord of ignorance, since ignorance is incapable of concord. It is due to the fact that the norm of truth concerning Bible inspiration exists and, having discovered that norm, men are automatically of one mind. Outside that norm only wrangling dissonance will ever be heard. The following from Dr. B. B. Warfield tends greatly to the clarifying of this subject:

> This church-doctrine of inspiration differs from the theories that would fain supplant it, in that it is not the invention nor the property of an individual, but the settled faith of the universal church of God; in that it is not the growth of yesterday, but the assured persuasion of the people of God from the first planting of the church until to-day; in that it is not a protean shape, varying its affirmations to fit every new change in the ever-shifting thought of men, but from the beginning has been the church’s constant and abiding conviction as to the divinity of the Scriptures committed to her keeping. It is certainly a most impressive fact,—this well-defined, aboriginal, stable doctrine of the church as to the nature and trustworthiness of the Scriptures of God, which confronts with its gentle but steady persistence of affirmation all the theories of inspiration which the restless energy of unbelieving and half-believing speculation has been able to invent in this agitated nineteenth century of ours. Surely the seeker after the truth in the matter of the inspiration of the Bible may well take this church-doctrine as his starting-point.—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, LI, 615–16, 1894

Could it be demonstrated that the Bible advances no doctrine as to its own inspiration, men might be justified in an attempt to formulate a so-called “theory of inspiration.” But the Bible is especially clear and convincing as to the character of its own inspiration. Its teaching upon this, as upon all major doctrines, challenges the student to vigilant research. It is,

however, one thing to give devout, analytical study to the comprehensive doctrine of inspiration as disclosed in the Bible, being amenable to every word God has spoken on this aspect of truth, and quite another thing to ignore what God has spoken and upon a rationalistic basis to invent a *theory*. In fact, the Bible presents no theory regarding its own inspiration which—not unlike the liberalist's notion that Christianity must take its place among comparative religions—is called upon to compete with humanly devised schemes. The irrelevance which obtains between revelation and reason is as conspicuous in the field of inspiration as elsewhere, and the theologian must be reminded again that his task is not that of creation or origination of doctrine but rather the induction and scientific arrangement of the truth bearing on this theme which God has been pleased to reveal. To reaffirm: The question is not what men—even great scholars—think is a workable theory as to the manner in which the Bible was written; it is what the Bible declares concerning itself.

It will be conceded that God is able to produce a book which is verbally accurate, the precise statement in every particular of His own thought. Such a book the Bible, as originally written, claims to be. However, in the light of this statement—confessedly dogmatic—, certain problems arise:

I. The Fact and Importance of Inspiration

There is need of a clear understanding of the precise contribution inspiration makes to the whole divine purpose in revelation. As previously demonstrated, inspiration is not revelation. At best, inspiration can only receive the message and add the element of accuracy to the Sacred Writings, which writings are that body of truth God has revealed. In the following section of Bibliology, which deals with *canonicity* and *authority,* it will be demonstrated that the authority of the Bible's message does not depend upon inspiration. However, there is no implication to be drawn from these requisite distinctions that the fact of inspiration in both its verbal and plenary forms, is not momentous. Revelation, inspiration, and authority are Bible doctrines, closely related, yet unconfused; each supplying an immeasurable offering to the grand actuality—*the message of God to man.*

Though the preservation of truth in unerring writings is of untold value to all generations, much that enters into the Scriptures existed before any

record was made, and the recording of the realities adds nothing to this substance. If the great essentials of revelation existed only in their written form they would be classed properly as so much fiction, regardless of the perfection of the literature by which they were expressed. Similarly, unfulfilled prophecy, though now wholly dependent on its written form, must, nevertheless, eventuate in actual occurrence.

Granting that God has a body of truth which He would enjoin upon man, it is not difficult to recognize the importance of an inerrant record of that body of truth. Nor is it a matter of surprise that an increasing pressure is exerted, first from one group and then another, to break down the Bible's own testimony regarding its inspiration. That doctrine of inspiration, which the church has held in all her generations, abides, not because its defenders are able to shout louder than their opponents, nor by virtue of any human defense, but because of the fact that it is embedded within the divine Oracles themselves. Since it is so embedded in the Oracles of God, no saint or apostle could do otherwise than to *believe* the word God has spoken. It may be observed, therefore, that to hold the traditional belief regarding inspiration is not necessarily a blind support of a "lost cause," or a retreat to the Romish position that a thing is true because the church propounds it; it is a recognition and acceptance of the Bible's teaching and that belief brings one into the "goodly fellowship of the apostles and prophets."

Little space need be given to quotation from the writings of the opponents of verbal and plenary inspiration. They have in the majority of cases admitted either directly or indirectly that the men who wrote the Scriptures held the traditional belief as to inspiration. Some admit that Christ may have held that view. Under these conditions it is necessary for these opponents to contend that the human authors were either deceived or were themselves deceivers. A very brief review of these arguments is introduced at this point:

1. Christ Versus the Apostles. In one conception a distinction is drawn between the supposed beliefs of Christ and those of the apostles. Christ is pictured as opposed to the apostles and seeking to save them from the erroneous traditions of the Jews, which traditions included the belief in the inerrancy of the Scriptures. It is declared boldly: "We conclude with great probability that the Redeemer did *not* share the conception of His Israelitish

contemporaries as to the inspiration of their Bible … from the fact that He repeatedly expresses His dissatisfaction with the manner usual among them of looking upon and using the sacred books. He tells the scribes to their face that they do not understand the Scriptures (Matt. 22:29; Mark 12:24), and that it is delusion for them to think to possess eternal life in *them,* therefore in a *book* (John 5:39), even as He also (in the same place) seems to speak disapprovingly of their searching of the Scriptures, because it proceeds from such a perverted point of view" (Richard Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, p. 177, cited by Warfield, *Revelation and Inspiration,* pp. 184–85). As to the two passages offered in evidence, the former was addressed to the scribes and not to the apostles and there is no evidence that such a criticism could be with any reason directed toward those of the apostles who wrote the New Testament or any who did not write. Whatever may be the interpretation of the phrase in the latter passage—"for in them ye think ye have eternal life"—, there is the clearest assurance that the Scriptures of the Old Testament "are they which testify" of Christ (cf. Luke 24:27). Thus the apostles are discredited, but an effort is made to extricate Christ from the indefensible tradition by which the apostles are supposed to have been bound. By a baseless assumption, Christ is presented as entertaining a liberality and looseness in doctrine in harmony with that which Rothe himself exhibits, and this in turn is made the occasion of a call, "Back to Christ!" which, in this and every other instance, means: come away from the tradition-bound apostles to the modernized Christ.

2. Accommodation. Again, an argument is advanced against the doctrine as held by the apostles which is to the effect that the apostles thought the Jewish tradition of the inerrancy of the Scriptures was untenable, yet they accommodated their language, though contrary to their own beliefs, to the insuperable prejudices of their day. To quote: "The New Testament writers were completely dominated by the spirit of the age, so that their testimony on the question of Scripture inspiration possesses no independent value" (Stuart, *The Principles of Christianity,* p. 70, quoted by Warfield, *ibid.,* p. 191).

3. Ignorance. Likewise, it is contended that the apostles were "ignorant men" (Acts 4:13) and were therefore predisposed to error, and that Christ

Himself, on His human side, could have known little more than was current in His day. It is intimated that He could have had no access to the scientific verifications of these modern times and therefore could rise no higher than the level of thought which characterized His own day. What hope is there of concord between two schools of thought, one of which freely questions the authority even of Christ on the ground of a baseless claim that He was, because of His humanity, as fallible and ignorant as other men, while the other ascribes to Him all the omniscience of the Godhead Three? As for the Apostle Paul, his views, though much influenced by Jewish tradition, were not stated dogmatically, it is claimed, and therefore carry little weight.

4. CONTRADICTION. Finally, much is made of alleged "contradictions," "inaccuracies," and "inconsistencies." It is pointed out with much assurance that an inerrant book could present no such problems. But who is the judge? If the Bible contains errors as seen by God, the case would be serious; if it contains errors as seen by men, the difficulty may be wholly accounted for in the sphere of human misunderstandings. The latter possibility is but little in evidence in the writings of the opposers of the Bible doctrine of inspiration. The Spirit of God has declared "Every word of God is pure" (Prov. 30:5); "The words of Jehovah are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times" (Ps. 12:6); "The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul" (Ps. 19:7); and, "As for God, his way is perfect; the word of Jehovah is tried" (Ps. 18:30). Confronted with such statements as these, a man of reason and candor will at least give some consideration to the possibility that the supposed errors in the Bible might seem to be such because of human limitations.

There are difficulties which do arise in the study of the text of Scripture. In the nineteenth century, Biblical criticism advanced many objections to the credibility of the Bible which, it was claimed, learned research brought to light. The publishing of these claims proved a stimulus to faithful men who were minded to defend the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Along with their research came the findings of archaeology; all of which have gone a long way both as a refutation of so-called *errors*, and as a demonstration of the fact that, with sufficient light, so-called *discrepancies* disappear. The part archaeology has played in this so important and far-reaching achievement cannot be estimated; and, we are assured, this

demonstration of the accuracy of the Word of God will go on to even greater confirmation of the Bible. It is suggestive at least that research and archaeology have strengthened the claims of the opposer at no point, but have served in every case to confirm the teachings of the Scriptures. Many worthy volumes have been written which set forth the results of recent investigation. These the student should read with exceptional care. Of these supposed errors, Dr. Charles Hodge wrote, even three generations ago, that "for the most part they are trivial," "only apparent," and there are few indeed that are "of any real importance" (*Systematic Theology*, I,, 169).

A difference is to be observed between *objections* and *difficulties.* The former, if they existed, might serve to deter one from espousing the doctrine involved. The latter do not tend to the same end. If one holds objections to the doctrine of redemption he will in all probability turn from that doctrine as a whole; whereas, though there are difficulties in the doctrine such as no finite mind has ever solved the way of life may be entered and its eternal values claimed in spite of the difficulties. In such a case, the individual humbly declares that, though he cannot understand all that is involved, he recognizes that all facts concerning the doctrine are doubtless capable of being harmonized and comprehended where sufficient understanding exists. Especially is one encouraged thus to believe when the doctrine is seen to stand every proper test put upon it. Concerning the doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration, it is equally reasonable and it is advantageous to stand where the devout men of all generations, including Christ and the apostles, have stood, and from that position to face and seek to solve such difficulties as may arise.

Aside from the definite claim of the Bible as to its verbal, plenary inspiration, there are two important considerations, namely, (a) the Scriptures are in themselves a phenomenon of such a character—presenting truth on so vast a scale and so marvelous that the added claim to divine accuracy appears, *a fortiori,* as a necessary corollary to the whole. Such surpassing revelation could hardly be presented in its perfection of form apart from divine inspiration. And (b) the men who served as human authors of the books of the Bible were in themselves trustworthy witnesses. As such, they are to be credited whether they speak under inspiration or not. These men were not deceived nor were they deceivers. Apart from the claims of inspiration, the basis of faith remains, established, as it is, by

credible witnesses. Their claim to inspiration cannot be discredited until the witnesses are discredited. Similarly, it is no small evidence in the case that the human authors—and there were upwards of forty of them extending over a period of 1600 years—, whether inspired or not, are in perfect agreement as to the things which they teach; nor has one of them at any time recorded one intimation that the Bible is *not* the inspired Word of God written.

The question at issue is not new. It has appeared in past generations and will appear in succeeding generations so long as unbelief is in the world. It is a question as to what is to be accepted—the teachings of the Bible, or the teachings of men.

II. Theories of Inspiration

So-called *theories* of inspiration are the attempts men of varying faith have made to frame a relationship between two authorships. Some of these *theories* are here presented:

1. The Mechanical or Dictation Theory. Had God dictated the Scriptures to men, the style and writing would be uniform. It would be the diction and vocabulary of the divine Author, and free from the idiosyncrasies of men (cf. 2 Pet. 3:15, 16). All evidence of interest on the part of the human authors would be wanting (cf. Rom. 9:1–3). It is true that the human authors did not always realize the purport of their writings. Moses could hardly have known the typical significance latent in the history of Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph, or of the typology of Christ hidden in his description of the tabernacle which he wrote according to the pattern that was showed him in the Mount. He could not have understood why no reference should be made to the parents, or the beginning or ending of days, of Melchisedec (Heb. 7:1–3). A message which is dictated is obviously the product of the one who dictates; but if one is left free to write in behalf of another and then it is discovered that, while writing according to his own feelings, style, and vocabulary, he has recorded the precise message of the one in whose behalf he wrote and as perfectly as though it had been dictated by that one, the conviction is engendered that a supernatural accomplishment has been wrought. Under this arrangement,

the human author is given full scope for his authorship, yet the exalted message is itself secured. The result is as complete as dictation could make it; but the method, though not lacking in that mystery which always accompanies the supernatural, is more in harmony with God's ways of dealing with men, in which He *uses*, rather than *annuls*, their wills. There is no intimation that God ever dictated any message to man other than that which Moses transcribed when in Jehovah's presence in the holy Mount. This theory is easily classified as one in which the divine authorship is emphasized almost to the point of exclusion of the human authorship.

2. Partial Inspiration. According to this conception, inspiration reaches only to doctrinal teachings and precepts, to truths unknowable by the human authors. Thus the objective in all inspiration—to secure inerrant writings—is denied to certain parts of the Bible. It matters nothing as to what the human author may have previously known; inspiration secures accuracy in *all* that he wrote. This theory is an assumption which finds no support in the Bible. It is obvious that it tends to separate the two authorships.

3. Degrees of Inspiration. The postulate that there are degrees of inspiration is a theory which has claimed many supporters. Advocates of this theory attempt to classify the degrees they propose by such words as "suggestion, direction, elevation, superintendency, guidance, and direct revelation." Though the Scriptures yield little encouragement to such distinctions, these distinctions do offer a wide field for the play of the imagination and for speculation, the value of which, at best, is most doubtful. This theory is classed as one in which some parts of the Bible are claimed to be inspired to a greater degree than others, giving latitude for the contention to be made that the Bible is infested with errors. The two authorships are acknowledged, but are not always conceived of as in coalition in any given text.

4. The Concept and Not the Words Inspired. This hypothesis attempts to conceive of thoughts apart from words, the theory being that God imparted ideas but left the human author free to express them in his own language. Quite apart from the fact that ideas are not transferable by any other medium than words, this scheme ignores the immeasurable importance of *words* in any message. Even a legal document which men

execute over trivial matters may depend wholly upon one word therein. Almost every covenant and promise contained in the Bible depends for its force and value upon one of the words used. Exegetical study of the Scriptures in the original languages is a study of *words*. It is to the one end that the concept may be gained from the words rather than that unimportant words represent a concept. Apart from verbal inspiration reaching to the *words*, exegetical study is at an end. The Bible, when referring to its message, never calls attention to a mere concept; it rather speaks of its message as committed to man in the *words* which the Holy Spirit teacheth (1 Cor. 2:13). Christ said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63), and "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me" (John 17:8), "and God spake all these words, saying" (Ex. 20:1). Such clear teaching of the Scriptures as to the significance of the specific words which are used is disclosed in hundreds of Bible texts.

5. Natural Inspiration. As there have been exceptional artists, musicians, and poets who have produced masterpieces which have not been excelled, it is contended by the proponents of this theory that there have been exceptional men of spiritual insight who, because of their native gifts, were able to write the Scriptures. This is the lowest notion of inspiration and emphasizes the human authorship to the exclusion of the divine. One writer states: "Inspiration is only a higher potency of what every man possesses in some degree." To this another has replied: "The inspiration of everybody is equivalent to the inspiration of nobody." The main objective in all Bible inspiration—to secure divine accuracy for every portion of it—is wholly wanting according to this opinion.

6. Mystical Inspiration. Since Christians are empowered of God for their various tasks—God working in them "both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13)—, it is held by some that, in like manner, the human authors were enabled to write the Scriptures. If this theory were true, any Christian might at any time by special divine energy write Scripture. The defenders of this scheme are evidently not concerned with the basis on which the authority of the Bible rests. Schleiermacher, who was himself a genius of no small magnitude, is probably responsible for the more general dissemination of this view of inspiration. His statement is that inspiration is

“an awakening and excitement of the religious consciousness, different in degree rather than in kind from the pious inspiration or intuitive feelings of holy men.” Of the influence of Schleiermacher upon the general beliefs concerning inspiration, Dr. B. B. Warfield, writing of the mystical view of inspiration, states:

> Very varied forms have been taken by this conception; and more or less expression has been given to it, in one form or another, in every age. In its extremer manifestations, it has formerly tended to sever itself from the main stream of Christian thought and even to form separate sects. But in our own century [the nineteenth], through the great genius of Schleiermacher it has broken in upon the church like a flood, and washed into every corner of the Protestant world. As a consequence, we find men everywhere who desire to acknowledge as from God only such Scripture as “finds them,”—who cast the clear objective enunciation of God’s will to the mercy of the currents of thought and feeling which sweep up and down in their own souls,—who “persist” sometimes, to use a sharp but sadly true phrase of Robert Alfred Vaughan’s, “in their conceited rejection of the light without until they have turned into darkness their light within.” … Despite these attempts to introduce lowered conceptions, the doctrine of plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, which looks upon them as an oracular book, in all its parts and elements, alike, of God, trustworthy in all its affirmations of every kind, remains to-day, as it has always been, the vital faith of the people of God, and the formal teaching of the organized church.—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, LI, 623–24, 1894

Under the stress of the mystical theory of inspiration, the divine authorship is submerged by the emphasis which is placed on the human authorship. It appears only as the usual and general spiritual insight vouchsafed to all believers in degrees which vary according to their personal relation to God.

7. Verbal, Plenary Inspiration. By *verbal* inspiration is meant that, in the original writings, the Spirit guided in the choice of the words used. However, the human authorship was respected to the extent that the writers’ characteristics are preserved and their style and vocabulary are employed, but without the intrusion of error.

By *plenary* inspiration is meant that the accuracy which verbal inspiration secures, is extended to every portion of the Bible so that it is in all its parts both *infallible* as to truth and *final* as to divine authority. This, as has been stated, is the traditional doctrine of the church and that set forth by Christ and the apostles. This teaching preserves the dual authorship in a perfect balance, ascribing to each that consideration which is accorded it in the Bible.

Certain citations where dual authorship is recognized are here given: The command, “Honor thy father and thy mother” bears the authority of “God commanded” in Matthew 15:4; but in Mark 7:10 Christ introduces the words “Moses said.” In like manner Psalm 110:1 may be compared with Mark 12:36, 37; Exodus 3:6, 15 with Matthew 22:31; Luke 20:37 with Mark 12:26; Isaiah 6:9, 10 with Acts 28:25; John 12:39–41; Acts 1:16 with Acts 4:25. Certain passages, and there are many, combine a reference to both authorships in the one passage: Acts 1:16; 4:25; Matthew 1:22; 2:15 (R.V.). The Holy Spirit is declared to be the voice speaking through the Psalms as quoted in Hebrews 3:7–11; through the Law—Hebrews 9:8; and the Prophets—Hebrews 10:15.

Referring to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Olshausen writes: “In this remarkable epistle, God, or the Holy Ghost, is continually named as the speaker in the passages quoted from the Old Testament; and this not merely in those of which it is said in the context of the Old Testament Scriptures, ‘God said,’ but also in those in which some human being speaks, e. g. David, as composer of a Psalm. In this the view of the author clearly expresses itself as to the Old Testament and its writers. He regarded God as the Principle that lived, and wrought, and spoke in them all by his Holy Spirit; and accordingly Holy Scripture was to him a pure work of God, although announced to the world by man” (*Die Echtheit des N.T.,* p. 170, cited by Manly, *Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 172).

III. Dual Authorship

By the term *dual authorship* two facts are indicated, namely, that, on the divine side, the Scriptures are the Word of God in the sense that they originate with Him and are the expression of His mind alone; and, on the human side, certain men have been chosen of God for the high honor and responsibility of receiving God’s Word and transcribing it into written form. Granting that it is God’s purpose to place His Word in written form into the hands of men, the method He has employed to do this is the natural way in which it would be done. However, the employment of human authors has created many problems. It seems reasonable to conclude that the product of a dual authorship could not be the inerrant Word of God if human authors have aught to do with it. Since He combines in hypostatic union both the

divine and human natures, the same question is propounded concerning the theanthropic Person of our Lord. Does not the merging of a human nature into His unique Being introduce all the restrictions and limitations into that Being which are resident in humanity? Few, indeed, will contend that any Person of the Godhead is not perfect, or that any word God speaks will not be as pure as He is pure. The element of doubt intrudes whenever and wherever the human element is combined with that which is divine.

The term Λόγος (*Logos*—'Word') is used in the New Testament about two hundred times to indicate God's Word written, and seven times to indicate the Son of God—the Living Word of God (John 1:1, 14; 1 John 1:1; 5:7; Rev. 19:13); and it is important to recognize that in either of these forms of the *Logos* both the divine and human elements appear in supernatural union. These two forms of the *Logos* are subject to various comparisons: They are, alike, the *Truth* (John 14:6; 17:17); *everlasting* (Ps. 119:89; Matt. 24:34, 35; 1 Pet. 1:25); *life* (John 11:25; 14:6; 1 Pet. 1:23; 1 John 1:1); *saving* (Acts 16:31; 1 Cor. 15:2); *purifying* (Titus 2:14; 1 Pet. 1:22); *sanctifying* (John 17:17; Heb. 10:14); *beget life* (1 Pet. 1:23; James 1:18); *judge* (John 5:26, 27; 12:48); *glorified* (Romans 15:9; Acts 13:48). While *theology* is the θεολογία (*theologia*, or 'ology of God'), the Λόγος of God is the expression of God—whether it be in Living or Written form.

Basing its confidence on such Scriptures as Luke 1:35 which reports the angel's word to Mary—"That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God"—, and Hebrews 4:15 where it is said that Christ, the perfect High Priest, was in all points tempted like as we are—sin apart, that is, apart from temptations which arise from a sin nature—, the church has with full justification believed that Christ, the Living Logos, was not only free from the *practice* of sin, but was also free from the sin nature, and that the perfection of His Deity was in no way injured by its union with His humanity. In like manner and with the same justification, the church has believed that the perfection of God's Word has been preserved, even though written by human authors.

The parallel between the Living Logos and the Written Logos is sustained only to a limited degree. There are important dissimilarities as well. An inerrant Book, though produced by the Holy Spirit and though living and active, being used by Him, is far removed from the unending incarnation of the Son of God into union with His own identified and

unfallen humanity. There is no hypostatic union or conjunction of natures in the Written Logos; in fact, there is a wide difference to be noted: whereas the humanity of Christ was unfallen and in no way subject to the Adamic nature, the human authors of the Bible were fallen men whose sin is without hesitation recorded in the Sacred Text. In the case of the Living Logos, the human nature could never sin, since it could never act outside its relation to the divine nature. In the case of the Written Logos, the human element was held to the one and only task of an inspired writing, which in no way tended to govern the human author's personal conduct, nor did the task itself continue beyond the time required to complete it. In the writing of the Scriptures the human authors wrote in such freedom as to leave the evidence of their personal human characteristics; yet these authors did not fall into errors being, as they were during the time of their writing, not allowed to act apart from, or contrary to, the precise mind of God, whose Word they wrote. They were literally "moved," or borne along, by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21).

If the truth regarding inspiration is to be given full recognition, both the divine and human authorships must be seen and accepted in their plenitude. God was the sole Author of the Decalogue when it was written by His finger on tables of stone. The element of inspiration and dual authorship appeared when Moses, with the accuracy which inspiration secures, transcribed the Decalogue into the Exodus manuscript. On the other hand, every word of the Bible is of human authorship. It is man's composition, which feature of inspiration is of great importance.

It is perhaps a weakness due to the fall that man seems never able to preserve a balance of truth but tends to swing from one extreme to the other. This proclivity is exhibited toward the theanthropic Person of Christ. Some swing to the right and so emphasize His Deity as to disregard His humanity, while others swing to the left and so emphasize His humanity as to ignore and dishonor His Deity. The truth concerning Christ's theanthropic Person is discovered when, quite apart from man's ability or disability to understand all that is involved, each of the two natures of Christ is recognized in its entirety. Thus, also, the truth respecting inspiration is discovered when, quite apart from man's ability or disability to understand all that is involved, each of the two authorships is recognized in its undiminished, intrinsic character. The Bible is not of man as to its *source*,

nor does man contribute any feature of infallibility or authority to it. It is, however, *through* man as the medium or instrument. This medium or instrument is a living, voluntary, and intelligent factor in its production. Doubtless men could better grasp the idea of authorship of the Bible if it came to them either as the sole work of men—a collection of human notions, desires, and guesses which even the wisest of men might compose —, or as an edict from God—written only and directly by the finger of God. Similarly, the difficulty would be relieved if the Bible were declared to be of two authorships in the sense that some parts of it were the sole product of God and some the sole product of men, thus coalescing only to the extent that the two messages are bound into one volume. Practically every *theory* of inspiration is an exhibition of one or another of these natural tendencies. It is in the way of truth, though somewhat more difficult, to observe and respect the dual authorship of the Bible giving to each its full, inherent, and undiminished import. Having proved the divine authorship of the Scriptures, it is natural, when attempting to protect the purity of the same, to contend that the human authors were mere *pens* in the hand of God, and not penmen; that they without volition and as automatons wrote only as the words were dictated to them. Such a conception diminishes the human authorship to the vanishing point. On the other hand, having proved the human authorship, it is natural, when attempting to conserve the importance of the same, to contend that the Scriptures are as given to limitation and error as would be the product of any human author. This latter line of reasoning may be expanded thus: If there is a human element in the writings, it must be fallible, and if it is fallible it might be, to any degree, inaccurate and untrue.

Though there are secondary suggestions and variations proposed, there are but four primary classifications of opinion with respect to inspiration. These are: (a) The Bible is of divine authorship almost exclusively; (b) The Bible is of human authorship almost exclusively; (c) The Bible is in some parts almost exclusively divine and in other parts almost exclusively human; and (d) The divine and human authorship are both without impairment to either, wholly present in every word from the first to the last. The final of these four classifications is here declared to be the true representation of the fact of inspiration. This solution is doubtless to the natural man more burdened with difficulties than all the other three put

together, and only because of the preponderance of the supernatural element in it. Manifestly, the Person of Christ would be more easily comprehended under the Apollinarian hypothesis that He is almost wholly divine, or under the Arian conception that He is almost wholly human. But, regardless of these difficulties to the natural man which the supernatural element introduces, the Scriptures present a theanthropic Person in whom both the divine and human natures subsist each in its undiminished fullness. Thus it is with the dual authorship of the Written Word of God.

If the conjunction of two authorships involved logical contradictions or the compounding of opposing principles, objection might be advanced against it. But in the case of the dual authorship of the Scriptures the elements which coalesce are the same in nature, and by divine arrangement are made to converge into none other than the Written Oracles of God. If this combined authorship cannot be understood it can be believed. In all matters supernatural, men are unable to understand, but they are able to believe. “A man who refuses to believe anything that he does not understand will have a very short creed” (Manly, *Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 31). We are not able to explain the mode of union of the authorships, nor are we free to solve the problem by rejecting its claims. Philip Schaff has written: “The Bible is thoroughly human (though without error) in contents and form, in the mode of its rise, its compilation, its preservation, and transmission; yet at the same time thoroughly divine both in its thoughts and words, in its origin, vitality, energy, and effect” (*History of the Christian Church*, I, 93, cited by Manly, *ibid*., p. 32).

The human side of the dual authorship of the Scriptures is rendered exceedingly complex by the fact that upwards of forty men participate in this incomparable service. In other books than the Bible, human authorship stands alone, but God has exerted His own power by thus working through many writers; yet He has preserved the unity of His revelation, and, at the same time, demonstrated His control over men of varying degrees of authorship qualifications. The human imagination could hardly visualize what the Bible would have been had it been the work of one man. All men are not naturally historians, or poets, or logicians. To secure Scripture which incorporates such diversity of literary features, God evidently employs the personal talents of the human authors, selecting them according to their natural ability for the task He commits to them. Moses the historian, David

the sweet singer, and Paul the logician, are examples. When—following the death and resurrection of Christ and the Day of Pentecost—the new system of truth which is termed *Christianity* was to be developed and introduced, God did not draft one of the twelve who, because of three and a half years of association with Christ, would naturally have been selected, but, having called him out from his unregenerate state by salvation, He prepared and used the greatest intellect of his generation, if not of all generations. But whether it be Moses, Isaiah, Daniel, John, or Paul, the standardized fact abides that, apart from the form of literature they produced and their personal qualifications for the same, the individual human author wrote in its purity the sublime message which was committed unto him, and the whole of these writings—unique as they are because of dual authorship—constitutes the Oracles of God.

A threefold statement by Dr. Basil Manly is all-inclusive on the fact of the dual authorship of the Scripture:

"1. The Bible is truly the Word of God, having both infallible truth and divine authority in all that it affirms or enjoins.

2. The Bible is truly the production of men. It is marked by all the evidences of human authorship as clearly and certainly as any other book that was ever written by men.

3. This twofold authorship extends to every part of Scripture, and to the language as well as to the general ideas expressed.

Or it may be summed up in one single statement: The whole Bible is truly God's word written by men" (*ibid*., p. 90).

IV. God's Word About God's Word

The intra-Biblical evidences that the Bible is the complete and inerrant Word of God are both manifold and manifest. As Bishop Butler has said regarding the evidence of Christianity, so it may be said concerning the evidences of inspiration, they are "of great variety and compass, … making up, all of them together, one argument; the conviction arising from which kind of proof may be compared to what they call *the effect* in architecture or other works of art, a result from a great number of things so and so disposed, and taken into one view" (*Analogy*, Part II. c. 7, cited by Manly, *ibid*., p. 174). In fact the intra-Biblical evidence is so extensive that to

tabulate it would require a careful study of, and reference to, almost every page of the Scriptures—a task which few, if any, have ever essayed. This vast array of material when assembled and classified, to employ Bishop Butler's architectural figure, would include every form of averment from the foundation stones of direct assertion to the last adornment of implication. Extended argument of a polemic nature may arise over the use of one word or one text of the Scriptures bearing on some one aspect of inspiration, but the *doctrine* of inspiration itself is all-inclusive, embracing all and representing the induction of all that the Bible declares or implies in its own behalf.

It may be deducted from the extent of the literature provoked, that, of the major passages which support the Bible's own claim to inspiration, two are of surpassing importance—2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:21. Not only the direct and unqualified claim to inspiration which these passages present, but their all-inclusiveness, has drawn out the most extended and vigorous attempts on the part of men unsympathetic to the doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration to tone down by exegetical manipulation the force of evidence which these passages proffer. It is doubtful whether any one original New Testament word has been more scrutinized under the searching rays of scholarship than has θεόπνευστος (*theopneustos*—'God-breathed'; a word evidently compounded from Θεός—'God'—, and πνέω—'breateh,' cf. the translation of Job 32:8—"the inspiration of the Almighty"); which word, whatever its specific meaning may be, comprehends the central or pivotal idea of the first of these two momentous passages.

It is reasonable to believe that as those languages in which the Oracles of God were written, were, by divine supervision, being developed through the natural processes by which all languages emerge, certain words were divinely introduced and their meaning determined and preserved with a view to the all-important service which they would render and the precise truth they would convey in the written Word of God. It is equally conceivable that certain words would need to be immediately coined which would indicate aspects of supernatural relationships and undertakings that could have had little or no occasion of expression before and at such times when the language in question was serving only as the enunciation of mundane things and that which is born of mere human speculation. The word Θεόπνευστος appears but the once in the New Testament, and

probably not at all in profane Greek. On the surface of the problem, it is presumable that nothing exactly similar to the idea of God-breathed, written Oracles had arisen among the Hellenistic peoples which called for expression. It is a fair assumption that this crucial word is of divine origin being fashioned by God with a view to the elucidation of a conception which is not only foreign to the range of things human, but supreme in the range of things divine. Thus the New Testament writers found a goodly number of words divinely prepared and introduced which were capable of expansion in their meaning in order to convey truths which had been heretofore unrevealed. The student will do well to note at this point the many compounds with Χριστός and πνεῦμα which his vocabulary affords.

The one text wherein θεόνευστος appears—2 Timothy 3:16, 17—is as follows: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." The phrase *all scripture*, as here used, is naturally identical in the scope of its meaning with the statement in the preceding verse, wherein the Apostle reminds Timothy "that from a child" he has "known the holy scriptures," and these, it is declared, are able to make him wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ. Varied and wonderful are the things, as enumerated in this context, which the Scriptures are able to do and because of which they are *profitable* to the "man of God." These asserted values are but little challenged; controversy centers rather upon the two phrases—*all scripture*, and *given by inspiration of God*.

When undertaking to determine just what is included in the phrase *all scripture*, it is well to remember that 2 Timothy is the Apostle's latest epistle, written, it would seem, near to the time of his martyrdom. By that time almost all the New Testament had been written—excepting only the later writings of the Apostle John. 2 Peter 3:16 clearly designates the writings of the Apostle Paul as "scripture," and Paul himself, as recorded in 1 Timothy 5:18, when quoting Deuteronomy 25:4—"Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn"—as "scripture," adds to it Luke 10:7—"For the labourer is worthy of his hire"— as Scripture of equal authority. Thus, and at so early a date, the Gospel by Luke—written by one outside the twelve—is accepted by the Apostle as authoritative Scripture. As to the apostles themselves, Peter writes: "That ye may be mindful of the words

which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour" (2 Pet. 3:2). Beyond this clear evidence as to the fact that the phrase *all scripture* included the larger part of the New Testament, it is agreeable to a simple faith to believe that He who "calleth those things which be not as though they were" (Rom. 4:17), as He indited the passage in question, included in this phrase all that, in His sovereign purpose, would be written, with the Scripture that had up to that time been written. Thus it may be concluded that the words *all scripture* are no less and no more than that embodied in the Bible.

Over the second phrase—*given by inspiration of God*—there is much more dissension. The English word *inspiration* is from the Latin *spiro* and the passage in question is translated in the Vulgate by *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata*, while the Greek is πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (*pasa graphē theopneustos*—'all Scripture is God-breathed'). Much of interest may be gathered from the various translations of this phrase.

The Æthiopic renders: "And every scripture is in the (by the) Spirit of the Lord."

Wycliff: "All scripture of God inspired."

Tyndale: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God."

Cremer (*Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N.T. Greek*, ed. 2): "promoted by God, divinely inspired."

Thayer-Grimm (*Greek-English Lexicon of N.T.*): "Inspired by God."

Robinson (*Greek and English Lexicon of N.T.*, new ed.): "God-breathed, inbreathed of God."

Warfield: "Every scripture seeing that it is God-breathed."

The Revised Version: "Every scripture inspired of God."

Aside from that of the Revised Version which seems to leave room for the idea that *some* Scripture might not be inspired, these translations express, with all the force that language is able to devise, the truth that the Scriptures are God-breathed. The question at issue is one as to whether the term *God-breathed* is to be taken in the *passive* form which implies only that, as to its *source*, all Scripture is the breath of God—its distinctive characteristic being the fact that it originates in, and proceeds from, God—, or whether it is to be taken in its *active* form which would imply that the Scripture is permeated and pregnant with the breath of God—its distinctive characteristic being the fact that it has received by impartation or *in*spiration

the breath of God. The passage does go on to say that the Scriptures are potent; for it is much to predicate of them that they are able to "make wise unto salvation," that they are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," and that by them the "man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." There are, it would seem, two statements made: (a) all Scripture is God-breathed and (b) all Scripture is profitable. Doubtless it is profitable because it is God-breathed; but the word θεόνευστος does not refer to the *in*spiring into men of a message, but of the *out*spiring of that message from God. The message is different and its effect surpassing because it is God's breathing and not because it has been accurately transmitted by men. It has been so transmitted and God's determining power was over the human authors; but the statement of 2 Timothy 3:16 emphasizes only the out-breathing of God. To quote Dr. Warfield again, and there is no greater authority on all problems of inspiration: "What is θεόπνευστος is 'God-breathed,' produced by the creative breath of the Almighty. And Scripture is called θεόνευστος in order to designate it as 'God-breathed,' the product of Divine spiration, the creation of that Spirit who is in all spheres of the Divine activity the executive of the God-head. … It does not express a breathing *into* the Scriptures by God. But the ordinary conception attached to it, whether among the Fathers or the Dogmaticians, is in general vindicated. What it affirms is that the Scriptures owe their origin to an activity of God the Holy Ghost and are in the highest and truest sense His creation. It is on this foundation of Divine origin that all the high attributes of Scripture are built" (*Revelation and Inspiration*, p. 280).

The result of so much discussion seems both explicit and unequivocal. The Scriptures in their entirety are effective since they are from God, God-breathed, God-given, and God-determined.

The second major passage, 2 Peter 1:21—"holy men of God spake as they were moved [borne along] by the Holy Ghost"—, approaches the problem of inspiration from another angle. As θεόπνευστος indicated that the Scriptures originated with, and are therefore the Word of, God, φέρω (*pherō*—'borne along') indicates the fact that the Spirit so wrought in the holy men of God as to secure through them an inerrant record of the mind of God. The two passages are supplementary and together form the entire revelation, namely, that (a) the Word came from God as His own *spiro* or

‘breath,’ and (b) that under the ‘inflatus’ or *inspiro* of God the Word was faithfully transcribed by holy men chosen for that high service.

The context of this second major passage is equally important. Peter has declared that the great theme of prophecy—“the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (as anticipated and prefigured in the transfiguration)—is certified by “eye witnesses” who were with Christ in the holy mount; but this truth is made “more sure” by the word of prophecy (or, better, the prophetic word); and reference here is to the inspired Scriptures as a whole and not merely to that portion which brings to notice the exceptional element of prediction. The writers of the Scriptures were all prophets in the larger meaning of that term and their writings were prophetic (cf. Acts 3:21; 10:43), in which *forthtelling* is the essential feature rather than *foretelling*.

The reference to “holy men” is to be received according to the root meaning of the word *holy*, or *sanctified*, which is to be *set apart* unto a specific service or purpose. They were the elect of God for this ministry and there is no reference to the sanctity of their lives. However, the experience of Isaiah in which his lips were purified with a coal from off the altar is suggestive (Isa. 6:1–8).

The word φέρω as used in this passage, contains in it the secret concerning the particularized influence of the Holy Spirit on these chosen men, which influence secured the inspired Scriptures The word is exceedingly expressive suggesting the effect of the wind on the sails of a boat, by which wind the boat is *borne along*. While φέρω indicates the divine control of the human authors, it allows in its breadth of expression for an indefinite variety of ways in which the end shall be attained.

At this point the so-called *theories* of inspiration are introduced. Too often these *theories* consist in an inquisitive attempt to pry into the unrevealed mystery as to *how* God moved the chosen men to write as they did. Upon this subject the Scriptures are silent. The writers at times bore brief but expressive testimony. We read: “The LORD said unto Moses” (Ex. 4:19; cf. Deut. 34:10); the “vision” which Isaiah “saw” (Isa. 1:1; cf. Hab. 1:1; Mal. 1:1); “The word of the LORD came” to Jeremiah (Jer. 1:2; cf. Hos. 1:1; Jonah 1:1; Micah 1:1; Zeph. 1:1; Hag. 1:1; Zech. 1:1). To Daniel God appeared in “visions” and “dreams.” John declares that his testimony is “true” (John 19:35; 1 John 1:1–3). And the Apostle Paul writes: “If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the

things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (1 Cor. 14:37). As to *how* the divine revelation was given to the human author, none other than God or the elect man could know. It was wholly within those personal and sacred relationships into which none other might intrude. Here the devout soul will hesitate and the prudent will at least respect the silence of God. It is possible that, as the testimony of these writers suggests, there was not only variety in the manner in which God spoke to different men, but there was variety, as well, in the way in which He spoke at different times to one man. The Scriptures give abundant teaching as to the *fact* of inspiration but do not offer explanation of this phenomenon. The *how* of every miracle is wanting, and inspiration is a miracle. Concerning this and all miracles, man is called upon to *believe* and not to *elucidate*. Christ called attention to man's limitations when He said: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth" (John 3:8). If having *experienced* the miracle of regeneration men are even then unable to apprehend its mystery, how could they discern the workings of the Spirit in realms into which they have never entered?

Concerning these *theories*, or suppositions, some damaging facts may be noted: (a) To those who in their zeal for the authority of God have implied that the human authors were automatons, it may be said that the evidence is complete enough to demonstrate the fact that these chosen men exercised every feature of their own volition and individual characteristics, yet were empowered to write only what the Spirit determined. Apart from this conception of inspiration there could be no dual authorship. (b) To those who claim that these elect men wrote under the influence of the exalted human faculties and the exercise of superior poetical genius, it may be said that the character of the truth disclosed demonstrates that it is the Word of God, being worthy of God, and this it could never be under the provisions this theory suggests. (c) To those who persist in the notion that inspiration constituted the elect men infallible and omniscient, it may be said that the evidence proves that the men were enabled only in the transcribing of truth and often they could not have comprehended the full import of all that they wrote. (d) To those who fancy that inspiration as it applies to the human authors tends to elevate every passage to the same level of spiritual importance, it may be said that in this sphere of inspiration its aim and

purpose is to secure an accurate transcription of the God-given message. The philosophy of Bildad, as recorded in Job, is not of the same usefulness to lost men as is the gospel of divine grace; but both are exactly what God intended to include in His Word—each in its place and for its purpose. Jehovah has said: "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:11). In like manner inspiration may record the untruth of Satan, but it does not vindicate the lie or sanctify it. It secures the exact record as to what was said—good or bad. Many unworthy actions are recorded but not approved by God.

On the general freedom of the human authors, Alexander Carson has said: "Inspiration … left the inspired historians under the power and regulation of the same laws and influences that guide other authors in their compositions, with the single exception of supernaturally preserving them from error" (cited by Manly, *Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 87). This statement leaves no place for the reception of the message. The authors were preserved from error, but they did not originate the message. They might be accurate in declaring their own thought. They were, however, accurate in declaring God's thoughts which they received from Him.

It may thus be seen that the specific import of 2 Peter 1:21 and its context centers in the word φέρω as it distinguishes the writings of certain chosen men who spoke as they were *borne along* by the Holy Spirit. Their message was the Word of God, and thus the dual authorship is preserved.

Another passage of great significance is John 10:34, 35 where it is reported that Christ, while speaking to the Jews concerning their cherished Scriptures, said: "Is it not written in your law?" and "The scripture cannot be broken". The three words, *Scripture, Law,* and *Prophecy,* are interchangeable when referring, as each often does, to the entire body of revealed truth. In this context Christ states that a thing written in their *Law* is none other than *Scripture* which cannot be broken. This passage is an example of the unvarying and unqualified honor which Christ gave to the Scriptures as the authoritative Oracles of God. According to the record, His first utterance after His baptism was a threefold challenge of Satan, and Satan's defeat was gained by the words, "It is written." Throughout His ministry, Christ constantly declared that the Scriptures must be fulfilled,

thus giving honor to them (Mark 14:49; John 13:18; 17:12; cf. 12:14; Mark 9:12, 13). Similarly, on the Emmaus road He "beginning at Moses and all the prophets … expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27). He also said, The Scriptures (continuously) "testify of me" (John 5:39). Christ thus assigned to the Scriptures the final word of authority. Turning only to Matthew's Gospel this fact is made clear—4:4, 7, 10; 11:10; 19:4; 21:13, 42; 22:29; 26:31, 56. An equally extended induction could easily be made of the passages which demonstrate the authority which all the New Testament writers accorded the Word of God.

The testimony which the Bible presents as to its own inspiration is diffused throughout all its parts. Each author witnesses to the supernatural character of his writings. But by far the most conclusive evidence that the Bible is inspired is the twofold fact: (a) that Christ so accepted the Old Testament as a whole as well as in every separate portion, and (b) that the New Testament was written at His direction and the human authors were promised superhuman ability to write according to the mind of God.

When contemplating the Bible's own claims to inspiration, of great significance, indeed, are those passages wherein God and His Word are treated as one and the same. It is written in Galatians 3:8 (R.V.): "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham." Assuredly the Scriptures as such, which were not then written, did not preach to Abraham, but God did. Thus in Romans 9:17—"The scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up." Yet Exodus 9:16, which text is here quoted, states that it is the Word of Jehovah to Pharaoh through Moses. The fact is patent that the Scripture which was not then written could not be responsible for the raising up of Pharaoh for a specific purpose; but God's Word, whether spoken or written, is the identification of Himself. It is especially observable that such phrases as "He saith," "He spake," and "He beareth witness," etc., indicate the voice of God speaking whatever is said. The oft-repeated expressions, "The word of Jehovah," "The law of the LORD," "The oracles of God," certify without exception the divine authorship. Because it is His Word, it shall stand forever (Isa. 40:8). Men are appointed to preach it as God's Word (Rom. 10:17; 1 Cor. 14:36); and

thus it came, first to Israel (Acts 10:36, 37), and then to the Gentiles (1 Thess. 2:13).

In making its own claim to inspiration, the Bible puts strong emphasis on the fact that individual men were empowered to write or speak the Word of God. “David in spirit [literally, in the Spirit] doth call him Lord” (cf. Ps. 110:1 with Matt. 22:43). “Who [the Holy Spirit] by the mouth of David thy servant hast said” (Acts 4:25). “Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of [by] the Lord by [through] the prophet” (Matt. 1:22; 2:15). “Wherefore (as the Holy Ghost saith …”) (Heb. 3:7; cf. Ps. 95:7). “Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us” (Heb. 10:15; cf. Jer. 31:33, 34). To Moses Jehovah said, “Go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say” (Ex. 4:10–12). “I … will put my words in his mouth” (Deut. 18:18, 19). “My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth” (Isa. 59:21). “The word of the LORD came unto me, saying … I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. …Thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak … Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth” (Jer. 1:4–9).

The New Testament writers were no less the voice of God. When about to leave this world, Christ committed not only the evangelizing witness to all who comprise His Church, but He gave assurance to chosen men that they would be called upon to record what He had said. The Holy Spirit, they were told, would “teach them all things,” “bring all things to their remembrance,” “guide them into all truth,” and show them “things to come” (John 14:25, 26; 15:26, 27; 16:12–15). While there is a general application of these words to all believers in that the Spirit is their Teacher, it is evident that the specific work of the Spirit in *bringing to remembrance* could be experienced only by those to whom Christ had spoken. The Apostle Paul was not one of the twelve and therefore he never claimed to have had their instruction. Nevertheless, he testifies to the direct energizing power of the Spirit. He wrote: “Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth” (1 Cor. 2:13; cf. 14:37; 2 Cor. 13:2, 3; Gal. 1:8–12; Eph. 3:1–7; 1 Thess. 2:13; 4:2, 8, 15; 2 Thess. 2:13–15. For other N.T. passages note: 1 Pet. 1:10–12; 2 Pet. 3:1, 2; Rev. 1:3, 10, 11, 19; 22:6, 7, 18, 19).

On this partial induction of all that the Bible asserts as to its own inspiration, enough has been presented to demonstrate that verbal, plenary

inspiration alone answers its claims.

V. General Objections to Verbal, Plenary Inspiration

If borne in mind, certain important facts tend to dissolve almost every recorded objection to the doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration, namely:

(a) The progress of doctrine which is observable from Genesis to Revelation does not imply that earlier and partial revelations were erroneous. At the end of His three and a half years of instruction to His disciples, Christ said to them, “I have yet many things to say unto you” (John 16:12), but that did not imply that what He had taught them at the first was untrue. Again, and somewhat similar to this, a fallacy has a long time been current which greatly dishonors the Word of God. It is to the effect that the Apostle Paul in later years receded from the emphasis on the return of Christ which he exhibited in his early Epistles, notably 1 Thessalonians; and no reason is assigned for this claim other than that this truth does not, it is affirmed, appear in his later writings. The later writings, it is obvious, are upon a different theme; but quite apart from that fact, the last chapter of his last Epistle presents one of the strongest testimonies the Apostle gave concerning the hope of the coming of Christ (2 Tim. 4:6–8). Such a conception intimates that the Apostle was mistaken in his earlier Epistles, which he cautiously corrected in those written later; but who shall say that, had his life been extended, he would not, according to this notion, at the end of his life have discredited *all* that he wrote? To doubt the early writings is to degrade all his writings, and only because of the fact that the essential element of *inspiration* is involved, and not merely the blundering of a sincere man. This situation may well serve to illustrate the distress into which men are plunged who question the trustworthiness of the Bible, whether their doubt arises from the problem of the progress of doctrine as a whole, or over the *suppose* progress of the human authors.

(b) Variations in rendering sometimes occur because of the different languages involved. The superscription over the cross of Christ was written in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek. The Apostle Paul usually quoted the LXX translation of the Old Testament. In every case of quotation from the Old Testament in the New Testament it should be remembered that the Holy Spirit is the Author of both Testaments and that it is wholly within the

province of an author, when quoting from his own writings, to change or restate anything he has written before. This does not necessarily imply correction of the earlier writings. It may be, as it is in the case of the Spirit, an adaptation of a truth to a new situation or setting.

Every devout student will believe that, to a very considerable degree, the preserving care of God has been over every worthy translation of the Scriptures and that in these translations no essential doctrinal value has been sacrificed.

(c) At best, human understanding is imperfect. What may seem a difficulty now—as has so often been demonstrated—is completely dissolved when all the facts are known. At this point archaeology has contributed much and will no doubt continue to do so to the end.

(d) The claim for verbal, plenary inspiration is made only for the original writings and does not extend to any transcriptions or translations. It is also true that no original manuscript is now available. Naturally, these facts give rise to the query whether the present existing translations—notably the text with which one is most familiar—is really trustworthy. This problem is worthy of serious consideration and has received the attention of the greatest textual critics in all generations of the church. But two passages of any considerable length are subject to dispute—Mark 16:9–20 and John 7:53–8:11. Of these two passages, the latter is more discredited than the former. As to textual difficulties generally, the following quotations are significant:

Westcott and Hort:

> With regard to the great bulk of the words of the New Testament, as of most other ancient writings, there is no variation or other ground of doubt, and therefore no room for textual criticism; and here therefore an editor is merely a transcriber. The same may be said with substantial truth respecting those various readings which have never been received, and in all probability never will be received, into any printed text. The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is very great, not less, on a rough computation, than seven-eighths of the whole. The remaining eighth, therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitutes the whole area of criticism. If the principles followed in the present edition are sound, this area may be very greatly reduced. Recognizing to the full the duty of abstinence from peremptory decision in cases where the evidence leaves the judgment in suspense between two or more readings, we find that, setting aside differences of orthography, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt only make up one-sixtieth of the whole New Testament. In this second estimate the proportion of comparatively trivial variations is beyond measure larger than in the former; so that the amount of what can in *any sense be called substantial variation* is but a small

> fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than *a thousandth part* of the entire text.—*The New Testament in Greek*, II. 2, cited by Manly, *Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 223

Dr. Philip Schaff, chairman of the American Committee of the Revisers, writes: “This multitude of various readings of the Greek text need not puzzle or alarm any Christian. It is the natural result of the great wealth of our documentary resources; it is a testimony to the immense importance of the New Testament; it does not affect, but it rather insures, the integrity of the text; and it is a useful stimulus to study.

“Only about 400 of the 100,000 or 150,000 variations materially affect the sense. Of these, again, not more than about fifty are really important for some reason or other; and even of these fifty not one affects an article of faith or a precept of duty which is not abundantly sustained by other and undoubted passages, or by the whole tenor of Scripture teaching. The *Textus Receptus* of Stephens, Beza, and Elzevir, and of our English Version, teach precisely the same Christianity as the uncial text of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, the oldest versions, and the Anglo-American Revision” (*Companion to the New Testament*, p. 177, cited by Manly, *ibid*., p. 224).

Conclusion

Of the almost limitless field of discussion which the doctrine of inspiration affords, enough has been presented to demonstrate that verbal, plenary inspiration is the unqualified claim of the Bible for itself, the teaching of Christ and the apostles, and the belief of the church from her beginning. It has likewise been pointed out that the Word as written came forth from God as His breath and that chosen men were empowered to receive and record that message. As to how He transmitted that Word to them and secured inerrant oracles at their hand, the Scriptures are silent. A dual authorship is preserved—God used the volition and faculties of the human authors without coercion and the human authors exercised their volition and faculties without injury to the divine message. Those who are disposed to disagree with these conclusions must reckon with Christ, the apostles, and the prophets upon whom, after all, we must depend for any knowledge of any truth whatsoever. If their testimony is broken regarding the truthworthiness of the Scriptures, it is broken regarding all else.

The doctrines of revelation, inspiration, canonicity, and authority being closely allied, the following discussion is requisite for the completion of that which has gone before.

Chapter V

CANONICITY AND AUTHORITY

THE INVESTIGATION of the canon of the Bible is an attempt to discover the true basis of its authority. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament form a canon because of the fact that they are authoritative Oracles. By the term *authoritative* it is implied that the Bible in all its parts is the voice of God speaking to men. Its authority is inherent, being, as it is, no less than the imperial edict—"Thus saith the LORD." When the Scriptures are deemed to be authoritative because of decrees by ecclesiastical councils or laws enacted by human governments, they may be considered to be binding only in so far as human influence extends. But, in contradistinction to such a conception, the Scriptures go so far as to declare God's will to ecclesiastical councils and human governments. Similarly, as worthy authority presupposes the ability to execute decrees, God's Word not only proclaims His assured purposes, but also sets forth the penalty which must follow whenever and wherever men are not amenable to it.

Since the Scriptures are imbued with the legitimate and wholly justifiable authority of God and since they were written at the hand of men and since the canon was, to some extent, determined by men, it is pertinent to inquire about the nature of that divine authority and how it resides in these Oracles. Since doubt has arisen concerning the full inspiration of the Scriptures because of the human share in the authorship, so, and in like manner, doubt has arisen regarding the authority of the Scriptures because of the part the human share has exercised in determining what writings should enter the canon. It has been demonstrated in connection with the study of the doctrine of inspiration that God has used human authors in the writing of the Scriptures and in such a way as to preserve those writings from the imperfections which human limitations might impose. It now remains to exhibit the truth that God, though having used men in the formation of the canon, has used them in such a way that only those writings have been chosen which comprise the divinely constituted Oracles with their perfections of unity and balance and completeness of their parts.

The problems related to the formation of the canon are greatly simplified by a certain actuality, namely, that the Bible is present, and in evidence with its exhibition of divine perfection. Thus the problem becomes one only of tracing back from the starting point which the infallible Scriptures provide. There is no occasion to theorize as to whether it is possible to assemble a collection of writings—from many human authors whose lives have been lived in different countries and dispersed through many centuries—into one book, which book is worthy of God. Such a stupendous phenomenon is achieved and its reality cannot be disregarded. Reasonable attention to the facts involved will disclose the truth that the method employed in the formation of the canon of the Bible is both natural and supernatural. In this undertaking there is a display of the coordination of divine determination with human cooperation. However, the element of divine determination is paramount in the formation of the canon just as it is in the dual authorship. Reason compels the conclusion that as God has brought to fruition the genesis of certain incomparable writings, He will, as faithfully, overrule not only the assembling of these writings into one unit, and without an error as to their selection, but will determine their final order in this relationship to the end that its unique continuity may be exhibited.

Far-reaching and determining conditions existed at the time the Bible was written and its canon was formed which do not exist now. Full recognition of these conditions must be sanctioned if a true evaluation of the problem of canonicity is consummated.

The Scriptures of both Testaments were written when there were exceedingly few literary efforts being produced. It was not then as now when every individual writes letters freely, when a prodigious array of people aspire to authorship of one kind or another, and when the output of religious literature has reached to staggering proportions. There was then little competition and comparatively little need of elimination. Of the restricted company who could write at all, only those who were moved by God would have experienced the impelling motive that inspiration imparts.

In the case of the Old Testament, the writings were produced, in the main, by the men who were in authority over the religious and, to some extent, civil life of the people. Moses was recognized as Jehovah’s representative and lawgiver. His writings, like those of the accredited prophets, were none other than the preservation in written form of what had

been proclaimed by word of mouth and with undisputed authority. Few indeed ever resisted the message of Jehovah's recognized messengers.

In the case of the New Testament, the writing was performed, for the most part, by men whom Christ had chosen. The Apostle Paul was no exception in this classification since the Lord appeared to him and called him when on the Damascus road. These men, it is true, exercised no influence in the world about them and the world had nothing to do with the formation of the canon of the New Testament. The New Testament Scriptures were addressed to a little band of despised (cf. 1 Cor. 1:26–29) believers; yet the spiritual response to these writings on the part of those who constituted the "little flock" had everything to do with the determination as to what would eventually enter into the final form of the canon of the New Testament. Communication was restricted, and for many years the writings which were current and effective in one locality did not reach to all localities. It is probable that no church came to possess a complete copy of all that enters into the New Testament canon until early in the second century. All copies of portions of Scripture were handwritten and few, indeed, could possess these treasures. The portion possessed by the local church was preserved with greatest care and its reading was a large part of the fellowship of believers when they assembled together. They could not have been concerned as to a canon or what belonged to a canon. They knew that their spiritual needs were satisfied as they read these writings and thus the portions became appreciated everywhere, and that is the basis of the formation of the canon. Without design or effort the canon thus came to be approved upon the peculiar merit of each portion. Without consciousness as to the momentous thing they were doing and apart from strife and design of men, the one great and final proof as to what writings were of God's own inspiration was wrought out. The perfection of the plan and the completeness of the result are an indisputable evidence of the sovereign working of God—working through human agencies. It was natural that the Latin church would be slow in recognizing the supernatural value of the anonymous letter to the Hebrews, and other existing prejudices were doubtless reflected in various localities. In due time and under the guidance of the Spirit of God, all difficulties were overcome and the last book—the Revelation—was added to complete the whole. It would be impossible to determine just when the complete New Testament was

acknowledged as such. Accepting the date of the Revelation at 96 A. D., it may be observed that the writings of Ignatius in 115 A. D. are but twenty years later. From these and others of the early Fathers, it is evident that, apart from a natural prejudice among Jewish believers for the Old Bible, the New Testament as it now stands was distinguished as such and obeyed as Scripture early in the second century. No record exists as to what church first acquired a complete Bible, or the precise date of such an occurrence. There is no way of knowing all that may have entered into the process by which any church received a new installment of Scripture to be added to that which they already cherished. No doubt, the fact that a new portion was accepted without question by some other assembly would go far in its favor. The way in which the New Testament canon was formed was wholly natural, and yet the thing achieved was as wholly supernatural.

There is no reason to believe that there was anything that would correspond to a Bible-forming consciousness among these early Christians. They were exceedingly grateful for any message from one who, because of association with Christ or His apostles, could write or speak with authority. It is evident that not all the messages thus received, though true to facts, were designed of God to be a part of the Bible. That living element which inspiration imparts was—and probably without specific identification of it by any who read those pages—with an irresistible determination sanctifying (by setting apart as infinitely sacred and infallibly true) those particular portions which were divinely appointed to constitute the canon of the New Testament.

In the days of Christ’s ministry on the earth, the Old Testament canon was ostensibly as it is now; but, as in the case of the New Testament, no one person or group of persons had acted with authority in the selection of the Old Testament books. The same inherent divine character which inspiration secures had made these particularized books the Word of God in distinction from all other human writings. It is inconceivable that this ineffable element belonging to inspiration should not then, as now, so impress all concerned that dissension, if any, would be negligible. Other writings, such as they were, fell behind, wanting this specific divine quality. However, the canon of the Old Testament had not been closed for there was no human authority to close it. The early church had received the Old Testament with binding supremacy. This is evident from the extent and manner of its quotation in

the New Testament. New books were added as an accretion which grew upon, and was thus closely related to, the Old Testament Scriptures. The apostles and prophets who served as writers of the New Testament were every whit as qualified in themselves and as worthy to write by inspiration of the Spirit as were the prophets of the Old Testament. In fact, the fitness of the human author, though of value in the general usefulness of his writings, was not the final basis of evaluation of the Sacred Text. This is proved by the inclusion into the canon of both Testaments of anonymous portions.

The formal closing of the New Testament canon is at least intimated in Revelation 22:18. The dissimilarity in the manner in which the two Testaments end is significant. All the unfulfilled expectation of the Old Testament is articulate as that Testament closes and the last verses give assurance of the coming of another prophet. But no continued revelation is impending as the New Testament is terminated; rather the announcement is made that the Lord Himself will soon return and the natural conclusion is that there would be no further voice speaking from heaven before the trumpet heralds the second advent of Christ.

Of no small moment is the fact that since the canon of the Bible was divinely closed no attempts have been made to add to it.

Finally, though brought to fruition through human assent and cooperation, God accomplished in the formation of the canon—as He did in the dual authorship of the text of the Scriptures—a stupendous miracle. His own inerrant Word was not only received and penned in incomparable writings, but was as inerrantly assembled into one volume and preserved from that confusion, injury, and miscarriage of the divine purpose which either subtraction from or addition to the canon would impose. God’s determining care over the formation of the canon of the Scriptures is as much in evidence and to His eternal glory as His care over the precise transmission of His truth through human authors.

Since any portion of the Bible is canonical because of the fact that it is an authoritative document, being God’s Word written, it is highly commendable to investigate most carefully the precise source and nature of this authority. The objective in so doing need not necessarily be one of dispelling doubt as to the Godlike constitution of the Scriptures; it may well

be the desire to arrive at a more worthy conception of their transcendent import.

Regardless of the infinity of proof that the Bible is God's Word written and therefore imbued with the same authority which the Creator exercises over His creation and that heaven exercises over earth, the human family are not all amenable to the supremacy and dominion of the Bible. Unregenerate men, who "have not God in all their thoughts," ignore the Scriptures. The world now weltering in the demoralizing influence of satanic ideals and philosophies cannot be expected to appreciate or to commend the Bible. Nor is their disregard of it other than an indirect proof of its heavenly character.

The authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments which gives to them their canonical preeminence is attributable to at least seven different sources. Of these the first three to be named have been already considered to some length, and, therefore, need little more than enumeration at this point.

I. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being God-Breathed

To predicate of the Scriptures, as they do of themselves, that they are God-breathed, is to assign to them the supreme authority which belongs to God alone, which authority proceeds from God *immediately* and without reductions or complications that might be imposed by contributing factors. This means that in their plenary fullness the Scriptures are, throughout, the Word of God written. They sustain the unique distinction of being no less than the imperial edict—"Thus saith the LORD."

II. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being Written by chosen men who were "Borne Along" by the Holy Spirit

This aspect of Biblical authority is closely related to the fact that the message which the chosen men received and delivered was God-breathed. The specific contribution which it makes to the whole field of authority is that it guarantees, as has been demonstrated, that the human share in the

dual authorship casts no shadow of imperfection on the infinite worthiness and holy excellence of the God-breathed message. It is of surpassing importance that the authoritative divine message shall be conserved in inerrant writings. Reducing the authoritative message to written form adds no supplementary supremacy and dominion to it, but an effectual means is constituted whereby the divine edict may reach to those who are subject to it. That the authority of the Scriptures is not derived from the inspired men or due to the inspiration properly attributed to them is evident from the fact that those books of the Bible which are anonymous are deemed as authoritative as any in the canon.

III. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being Accredited by Those who First Received Them

In the case of the Old Testament, the congregation of Israel under the leadership of their elders, rulers, prophets, and priests, gave sanction to those writings which formed the first canon. In the case of the New Testament, the early church, including her officers and ministers, gave sanction to the second canon. Without consciousness on their part in either case that they were being used of God to accomplish a momentous objective, they did, nevertheless, under the presidency of the Holy Spirit, determine what could not have been postponed to later generations nor surrendered to other peoples, namely, to decide the inclusiveness and exclusiveness of the Bible canon. The inclusion of one page or one word that was not inspired and designed of God to serve as Scripture would have wrought no less than immeasurable injury to that which was designed to manifest infinite perfection. To the same measure, to have left out one page or one word that was inspired and designed of God with a view to its place in the canon would have marred as disastrously the faultless Word of God. Through the permission of either of these hypothetical defects, the Bible would have been rendered unworthy of its divine Author. Thus it may be seen that acceptance and accrediting of the precise material which was prepared by inspiration and designed of God to comprise His Holy Word, though wrought through human instrumentalities and without regard to their cognizance as to what they did, were achieved altogether through divine superintendency and determination.

IV. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being Attested by the Lord Jesus Christ—the Second Person of the Godhead

The legal term, “The Law of God,” is one of the true and proper designations for the entire Bible, and one which, because it suggests the thought of the divine empire or dominion, is the befitting and pertinent title when the authority of the Scriptures is in view.

In any government which enacts its laws with due regard for the freedom and best good of its subjects, there are represented in the making of those laws two widely different procedures, namely, (a) the bill, or law, is drawn and agreed upon by lawmakers, and (b) it becomes a binding, operative regulation by the attesting signature of the chief ruler —the President of the United States or the King in Great Britain. This process is especially demanded in the latter government named, where established relations between parliaments and the throne exist. These two imperative features—the creation and enactment of laws on the one hand, and the royal assent on the other—are in no way interchangeable nor are they to be confused. These facts, regarding the process by which civil laws are consummated, may serve by way of illustration to bring into view one of the important features of the basis on which the canonical authority of the Scriptures rests.

Pursuing this analogy into more detail, it will be observed that the emanation of the Scriptures from God as His breath, the determining afflation of the human authors, and the divine control of multitudes in their essential agreement which served to single out and seal the canonical Writings, has secured the perfect bill, or law, but its binding force is greatly enhanced by the attestation, certification, and royal assent of the King of kings. No consideration is given at this point to those functions and activities which belong specifically to the humanity of Christ. It was from the divine side of His Being that He attested the Word of God; on the human side He was subject to it. As corroborating Authenticator of the Scriptures, Christ was not merely one among many who spoke well of the Oracles of God. Likewise, He was not offering the opinion of a human prophet, priest, or king, though He was and is forever all of these. His attestation of the Sacred Writings was no less than that of Deity—the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity. This royal indorsement on the part of

the Son of God adds nothing to the inspiration or inherent supernatural character of the Bible which was before His vision as a perfect whole; it rather lends to that perfected whole the immeasurable added *authority* which the royal signature communicates.

It is a misapprehension to suppose that the *authority* of the Bible is vested primarily in either the fact of the inspiration of the human authors or in the actions of any kind by Israel or the Church. The voice of God, attested by the Son, and (a theme yet to be elucidated) the employment of the Scriptures by the Spirit, form the basis of canonical authority. The inspiration of the sacred writers has a side which pertains to the field of letters, having its human aspects. On the other hand, that which constitutes the Bible to be *The Law of God* is not a literary question at all; it is rather to be classed as *theological, moral*, and *vital*. It is more even than a matter of life and death as those terms are related to this sphere; it embraces no less than the issues of *eternal life* and *eternal death*. Naturally, it is the part of wisdom and in agreement with truth to discover this transcendent authority within the Godhead itself and not in any human cooperation, however exalted.

The four Gospels contain upwards of thirty-five direct references to, and quotations from, the Scriptures on the part of the Son of God. These, it will be discovered, not only record His witness to the divine character and verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, but, taken as a whole, they contemplate the entire Old Testament and thus serve to certify plenary features of its perfection. Since it is in and through these citations by Christ that He has given His royal assent to *The Law of God*, a careful examination of them—such as cannot be undertaken here—is enjoined.

When Christ declared, “I am … the truth” (John 14:6). He alleged far more than the incontrovertible fact that He is Himself truthful. He declared Himself to be *the Truth* and in the sense that He is the central theme of the Scriptures of Truth. He is the Amen, the Faithful and True Witness (Rev. 1:5; 3:14. Cf. Isa. 55:4). He said concerning Himself, “To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth” (John 18:37)—not merely a witness to the moral value of truth, but a witness to the Word of God. “Thy word is truth” (John 17:17). The phrase, “for this cause came I into the world,” lifts His ministry of attestation to the highest level of being a primary purpose of the

incarnation. To the same end, the Apostle declares, “Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers” (Rom. 15:8). He is, indeed, the divine Confirmer of those Writings which were then identified as “the scriptures,” of which He also affirmed that they “cannot be broken.” Thus the Second Person of the Godhead adds the royal assent to *The Law of God*. If this royal witness seems to comprehend no more than the Old Testament Scriptures, it will be remembered that Christ appointed and commissioned the writers of the New Testament and that He spoke from heaven saying “He which testifieth these things” (Rev. 22:20), and this was said regarding the New Testament canon (vss. 18, 19).

V. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being Received, Delivered, and Attested by the Prophets

The prophets of the old order were the divinely appointed spokesmen for God, and the same was true also of the New Testament prophets. When speaking to the Apostle John, the angel said, “I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets” (Rev. 22:9). The prophets are among the distinctive leaders of the new order (Eph. 4:11); the Church is being built upon them (Eph. 2:20); and they speak to edification, exhortation, and comfort (1 Cor. 14:3).

The Mosaic Law assigned specific responsibility to various Old Testament groups and officials with respect to the Scriptures.

1. The Congregation’s Relation to the Scriptures. The congregation of Israel were charged, “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you” (Deut. 4:2) Thus the people were given no authority to originate or to deliver Scripture, but they were commissioned to keep the commandments of the Lord, which implies their ability to identify those Oracles to which they were to be obedient.

2. The King’s Relation to the Scriptures. The king’s relation to the Scriptures is stated thus, “And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of

his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the LORD his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them" (Deut. 17:18, 19). Though no king would rule in Israel until the days of the Judges were past—a period of about five hundred years—, the Mosaic system anticipated the office of the king and provided divine charges governing the attitude of the king toward the Scriptures. The king was granted governmental authority by which he could put prophets and priests to death, but in his relation to the written Word of God, the king was no different than his lowliest subject.

3. THE OFFICIALS' RELATION TO THE SCRIPTURES. The Judges were arbiters in common matters, but if there came before them an issue too hard for the judge it was to be appealed to the priests, who served as a supreme court over all judges. Thus is the judge instructed: "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood [civil], between plea and plea [ceremonial], and between stroke and stroke [leprosy], being matters of controversy within thy gates: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the LORD thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and enquire; and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgment: and thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the LORD shall choose shall shew thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee" (Deut. 17:8–10). The following verses in this context prescribe the death penalty upon any who refuse to do according to the decision of the last or supreme court over Israel.

The service of the judge, the ruler, or priest with regard to the written Law of God was that of interpretation and administration and never the higher responsibility of drafting or originating laws. They were to "shew the sentence of judgment" according to the Law (cf. Deut. 31:9–13).

4. THE LEVITES' RELATION TO THE SCRIPTURES. To the Levites was given the custody or care of the written Scriptures. Thus they are instructed: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the

LORD your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (Deut. 31:26).

5. THE PROPHETS' RELATION TO THE SCRIPTURES. To the prophet was committed the high responsibility of receiving and delivering the Word of God. Not all the writings of the prophets, though the Word of God for the time, became Scripture; nor could all who claimed to be prophets be heard. The test between true and false prophets was both reasonable and natural. The directions were: "And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the words which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speakest in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him" (Deut. 18:21, 22).

The commission of the prophet to speak for God and the requirement of the people to hear is set forth in the midst of Israel's constituted law. No doubt, the passage, as many another, has its final fulfillment in the prophetic ministry of Christ. Christ is the final Prophet of all prophets; the final Priest of all priests; and the final King of all kings. This instruction is an immediate authorization of the prophets who under God were to succeed Moses. The passage reads: "The LORD thy God shall raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. … I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him" (Deut. 18:15, 18, 19). The true prophet's message had to be received and heeded by the whole house of Israel from the king on the throne to the least in the kingdom. Of these messages, however, only such portions as the Spirit of God determined became canonical. The true prophet attested his own message and demonstrated its authority by supernatural evidence. This did not preclude one prophet attesting the message another prophet had received and delivered with authority. Such corroboration is observable, especially in regard to writings which have their place in the New Testament canon.

In the larger meaning of the designation, as before indicated, the prophet was a *forth*teller as well as a *fore*teller. He was always the former and

undertook the latter only as specific necessity demanded. The title connotes the receiving and delivering of the message of God on any subject without restriction as to the time of its application. The Old Testament prophets were to continue until John (Matt. 11:13), which abrupt termination reveals the divine plan regarding a new canon and the prophetic writers of this should receive their commissions from the One whom John would announce. Malachi closes with a look on to the prophetic ministry which John in part fulfilled. “Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet” (Mal. 4:5), and, of John, Christ said, “And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come” (Matt. 11:14). Thus the canon of the Old Testament remained open until John, but the New Testament closed with the last writing of the last apostle. The Old Testament, as to its hope, was centered on the first advent of Christ. The New Testament hope is centered on the second advent of Christ; its closing word is from the glorified Lord, “Surely I come quickly.” To this the inspired writer adds, “Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.”

The Church, or those to whom the New Testament came, is said to be built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:20), rather than that the apostles and prophets were built on the Church. The Church did not bestow apostolic and prophetic authority upon men, but chosen men, moved of the Holy Spirit, received and delivered the truth and doctrine by which the Church came to be and on which she must ever continue to the end of her pilgrim journey. It is one thing to authorize and ordain a prophet, and quite another thing merely to recognize what God has with sovereign authority constituted. Neither the congregation of Israel nor the Church ever functioned beyond the latter undertaking.

It may be concluded, then, that the highest divine service ever committed to man is that of the prophet, and transcending the usual prophetic ministry was that service, committed to a few among the many prophets, in which they were exercised in receiving and delivering those portions which by sovereign authorization were to constitute the canon of the Scriptures. Since a general forthtelling prophetic ministry is announced and delegated to continue throughout this age (1 Cor. 14:3; Eph. 4:11), it is possible that the averment that prophecy shall “cease” (1 Cor. 13:8) anticipates the close of the New Testament canon; for where there is no divinely designated and duly attested prophet there is no Scripture to be received or delivered.

VI. The Scriptures are Authoritative Being the Word Employed by God the Holy Spirit

Having originated and transmitted the Scriptures by chosen prophets, the authority of those writings is further revealed by the fact that the Spirit employs the Scriptures as His own language in speaking to men. The Bible, being the Word of God, is suitable for perfect expression in every situation in which the Spirit functions in executing the divine ascendency and purpose. The Scriptures are "the sword of the Spirit" [Eph. 6:17), and "Thus saith the LORD" is always equivalent to "Thus saith the Holy Spirit." The phrase, "The Spirit speaketh expressly" (1 Tim. 4:1), might with entire justification be applied to all the Word of God. It is His voice, speaking—not only in the sense that it springs from Him, but in the sense, also, that it is employed by Him as His own vocabulary and phraseology. It is that to which He, to a large degree, confines Himself in His address to men.

VII. The Authority of the Bible is Seen in the Fact that without the Slightest Deflection it Vindicates and Satisfies its Every Claim

This theme, though already considered in its logical place as related to apologetics, may well be pursued briefly at this point and under a somewhat comprehensive classification of its parts, namely:

1. ENDURING POWER. The Bible writers asserted that the Scriptures would endure, being God's authoritative word to man, which certification has proved true in the supernatural preservation of these Oracles. The engaging consideration of the preservation of these writings is yet to be undertaken more at length.

2. IMPERIAL POWER. The Bible, since it incorporates the gospel, is "the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16), and, as too often unobserved, the gospel is addressed to man as an imperial edict. It is something to be *obeyed* (Acts 5:32; Rom. 2:8; 10:16; 2 Tim. 1:8; Heb. 5:9; 1 Pet. 4:17). It not only conveys the divine offers of salvation to men but penetrates into the very heart with illuminating, transforming power. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). "For the word of

God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). The Word of God is to be preached and not the word of men, and wherever the Word of God is preached it justifies its own claim to be "the power of God unto salvation."

3. Sanctifying Power. The Bible's authority is asserted and demonstrated in the fact that it has sanctifying power. The Lord prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17). Israel will yet be sanctified by the Scriptures of truth. Jehovah's covenant declares, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people" (Jer. 31:33); unmeasured blessings are provided for those in whom the Word of God dwells "richly in all wisdom" (Col. 3:16); and by taking "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (Eph. 6:17), the armor of God, by which the enemy may be defeated, is completed. The lives of countless saints have proved the Bible to be a sanctifying power.

4. Revealing Power. The Bible asserts and vindicates its authority in its claim to be a revelation to men. All authoritative information of things celestial or mundane, of time or eternity, of right or wrong, is derived from the Oracles of God. At every point and by every test that man has been able to apply to this vast disclosure of erudition it has proved to be no less than the "wisdom of God" revealed to man.

5. Accuracy. The Bible's authority is demonstrated, also, in that it is accurate to the degree of infinity in matters of history and prophecy. Historical data set forth in the original writings are inerrant, and prophecy not only discloses the oncoming events of the future, but provides unfailing assurance that all that is predicted will be executed by the sovereign and therefore irresistible competency of God. Thus has the divine authority of the Scriptures been demonstrated in the grand array of predictions already fulfilled, and thus it will be demonstrated in the plenary realization of all that is yet unfulfilled. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

6. Prevailing Power. The Bible proves its authority by the way it prevails over human activities. Its dominion began with a small and despised people in a restricted locality. It divided its task with no other agency. Like the breaking of a dam it gushed forth submerging the world. In doing this, it conquered empires though unanticipated, hated, and derided. Its advocates were massacred yet without a counter blow being inflicted. Entrenched depravity could not stay its victorious onward movement. Like the building of the temple whereon the sound of no tool was heard, so this mighty edifice of God has advanced. It is not implied that the Bible has transformed the world; but Jehovah's Word has been and will be fulfilled which announced, "It shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:11). Men, indeed, have not been blind to the fact that this authoritative Book ascribes all its qualities and effectiveness to God alone. No theory that feverish brains could advance can account for the Bible's irresistible authority. Speaking of His own Word, Jehovah said, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord" (Isa. 55:8).

7. Prophecy. The Bible demonstrates its authority by proposing a divine program which God alone could complete. To a considerable degree this program has been executed. Apart from such a comprehensive plan, how could Jehovah's everlasting and all-inclusive covenants with Abraham, David, Israel, and the Church—in which He assumes a determining direction over all generations of human life—be interpreted? Apart from an irresistible divine purpose, how else could the statement, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18), be understood? The transcendent authority by which Jehovah will complete His undertaking is equaled in every respect by the authority of His Word which reveals His purpose to men.

Conclusion

Of these seven exhibitions of the authority of the Scriptures, three are primary. (a) The fact that the Bible is the breath of God is consummated in the transmission of that message to chosen prophets and in the recognition and acknowledgment of the sacred canon by those to whom it first came.

Neither the part wrought by human authors nor the part wrought by those who under God determined the canon is the basis of the Bible's authority, though some have asserted that such authority is discoverable in the inspiration of men or the dogmas of the church in her assemblies and councils. (b) The royal assent which the Second Person has given is closely related to the assent of the prophets, but no comparison is tenable between these sources of authority. And (c) the employment of the Scriptures as His own utterance on the part of the Holy Spirit is closely related to the manifest power of the Scripture in operation and demonstrates their final authority. Thus to recapitulate, the authority of the Word of God may be traced to three actualities, namely, (a) the Scriptures are the breath of God—His own Word to man; (b) the Scriptures are given the attestation, or royal assent of the Son of God; and (c) they originate with and are employed by the Holy Spirit of God.

Chapter VI

ILLUMINATION

THE PURPOSE of God in providing the Bible is that man, to whom the Bible is addressed, may be possessed of dependable information regarding things tangible and intangible, temporal and eternal, visible and invisible, earthly and heavenly. In view of man's native limitations, this fund of truth is of measureless value to him. The unfallen man while in Eden depended upon a direct communication from God relative to all things both physical and spiritual. Undoubtedly much was learned by man before the fall, but new and drastic incompetency came to his mind and heart as a result of the calamitous changes which the fall imposed. From that time forth, God contemplated man as in "gross darkness" and "in the shadow of death." Gross, indeed, is the darkness, and deep, indeed, is the shadow of death. The graphic phrase, *the shadow of death*, which recurs about eighteen times in the Bible, is always employed in the Scriptures as a vivid portrayal of the fallen estate of man.

I. Specific Forms of Spiritual Darkness

Added to the original darkness which came by the fall, there are at least four particularized forms of spiritual blindness which, according to the Bible, are experienced by certain classes of humanity and which augment beyond computation man's natural unenlightenment. Some consideration of the need of illumination is essential as a background to an adequate apprehension of all that illumination provides.

1. ISRAEL'S BLINDNESS. In addition to natural blindness, a judicial darkness has fallen upon Israel which Jehovah instructed Isaiah to announce in these words, "Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert [turn about], and be healed" (Isa. 6:9, 10; cf. Matt. 13:14, 15; Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10; John 12:40; Acts 28:26, 27; 2 Cor. 3:14, 15). This blindness was

predicted to appear in Israel when their Messiah would come. The blindness came upon them as anticipated and caused that national unbelief which not only rejected their Messiah (Acts 2:22–24), but was the occasion of the breaking off of the natural branches from the olive tree (Rom. 11:13–25); only, however, for the restricted time of the duration of this age. Isaiah also said, "For the LORD hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath he covered. And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed: and the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned" (29:10–12). The blindness, though national, is not universal. In Romans 11:25 it is stated: "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." From Ephesians 1:22, 23 it is discovered that the phrase, *the fulness of the Gentiles,* refers to the present purpose of God in the out-calling of the Church from both Jews and Gentiles. Those from among Israel who, being illuminated by the Spirit of God, obey the gospel, are saved into the heavenly glory and are no longer blinded as before.

But the time is coming when the veil now upon national Israel shall be lifted. The "vail is done away in Christ," but Israel as a people do not yet believe that Jesus is their Messiah. "Nevertheless when it [Israel] shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away" (2 Cor. 3:14–16). This national illumination, which will, no doubt, break upon them through a new and right understanding of the Scriptures, is predicted by Isaiah in these words: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the LORD is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but the LORD shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising" (60:1–3).

Thus it is disclosed that for Israelites there are two possible illuminations: one for the individual Jew who believes to the saving of his soul, which illumination dispels all previous darkness; and the other for the whole nation, which will be their portion when the "Sun of righteousness" arises with healing in His wings (Mal. 4:2), and when the Deliverer shall

come out of Zion and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob (Rom. 11:26). Since the Word of God shall then be written "in their hearts," it is evident that the agency which the Spirit will use to enlighten that nation will be the Scriptures of truth.

2. Gentile Darkness. The darkness which is now experienced by the Gentile nations, apart from satanic blindness, is none other than that which has come upon them because of the fall. The unsaved, having never known any other estate, are unconscious of their condition and therefore almost universally disbelieve those Scriptures which describe their plight. There are many descriptions of this Gentile darkness presented in the Bible. Even when the light, which Christ is, shined in darkness, "the darkness comprehended it not" (John 1:5; cf. Eph. 5:11; 1 John 2:11). But the following from Isaiah, already cited, declares the illumination that will reach them when Christ returns, "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined" (9:2). It is when the glorious Light of God, the returning Messiah, shall come to Zion that the long-promised blessing shall reach also to the Gentiles.

3. Satanic Darkness. An extraordinary disclosure is made in 2 Corinthians 4:3, 4 of the fact that unregenerate men, individual Jew and Gentile alike, are blinded as to the gospel and that this blindness is as a veil upon the mind. This incapacity to respond to the gospel has been imposed by Satan with a view to impeding the normal reception of the message concerning God's saving grace. This obstruction is not in evidence concerning any aspect of truth other than the gospel. The passage asserts: "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." Two exceedingly important statements by Christ bear on this same incapacity of the unregenerate man. To Nicodemus He said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3); and of the present relationships of the Spirit, He said, "… the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him" (John 14:17). So, also, the Apostle points out that the knowledge which the world

possesses, forged as it is out of a perverted understanding of God's truth into false philosophies and conceptions, is the very agency which Satan uses to mislead them. He declares, "The world by wisdom knew not God" (1 Cor. 1:21). Likewise, after having pointed out the fact that men have willfully turned away from the truth about God which nature discloses, the same Apostle writes, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools"; and that because of their folly God gave them up to "uncleanness," to "vile affections," and "a reprobate mind" (Rom. 1:19–32). All of this is an added revelation of the fallen estate of the unregenerate. But these restrictions—both native and satanic—can be overcome by the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit. With this in view, the Spirit reproves, or enlightens, the world with respect to the cardinal features of the gospel, namely, "sin, righteousness, and judgment" (John 16:7–11). The Scriptures are evidently the primary agency which is used by the Spirit to this end, for "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17).

4. Carnal Blindness. Having depicted the restrictions of the ψυχυκός (*psuchikos*, 'natural') man respecting his inability to receive the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:14) and having appraised the supernatural capacity of the πνευματικός (*pneumatikos*, 'spiritual') man (1 Cor. 2:15), the Apostle portrays the restricted spiritual understanding of the σαρκικός (sarkikos, 'carnal') man and assigns the cause for carnality in the specific group to which he was writing. This revealing passage reads: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual [πνευματικός], but as unto carnal [σαρκικός], even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able" (1 Cor. 3:1, 2). The carnal man is here addressed as a *brother* and as a *babe in Christ*, all of which demonstrates that he is saved. However, his reception of God's Word is limited to its simplest messages—likened to *milk* and in contrast to *meat*—, and this, it is asserted, is due to his unspiritual life. The same unspirituality in believers is in view in Hebrews 5:12–14, "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a

babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."

Thus it is disclosed that unspiritual living hinders the normal illuminating work of the Spirit of God in the mind and heart of the child of God.

II. The Illuminating Work of the Spirit

The period of time between the two advents of Christ is often designated as *The Age of the Holy Spirit*, and properly so, since these days are characterized by the activity and administration of the Spirit. In these specific days, also, the child of God is blessed to no small degree by the fact that the Holy Spirit indwells him, and the Spirit is thus residing in the Christian to the end that supernatural power may be ever available. Were it not for this divine resource and sufficiency, the superhuman manner of life now expected from each believer would be an impossible and, therefore, an inconsistent requisition. Among the age-characterizing operations of the Spirit is that of teaching or enlightening the individual in whom He dwells. This reception of truth is not confined to commonplace issues, but may reach out into the "deep things of God," and the experience of the believer when thus taught by the Spirit is peculiar in this respect, that the divine Teacher is within his heart and he therefore does not hear a voice speaking from without and at stated times, as is the method of human teachers, but the mind and heart are supernaturally awakened from within to apprehend what otherwise would be unknown. It need only be observed here that, of necessity, this awakening ministry of the Spirit may be greatly hindered by sin or by unspiritual ways on the part of the child of God. This truth alone accounts for the existing difference between the spiritual Christian who "discerns all things" and the carnal Christian who cannot receive the deeper and more vital truths which are likened to strong meat (1 Cor. 2:15; 3:1–3).

On the day of His resurrection, Christ walked with two of His disciples on the Emmaus road (Luke 24:13–35) and it is recorded that He "expounded" and "opened" the Scriptures to these disciples. Similarly, at evening when He appeared to the whole company of disciples He opened their understanding to the Scriptures (Luke 24:45). Until the crucifixion, these men had not believed that Christ would die (Matt. 16:21–23), and it

was to the end that they might know something of the meaning of His death and resurrection that He opened their understanding (Luke 24:46). Thus a limitless field of truth came to them, even the gospel which they were to proclaim (Luke 24:47, 48); but not without the power which the Spirit coming upon them would secure (Luke 24:49). On the Day of Pentecost, Peter, who had so recently rejected the prediction concerning Christ's death (Matt. 16:21–23), preached the value of that death with such convincing power that three thousand were saved. It is evident that Peter's understanding had been opened concerning Christ's death; this, however, was not Peter's first experience with the penetrating power of a divine revelation. In answer to Christ's question, "But whom say ye that I am?" Peter replied, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And to this Christ responded, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 16:15–17). Though in the Scriptures, above cited, the Father and the Son are declared to have revealed definite aspects of truth to various men, the Spirit of God is the divine Teacher since His advent on Pentecost, and a very extensive body of Scripture bears on this specified ministry of the Spirit.

After having preannounced the illuminating power of the Spirit upon the unsaved by which the satanic veil concerning the gospel is lifted and apart from which none could ever receive Christ as their Savior (John 16:7–11), the Lord proceeded to say, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of ["from"—as originator] himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come" (John 16:12–15). The primary statement of this crucial passage is that Christ, who has been teaching these disciples throughout three and a half years, is going on teaching them, but by a new way of approach to their hearts. The phrase, "when he, the Spirit of truth, is come," no doubt anticipates the advent of the Spirit on Pentecost and the new undertakings that would be made possible by His indwelling presence in their hearts—not the least of which is His service as Teacher. But it must be recognized that the Spirit purposely originates nothing. It is "whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak," and, "he shall receive of mine," Christ said, "and shall shew it unto you." And, again, "he shall take of mine

[including the *all things* of the Father], and shall shew it unto you." It is thus by presenting the message of the ascended Christ that the Spirit will "glorify Christ." Apart from this so definite yet unprecedented manner of imparting truth, the disciples—as is equally true of all believers from that day until now—could not "bear" the "many things" which, evidently, were still not apprehended after the three and a half years of unbroken schooling. Language could not more explicitly convey the fact that certain aspects of truth—immeasurable indeed—cannot be gained by usual didactic methods. These supermundane revelations must be disclosed from the ascended Lord through the mediation of the Spirit and only then as the Spirit speaks from His incomparable position of nearness—within the heart itself.

The Upper Room Discourse, in which the above passage is found, is the seed-plot of that form of doctrine which is later developed in the Epistles. It is not strange, therefore, that the Apostle Paul takes up this great theme for further elucidation. This is found in 1 Corinthians 2:9–3:4. It reads:

> But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ. And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?

The central truth of this context is presented in the opening verse where it is stated that God hath prepared certain "things" for them that love Him—things which are not gained by the eye, the ear, or the heart (reasoning power; cf. Isa. 52:15; 64:4; 6:9, 10; Matt. 13:15). This negative declaration concerning the eye, the ear, and the heart is abundantly sustained in the following verse, where it is asserted that these specific "things" are *revealed* unto us by the Spirit. These "things" are a present reality, and not, as

sometimes supposed, an array of future glories to be experienced in heaven. The Spirit who reveals these “things” is One who “searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.” It is not difficult to believe that the Third Person of the Godhead is in possession of all truth; the marvel is that this Third Person indwells the least Christian, and thus places that Christian in a position to receive and understand that transcendent truth which the Spirit knows. Within his own capacity, the child of God can know no more than “the things of a man,” which are within the range of “the spirit of man which is in him.” Amazing, indeed, is the disclosure that “the Spirit which is of God” has been received, and for the express purpose in view that the children of God “might know the things that are freely given to us of God.” And as written elsewhere: “But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it [He] hath taught you, ye shall abide in him” (1 John 2:27).

Following the stupendous disclosures that the Christian is indwelt by the Supreme Teacher and is therefore already admitted into an inimitable seminary where the instruction is said to be “freely given,” *i.e.*, without limitation, the Apostle proceeds to point out, as before noted, a threefold division of humanity—, and to disclose the proof concerning the classification of each man as found in his attitude toward the Word of God. (a) The natural or unregenerate man cannot receive the Scriptures, since they are by the Spirit discerned, and the natural man, though educated with all that the eye, the ear, and the reasoning power can impart, has not received the Spirit (cf. Jude 1:19 where *sensual* is the translation of the same designation—ψυχικός Cf. 1 Cor. 15:46; James 3:15), and therefore all revelation is “foolishness” to him. Should this natural man, because of human attainments and ecclesiastical authority, be placed where he molds or directs the affairs of the Church of Christ on earth, his influence must ever be a peril to the things of God. Even reverence and sincerity may not be wanting, but these cannot substitute for the *revelation* which can come only from the indwelling Spirit. (b) The spiritual man is in a position to receive *all* truth (there is no implication that he has already attained to it). He is indwelt by the Spirit and all adjustments concerning his daily life are made with the end in view that the Spirit may not be hindered in His teaching ministry within his own heart. And (c) the carnal Christian

demonstrates his fleshliness by his inability to receive the deeper truths which are likened to *strong meat* as in contrast to *milk.* The need of the carnal man is *sanctification* and not regeneration.

Lest that which the Spirit teaches be deemed a small feature in the vast field of human knowledge, it is well to recount what is included in the category of "things" which are taught by the Spirit. These are: "things" related to the Father, "things" related to the Son, "things" related to the Spirit, "things" to come, and "things" related to the kingdom of God; for "except a man be born again ['from above'], he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). Thus, by comparison, the sum total of human knowledge is reduced to the point of insignificance.

There is no didactic discipline in the world comparable to the teaching of Christ by the Holy Spirit, both because of the fact that infinity characterizes the themes which are taught, and because of the Teacher's method of approach by which He, by the Spirit, enters the innermost recesses of the heart where impressions originate and there not only tells out the truth of transcendent magnitude, but causes the pupil actually to grasp the things thus revealed. "By faith we understand" (Heb. 11:3, R.V.). That Christ would continue the teaching begun while here on earth was clearly promised (John 16:12–15), and implied in Acts 1:1 where reference is made to "all that Jesus began both to do and teach."

In view of the fact that the minister's distinctive and essential message is in the realm of spiritual truth which can be discerned only by the Holy Spirit and that the Holy Spirit must require a yieldedness to Himself on the part of the one whom He teaches, the minister or theological student may well seek by heart-searching and confession to be in right relation to the One upon whom all progress in the knowledge of God's truth depends. A requisite life in conformity to the will of God, on the student's part, is neither incidental nor optional; it is *arbitrary*, *determining*, and *crucial*. There is not the slightest possibility that the most educated and brilliant mind can make one step of progress in the understanding of spiritual truth apart from the direct, supernatural teaching to the individual heart by the indwelling Spirit. Hence the imperative aspect of the new birth. In like manner, there can be no full or worthy apprehension of God's revealed truth by the Christian who is unspiritual or carnal. Hence the imperative aspect of a yielded life.

Chapter VII

INTERPRETATION

IT IS properly required of the theologian that he both understand and expound the Scriptures. This is the distinctive field in which he serves. However, he confronts a wide latitude of interpretation which is represented when all schools of theological thought are considered. Nevertheless, whether any person or group of persons has ever attained unto it or not, there is but one system of related and interdependent revelation set forth in the Word of God. Though they build their structures on selected proof-texts (which too often receive biased interpretation), the Bible does not lend itself equally in support of Calvinism, Arminianism, various forms of lapsarian beliefs, postmillenarianism, premillenarianism, and amillenarianism. The widely divergent and contradictory claims of these and other systems of interpretation serve to demonstrate the fallibility of sincere men. It is sometimes claimed that anything good or bad may be proved or defended from the Scriptures. Such an impression could be sustained only by the permission of violent misuse or disuse of the Sacred Text. It is noticeable that all theological systems and even modern cults make use of the Bible.

It is probable that, owing to human limitations, no theological system has reached that illation which is exempt from all error and which incorporates into itself all truth in its proper balance. Men of candor have long striven to reach this desideratum, while others, apparently, have too often been lacking in that holy regard for the divine Oracles which leads to a proving of all things and to a holding of that which is good. The unrevoked *anathema* which rests upon all who pervert the gospel of divine grace (Gal. 1:8, 9) may be deemed, to some degree, to be true concerning the misrepresentation of all divine revelation. In view of these considerations, the uncompromising student will do well to give indefatigable study to the Sacred Text and demand of himself that right relation to God which insures the priceless divine guidance into all truth. The conclusions of other men should be given due respect. It is the student’s task, having considered and weighed the contribution men have made to the general understanding of the Scriptures, to advance these assured results of scholarship beyond the

attainments of past generations, striving to be as humble and true as the fathers have been. Among other things stated, 2 Timothy 2:15 does enjoin "study" which is the application to, and the investigation of, the text of Scripture itself and not merely a perusal of the writings of other men about the text.

The science of interpretation—usually designated *hermeneutics*, which term denotes the art of interpreting literature, especially the Sacred Scriptures—includes the recognition of the principles upon which a true analysis must proceed. This science is to be distinguished from *exegesis*, which is the application of the laws of interpretation. Both of these disciplines deserve an extended treatment as independent courses of study in every theological curriculum.

Among all the major divisions of Bibliology, hermeneutics, or the science of interpretation, holds a unique place, being, as it is, wholly the work of men. Its results, therefore, at best, are characterized by imperfections due to human limitations, and it is subject to such general rules and principles of procedure as are obviously demanded. When undertaking to interpret the Scriptures, due consideration should be given to: I. The Purpose of the Bible as a Whole When searching the Scriptures, it is well to have in mind the fact that beyond the sphere which limits the primary objective for which the Bible as a revelation from God was given, incomplete features appear. The Bible is not a treatise on natural science or history. It is a plenary declaration from God concerning Himself and His works—especially as those works enter into the eternal welfare of men. On other themes the sacred writers did, of necessity, touch at times, and what they wrote is accurate in so far as it goes. This, as has been observed, is notable. With reference to mundane things, these writers were not permitted to go beyond the intelligence of the men of their day by anticipating later scientific discoveries, nor to express themselves within those restrictions in such a manner as would develop absurdities when their writings would be compared with the later development of knowledge, which development was predicted (Dan. 12:4).

II. The Distinctive Character and Message of Each Book of the Bible

Though it demand much labor, the noting of the differentiating characteristics of each book of the Bible is essential, since a

vital factor in any revelation is its place in a certain book, and in the light of the specific message of that book. The four Gospels offer an illustration of this verity. The truth set forth in Matthew's Gospel is especially germane to the *kingship* of Christ; the truth set forth in Mark's Gospel is especially germane to the *servanthood* of Christ; the truth set forth in Luke's Gospel is especially germane to the *humanity* of Christ; while the truth set forth in John's Gospel is especially germane to the Deity of Christ. Each book of the Bible not only maintains a specific purpose, but its contribution to the whole structure of the Bible is to be observed as well.

III. To Whom is a Given Scripture Addressed?

An accurate interpretation of any given Scripture depends very much upon a differentiation between its *primary* and *secondary* applications. As has been stated, "All scripture" is *for* the Christian in the sense that it is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness (2 Tim. 3:16); but not all Scripture is *about* him. This is obvious since all Scripture is not addressed to the angels or to the Gentiles. In like manner, all Scripture is not addressed to the Jew or to the Christian. The Scriptures are "profitable" because they are pregnant with moral and spiritual values; this is true even when they exert only the influence of a secondary application.

A primary application is made when a given Scripture is recognized as pertaining directly to those to whom it is addressed. A secondary application is made when a given Scripture is recognized as not applying directly to a certain person or class of persons, but its moral and spiritual teachings are, nevertheless, appropriated by them. To illustrate this: Much valuable truth may be gained by Christians from the extensive body of Scriptures bearing on the Jewish Sabbath; but if that Scripture is given a primary application to the Christian, to whom it was never directly addressed, the Christian would have no Biblical ground for the observance of the first day of the week (which he certainly has), and he could offer no excuse for his failure to keep the specific features of the Sabbath law. He must, like all Sabbath-breakers, be stoned to death (Num. 15:32–36). In like manner, if all Scripture is of primary application to Christians of this age, then they are in danger of hell fire (Matt. 5:29, 30), of unspeakable plagues, diseases, and sickness, and by

reason of these to become few in number (Deut. 28:58–62), and to have the blood of lost souls required at their hands (Ezek. 3:17, 18). Of the Christian it is said that "he cometh not into judgment" (John 5:24, R.V.), and, "there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). In no way are false theological systems more sustained than by their confusion of primary and secondary applications of the Word of God. It is evident, also, that no feature of interpretation demands more discernment born of true scholarship than this. The precise application of some passages—especially in the Synoptics—is exceedingly difficult. The Apostle's plea for "study" is also a warning; for the Scriptures will not be "rightly divided" apart from arduous "study." However, this is the theologian's distinctive task and his worthiness may be measured, to a large degree, by his analytical knowledge of, and ability to apply, the entire text of God's Word.

IV. Consideration of the Context **The character and scope of the truth under contemplation at any point is to be discovered, very largely, by the surrounding context. The student must learn to establish context boundaries regardless of the mere mechanical chapter and verse divisions. No more striking illustration of the context extending beyond chapter boundaries is to be found than in Matthew's account of the transfiguration of Christ. This context begins with the last verse of chapter 16 and continues into chapter 17. To the general reader, Matthew 16:28 is completely unrelated to 17:1–8 because of the wholly artificial intrusion of a chapter division. Matthew 16:28, standing alone, seems to be a misrepresentation of facts; but when seen as a part of the transfiguration account, its prediction is not only explained, but it lends a very important contribution to the *purpose* of the transfiguration (cf. 2 Pet. 1:16–21). Likewise, the promise of 1 Corinthians 2:9 is seen to be fulfilled, not at some future time in heaven, but *now*, if the reader continues on into verse 10. Again, ἀδόκιμος (*adokimos*,**

‘castaway,’ or ‘disapproved’) of 1 Corinthians 9:27 cannot mean the loss of salvation in a context which has only to do with rewards for Christian service.

V. Consideration of All Scripture Bearing on any given theme A right interpretation will also depend very largely on an induction being made of *all* that the Bible presents on a given subject. The conclusion must be no less than the consensus of that full testimony. Though there is no complete unanimity as to the meaning of 2 Peter 1:20, the majority of expositors favor the interpretation which implies that no one Scripture bearing on a theme is to be considered apart from other Scriptures bearing on that theme. The passage states: “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.” There could be no reference here to the privacy of the one who interprets, for, in the end, all interpretation is personal and therefore private. From the verse which follows, there is some ground for concluding that the lack of privacy belonged to the prophets who did not disclose their private opinions, but were moved by the Holy Spirit. However, it would seem more in harmony with the underlying conditions which all must recognize, that the statement of a doctrine or theme of the Word of God will be true to the mind of God only as all He has said on that theme is brought into view. *Prophecy*, as contemplated in this passage and as has been before pointed out, is that larger forthtelling message which includes all that the Old Testament writers have written.

The necessity of a full induction is indicated when the progress of doctrine is recognized. The early disclosures concerning redemption by blood are not to stand alone, though it will be observed that the early revelation was at one time all that God had revealed. Redemption by blood is consummated in the death of Christ and defined in the doctrinal structure built upon that death by the apostles. Therefore, an interpretation of redemption based on a private or isolated passage of the early Scriptures would be misleading; yet the early passages make a grand contribution to the whole revelation.

VI. Discovery of the Exact Meaning of the determinative words in the text Apart from the knowledge of the original languages in which the Bible was written, there can be no very accurate conclusions as to what a difficult passage teaches. For this reason the study of both Hebrew and Greek to the extent that worthy exegesis in one's own right is undertaken is most essential and belongs to the preparation of a Bible expositor. The history of the great preachers and teachers of the past relative to the use of the original languages is most stimulating. Those who have not gained a working knowledge of the original languages can hardly be expected to realize what a wealth of disclosure that ability imparts. To be utterly dependent upon the findings of other men, while it may not preclude one from a fruitful ministry, is depressing since the vital authority in utterance (which should be graced with humility) is lacking.

VII. Necessity of Avoiding Personal Prejudices It is exceedingly easy to twist or mold the Word of God to make it conform to one's preconceived notions. To do this is no less than "handling the word of God deceitfully" (2 Cor. 4:2), and is worthy of judgment from Him whose Word is thus perverted. At no point may the conscience be more exercised and the mind of God more sought than when delving into the precise meaning of the Scriptures and when giving those findings to others.

These and other instructions relative to logical procedure and scientific method are presented in any complete course in hermeneutics, and all of these taken together provide the best safeguards men have devised against the misrepresentation of, and disproportionate emphasis on, the doctrines of the Bible.

Chapter VIII

ANIMATION

BY THE TERM *animation* reference is made to that inimitable element of vitality or life which obtains in the Bible as in no other book. There are various attributes which are predicated of the written Word of God. In the Old Testament these are presented in two Psalms. Seven appear in Psalm 19: "The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether" (vss. 7–9). Similarly, seven attributes of the Bible are named in Psalm 119. These are: *faithful* (vs. 86), *broad* (vs. 96), *right* (vs. 128), *wonderful* (vs. 129), *pure* (vs. 140), *everlasting* (vs. 160), and *righteous* (vs. 172). The New Testament adds that the Word of God is *truth* (John 17:17), *profitable* (2 Tim. 3:16), *quick* and *powerful* (Heb. 4:12).

Much, indeed, is asserted when the attributes ζῶν (*zōn,* 'quick,' or 'living') and ἐνεργής (*energēs,* 'powerful') are ascribed to the Scriptures. The word ζωή, used about 140 times in the New Testament, means *life* either as an actuality or as a manner of conduct. This word root appears in each of the thirteen repetitions of the phrase, "the living God." Twice the root appears as an integral element in the written Scriptures. It is stated: (a) "For the word of God is quick ['living'], and powerful ['active'], and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents ['ideas'] of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). The reference in this passage to "the word of God," has been by the Fathers in general and many of later times taken to designate the Logos or Living Word, as that term is used by John; but the context immediately leads away from the thought of Logos to that of the written Word. In Hebrews the Second Person is set forth as the *Son of God*, and 6:5 and 11:3 do not translate Logos, but these passages do translate another word altogether (ῥῆμα, *rēma*), which word is always used to designate a form of utterance and never used of the Person of Christ. Of

the interpretation which makes this reference to be of the spoken Word of God as such, it may be pointed out that there is practically no difference in the essential reality of the spoken Word and the written Word, for one is no more than a form in which the other appears. Both are alike the breath of His mouth. The element of *life*, here asserted to be inherent in the Word of God, is more than that which is now in authority as in contrast to that which has become but a dead letter; it is more than something which supplies nourishment, though this the Scriptures do supply. Scripture is *living* in the sense in which God is the *Living God* (cf. 10:31). The predicates here used are not only revealing, but are so arranged as to form a climax. The Word of God is *living*, it is *energizing*, it is *sharp*, it *pierces*, it *discerns*. (b) "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Pet. 1:23). Here, again ζάω (*zaō*)appears, with the added thought of eternal duration. Not to be overlooked at this point is the utterance of Christ, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (ζωή—*zōē*, John 6:63).

The second word, already indicated in Hebrews 4:12, is ἐνεργής, which ascribes to the Scriptures the attribute of *energy*. It is the energy which vital life supplies. This element of power, or energy, is not to be accounted for on insufficient grounds. Truth is always potent, and the Scriptures, being *truth* (John 17:17; cf. 8:32), are ever the prevailing voice where conscience and candor obtain; but the *power* of the Word of God is not alone in its indisputable integrity. In like manner, the Word of God is the "sword of the Spirit" (Eph. 6:17); but even the vital force which the Spirit releases when wielding His sword does not fully account for the *energy* of the Bible. The written Word of God is God-breathed. Life inheres in it. This truth does not imply personality or that the Bible possesses the constitution of a living creature. It declares that divine life is resident in the Scriptures. Because of this fact, certain stupendous accomplishments are said to be wrought by the Word of God:

I. The Power of God's Word Upon the Unsaved

The Word of God is the agency by which faith is generated. It is written: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). In this same connection the Apostle declares that the Scriptures "are able to

make thee wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. 3:15). And Peter states that it is through "great and precious promises" that men may "be partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4). The Psalmist declares, "The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul" (Ps. 19:7). So, also, as "water," the Word of God cooperates with the Spirit in the accomplishment of the new birth (John 3:5; cf. Titus 3:5). "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God" (1 Pet. 1:23).

II. The Power of God's Word Upon the Saved

In His High Priestly prayer, Christ made request that those the Father had given Him might be sanctified through the truth, adding, "Thy word is truth. … And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth" (John 17:17–19). The Word of God is a nourishment imparting strength: "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby" (1 Pet. 2:2). The Scriptures are of special value to the believer. "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh [ἐνεργεῖται, 'energizes'] also in you that believe" (1 Thess. 2:13). "And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified" (Acts 20:32). And, lastly, the Word is a purifying agency. Writing of Christ's care for His Church, the Apostle said, " … that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word" (Eph. 5:26; cf. Ps. 37:31; 119:11).

In the light of this body of truth which so definitely predicates of the Word of God that it is a living, vital agency with supernatural power, the preacher has little excuse for the presentation of anything else. The divine promise through Isaiah is, "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:10, 11). To the same purpose Jeremiah has written: "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the LORD; and like a

hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" (Jer. 23:29). God uses His Word. It is efficacious in the hand of the Holy Spirit in accomplishing supernatural results. For this reason, the Apostle, with that wisdom given him of God, directed his young student, Timothy, to "preach the word."

Chapter IX

PRESERVATION JEHOVAH'S COVENANT, NAMELY, THAT HIS WORD WILL ENDURE FOREVER, HAS BEEN DISCHARGED TO THE PRESENT HOUR. MEN HAVE DONE WHAT THEY COULD TO DESTROY THE INFLUENCE OF THE SCRIPTURES. THEY HAVE BOTH TESTIFIED AGAINST THEM AND PREDICTED THEIR SUBSIDENCE; BUT AT NO TIME IN THE WORLD'S HISTORY HAS THE BIBLE BEEN MORE A POWER FOR GOOD, NOR HAS IT EVER BEEN MORE CLEARLY MARKED OFF FOR AN EVER INCREASING INFLUENCE. THE PRESERVATION OF THE SCRIPTURES, LIKE THE DIVINE CARE OVER THE WRITING OF THEM AND OVER THE FORMATION OF THEM INTO THE CANON, IS NEITHER ACCIDENTAL, INCIDENTAL, NOR FORTUITOUS. IT IS THE FULFILLMENT OF THE DIVINE PROMISE. WHAT GOD IN FAITHFULNESS HAS WROUGHT, WILL BE CONTINUED UNTIL HIS PURPOSE IS ACCOMPLISHED. THERE IS LITTLE INDEED THAT MEN CAN DO TO THWART THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GOD'S WORD, SINCE IT IS SAID

OF THAT WORD, "CONCERNING THY TESTIMONIES, I HAVE KNOWN OF OLD THAT THOU HAS FOUNDED THEM FOREVER," AND, "FOR EVER, O LORD, THY WORD IS SETTLED [ESTABLISHED] IN HEAVEN" (PS. 119:152, 89). TO THE SAME PURPOSE CHRIST SAID, "HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORD SHALL NOT PASS AWAY" (MATT. 24:35); AND THE APOSTLE PETER ASSERTS THAT "THE WORD OF GOD" IS THAT "WHICH LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOR EVER" (1 PET. 1:23).

It is no small distinction conferred on the Bible that it is classed with a very few realities which endure forever. The writer to the Hebrews predicts the time when there will be a removal of all things that can be shaken and the continuation of those things which cannot be shaken. His reference is specifically to the kingdom of God and contemplates, naturally, all that enters into that kingdom (Heb. 12:25–29). Eternal endurance is predicated of the Bible; not that its message in all its parts will need ever to be preached as it is now, but it is indestructible, being the Word of the eternal God. It is not that some one book out of the innumerable books men have written has been arbitrarily singled out for the highest honor. The Bible is eternal in its own right. It abides because of the fact that no word Jehovah has spoken can be removed or shaken. In fact, it is by means of His written Oracles that God announces His binding declarations concerning the "all things" which cannot be shaken. The Scriptures are the legal instrument by which God obligates Himself to execute every detail of His eternal covenants and to fulfill every prediction His prophets have made. The legal instrument which secures this vast consummation must continue, and shall continue, until the last promise, for which it stands as surety, has been

realized. Not one jot or tittle of the divine deposition can pass until all is fulfilled.

Theology Proper

Chapter X

Introduction to Theology Proper The term *Theology Proper* is a somewhat modern designation which represents the logical starting point in the study of Systematic Theology, being, as it is, its primary theme, namely, a scientific investigation into what may be known of the existence, Persons, and characteristics of the triune God—Father, Son, and Spirit—and quite apart from their works. Since the whole field of Systematic Theology is so extensive, it is the part of wisdom to reserve the consideration of the works of the triune God, as unfolded in Angelology, Anthropology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology, and Eschatology, for later contemplation. Unabridged investigation of the truth concerning the Second and Third Persons, including their works, is to be undertaken under the two cardinal divisions, Christology and Pneumatology.

Following the period—unknown as to its duration—when unfallen man was in normal, unbroken relations with God, and which ended with the expulsion of man from the presence of God, the thoughtful and sincere from among the human race have been engaged in a feeble attempt to penetrate into the vast field which the knowledge of God represents. Their handicap has been drastic, for it is written: “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (1 Cor. 2:14); and, again, “All his thoughts are, There is no God” (Ps. 10:4, R.V.). Doubtless each generation has added something to the total of finite speculation regarding God. In the midst of all these human gropings after the knowledge of Him, God has spoken in specific revelation of Himself, and to those thus enlightened the disclosure is far-reaching and final. But to the unenlightened little is added through revelation, their neglect of the Scriptures and their native inability to receive them being sufficient proof.

The sources of knowledge about God, which are somewhat interdependent, are four: I. Intuition

An intuition is confidence or belief which springs immediately from the constitution of the mind. It must ever be so; hence intuition is a necessary human function. Therefore, it may be said that intuitive knowledge is that which the normal, natural mind assumes to be true. It includes such themes as *time* and *eternity; space*, *cause*, and *effect; right* and *wrong; mathematical demonstration; self-existence*, the *existence of matter*, and the *Person of God*. These and other primary truths, being already accepted by the rational mind, are little enhanced by added demonstration, nor are they greatly decreased by counter argument. Intuitive knowledge is little more than a bias in the direction of certain truths. Each intuitive theme offers a field of endless research and conceals inexhaustible stores of reality. This is particularly true of the knowledge of God. The very universality of the belief in God proves that it is intuitive. Such general knowledge is not the superstition of perverted minds, for it is evidently more assertive where culture and education obtain. In the midst of a universe of transcendent marvels, whether observed in their telescopic grandeur or microscopic perfection, the rational mind can find but one explanation for the phenomenon which is observed, namely, a God of infinite wisdom and

power. It is true that some men have sought to move themselves away from this intuitive conception of God and profess to be *agnostic*. The Bible recognizes this abnormal mind when it says: “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Ps. 14:1; 53:1).

If by definition is meant a complete statement of all that is in a subject, it is impossible for man to define God. The most that man can do is to recognize the incomparable position which God occupies above all beings, to ascribe attributes to Him, and to frame a general statement of what the mind conceives to be true. The extent of the scope of this declaration will, of necessity, depend on the degree of understanding to which the mind of the author of the statement has advanced. A wide range of individual vision is observable at this point, which extends all the way from the most elemental intuition of the untrained unregenerate person to the full-orbed experience of God which belongs to the most spiritual and mature of saints. A well-defined twofold grouping will be perceived when this wide latitude of human apprehension is analyzed—the apprehension of the unsaved on the one hand and of the saved on the other—with but little in common between them. Of the regenerate persons it may be said that in their knowledge of God they have passed beyond mere intuition and attained unto that insight which is revelation.

Intuition is direct knowledge, a rational perception which by its nature precedes all the processes of observation and deduction. Descartes taught that the intellect finds itself at birth, or when the mind awakens to conscious action, to be in possession of conceptions which need only to be identified for what they are. Calvin writes: “Those who rightly judge will always agree that there is an indelible sense of divinity engraved upon men’s minds” (*Institutes*, 1:3:3, cited by Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 30).

On the ground of their essential nature, intuitive truths are to be tested by certain factors, namely, whether or not (a) they are *universal*—that is, they are common to all men, not that all men understand them or assent to them, but in the sense that all men consciously or unconsciously act upon them; (b) they are *necessary*—that is, they are wrought into the constitution of every normal person; and (c) they are *self-evident* and *self-demonstrating*—that is, they are subject to no other truths for their cognition.

The following from Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (*Principles of Theology*, pp. 4, 5) will serve to summarize this theme: What is the origin of the idea of God?

There are two general explanations. By some the idea of God as a Supreme Being is regarded, in technical language, as “an intuition of the moral reason.” St. Paul seems to have recognized in the mind an innate perception of God (Acts 17:28). This means that the belief in a personal God is born in every man, not as a perfect or complete idea, but as involving a capacity for belief when the idea is presented. If this is so, it is one of the primary intuitions of human nature. It is certainly a mistake to suppose that we derive the idea of God from the Bible, for races that have never heard of the Bible possess a definite belief in a Supreme Being. The Bible reveals God’s character and His purpose for man, and thus gives us a true idea of the Divine Being, but the emphasis is on the truth rather than on the mere fact. In the same way it is equally incorrect to say that we obtain the idea of God from reason, for reason is not in this respect originative. By reflection we can obtain a fuller conception of God, but the reason itself is not the source of the conception. By those who hold that our idea of God is intuitive the conception of God is analysed into three elements: first, a consciousness of power in God which leads to a feeling of our dependence on Him; second, a consciousness of His perfection which leads to a realisation of our obligation to Him; third, a consciousness of His Personality which leads to a sense of worship of Him.

> Others object to the idea of God as intuitive, and say that it is the result of the reason instinctively recognising Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, and that these coalesce in the thought of one Reality. On this view these three elements afford an argument for Theism.

The latter of these theories is that advanced by Everett in his *Theism and the Christian Faith* (Unitarian and Hegelian) which lacks the support of human experience as well as that of the Scriptures.

II. Tradition

Tradition may be considered either (1) as that which is remote—the early impressions of the race—or (2) as that which is present—teaching which is given to children.

1. The Remote. Scripture records the fact that unfallen man began with the highest knowledge of God, such as one must possess who walks and talks with God. His memory and sense of the reality of God was not lost in the fall, for even then Adam heard the voice of God in judgment and received the divine provision of clothing from the hand of God, which clothing implied divine grace to the sinful. Adam’s testimony concerning God was given directly to succeeding generations, for hundreds of years, with all the force of an original expression, and in a time when tradition as a means of education was paramount. It is, therefore, conceivable that the authoritative, original beginning of traditional knowledge about God was disseminated from generation to generation. On the other hand, it must be conceded that tradition is as potent in the transmission of error as it is of

truth, that the fallen nature of man is ever prone to depart from the knowledge of God (Rom. 1:19–32), that if traditional impressions regarding God survive they do so in spite of counter forces.

2. The Present. The present influence of tradition as represented in the instruction of children is the most vital aspect of education. Children are being taught the faith (or no faith) of their parents, and when the saving knowledge of God pervades a home or community the effect may be traced into succeeding generations. The reverse of this is also true.

The influence of the teacher or parent upon the child's understanding of God and relationship to Him is far-reaching, else the Church of Rome would not assert that it is of little consequence as to what later influences encompass a life provided they have the molding of the early years.

This, it will be observed, is closely related to the general theme of *intuition;* for a child cannot be taught what he has no constitutional competency or faculty to receive. All education proceeds on the principle that the learner has capacity to receive the instruction imparted. There must be a latent ability which needs only to be awakened by the challenge which the facts present. In the knowledge of God, children receive the truth more readily than adults. This is not a feature of *immaturity*. It is due to *purity*. "… the pure in heart: for they shall see God."

On the general relation between tradition and intuition Dr. Samuel Harris declares: Why is the belief in the existence of a God the common characteristic of humanity? Why has it been so spontaneous, powerful and persistent? How comes man by the ideas of eternity, immensity, unconditionedness? Some say that they come from his knowledge of his own limitations. But how can I have the ideas of finiteness, conditionedness and imperfection except as I contrast them with the ideas of the unlimited, the unconditioned, the perfect? And if it is said that these ideas and the idea of the all-perfect God have been communicated by tradition, this only pushes us back on the question, How did it originate, so that man's ancestors had it to transmit? Certainly, if the belief in a divinity has no root in the constitution of man, if man has no rudiment of a faculty for knowing God, then this grand idea of the absolute Spirit, infinite in power and perfect in wisdom and love, could not have been originated by man nor even communicated to him by instruction or revelation from without. The

idea would simply be impossible to him. —*The Self-Revelation of God*, pp. 357–58

III. Reason

By the term *reason*, reference is made to the highest capacity in man—apart from revelation and the divine energy imparted to man—in his attainment unto the knowledge of God. It is that sanity in man which makes possible the pursuance of logical deductions based on those realities which he observes.

The general subject of *reason* may be considered either (1) on the ground of its own intrinsic value, or (2) on the ground of that which it has accomplished.

1. The Intrinsic Value. The intrinsic value of reason must incorporate the essential fact that reason is one of the characteristics belonging to God, and that the universe in its order, system, and purpose reflects the perfect reason which is in God. Similarly, all conclusions of rational beings are but the recognition of, and adaptation to, the primary reason which is in God. On the fact that man can know by inference or reason, only as it is assumed by him that God exists and that God acts in perfect reason, Dr. Samuel Harris states: If the mathematics by which astronomers make their calculations are not the mathematics of all space and time, all our astronomy is worthless. If the law of causation, and the principle of the uniformity of nature that the same complex of causes always produces the same effect, are not true of the whole universe, all our science is invalidated. If the law of love is not the law of all rational beings all ethical knowledge is annihilated. That the principles of reason are everywhere and always the same is the basis of the possibility of rational knowledge. But this is only saying that Reason supreme and universal, everywhere and always one and the same, is energizing in the universe and is the ultimate ground of its existence, constitution and development. And this Energizing Reason is God. Science assumes that the universe is a system of cosmos concatenated and ordered under principles and laws everywhere and always the same, and that by these it can determine what the ongoing of the universe is in its farthest extent in space and what it has been and will be in the remotest past and future. This is possible only because these truths and laws are eternal in the one absolute Reason who expresses them by his energizing in the constitution and evolution of the universe. And the theist adds that the evolution of the universe is the forever progressive expression and realization, not only of truths and laws, but also of rational ideals and ends; ideals and ends of wisdom and love, which are eternal and archetypal in the Absolute Reason, God. —*The Philosophical Basis of Theism*, rev. ed., p. 82

2. The Achievements. The value of reason as measured by its achievements may, in the case of God, be observed in the ongoing of the

universe. The reason which is in God being absolute, its results are infinitely perfect. The consummation of all things as predicted in the Scriptures will be a demonstration of this. The value of reason as measured by its achievements in its exercise by men is altogether another matter. All human limitations and imperfections are reflected in the exercise of human reason. Man being finite, his premise and his deduction are too often distorted by error. However, in no sphere has this exalted faculty in man been more exerted than in his attempt to prove, by natural deduction and apart from revelation, the existence of God. None has excelled in this endeavor as has Samuel Clarke (1675–1729). The naturalistic arguments which the great metaphysicians have expounded have, for the most part, had their origin with the ancients; but when followed, apart from revelation, these arguments have led to nothing more real than "a dumb idol of philosophy, neglected by the philosopher himself and unknown to the multitude; acknowledged in the closet and forgotten in the world." There was naught in these reasonings which made God real to any heart, nor was there enough to keep men from drifting into polytheism, pantheism, or any other antitheistic notion. Turning to idolatry was, to some extent, their attempt to realize the unworthy ideals which grew out of the error of their reasonings.

In general and apart from the usual theistic arguments men have advanced, the process of reasoning in the direction of the discovery of truth concerning God has followed three general methods, namely, by *negatives*, which plan called for the elimination of all imperfections, by *eminence*, which method ascribes all human excellencies to God, and by *deduction*, which process ascribes all perfections and qualities to God which reason assumes to be true of Deity.

IV. Revelation

God has spoken to man through nature, through the manifestation of Himself in His Son, and through the Scriptures of Truth. By means of the written Word of God, man has become possessed of truth in its full and absolute form. The dim lights of intuition, tradition, and reason, are submerged under the blazing irradiation of revealed truth. No measurement

can be placed on the advantage the Word of God is to those who humbly receive and profit by its message.

Of these four sources of knowledge concerning God, intuition and tradition add but little to the science of Systematic Theology. Reason and revelation are vital factors, yet revelation surpasses reason as the Word of God surpasses the thoughts of men.

The term *Theology Proper* is a somewhat modern designation which represents the logical starting point in the study of Systematic Theology, being, as it is, its primary theme, namely, a scientific investigation into what may be known of the existence, Persons, and characteristics of the triune God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Quite apart from the works of the members of the Godhead, Theology Proper is subject to a twofold division: (1) *Theism*, which concerns the existence and character of God as an extramundane Being, the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the universe; and (2) *Trinitarianism*, which is the recognition of the three Persons who comprise the Godhead, with specific reference to their functions and characteristics, and their relationships within the Godhead.

Naturalistic Theism

Chapter XI

Naturalistic Theistic Arguments

The etymology of the word *theism* would give it a wide range of application, but in common usage it has come to mean a belief in God, and incorporates a system of beliefs which constitutes a philosophy, restricted, indeed, somewhat to those findings and conclusions which human reason suggests. Even in its Biblical expression, theism is not confined to Christianity, though Christianity is a theistic system. The term *theism* could with practical value be more largely used and the field of truth which it connotes more clearly defined. I. H. Fichte writes: “It is now time again to install Theism, that inextinguishable and fundamental conviction of humanity, as a science in its true significance; but therewith equally to free it from so many obstructions and veils which long enough have darkened its true light. Theism is neither an hypothesis grubbed out by onesided speculation, as some represent it; nor is it an invention of priestcraft nor of superstitious fear, old ways of representing it which one still unexpectedly meets. It is also not the mere confession of any exclusive school or religion. But it is the ultimate goal of all investigation, silently effective in that which externally denies it” (*Theistische Weltansicht;* “Vorwort,” S. ix, cited by Harris, *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, rev. ed., p. 314).

Since all lines of general study of necessity are related to created things, there is no more exalted subject to which the finite mind may address itself than *theism* with its contemplation of the Person and character of God. Theism, as also the larger field of Theology Proper, excels all other themes, as infinity exceeds that which is finite. To quote William Cooke: “There is, indeed, no element of sublimity either actually existent or even conceivable in Nature, but what is indefinitely surpassed in the idea of God. The proposition, therefore, that there is a God, has no equal, no competitor; it stands alone in unrivalled and unapproachable grandeur; and if its sublimity does not prove its truth, it renders it at least worthy of inquiry, and imposes a weighty task on the unbeliever; for if it be false, it is not only the sublimest of all errors, but is an error more sublime than truth itself—yea, more ennobling and elevating to the mind than any truths which Nature can present to our contemplations. If this be a paradox, its solution is a task devolving on those who deny the being of a God” (*The Deity*, 2nd ed., p. 3).

In the Bible, man is ever reminded of the fact of his own limitations and of the knowledge-surpassing perfections of God. Antitheistic agnosticism has taken refuge in the denial of divine cognizability; but there is a true knowledge of God—true as far as it is able to go—which does not fully comprehend its subject. Such incompleteness, indeed, may be predicated of very much if not all of human cognizance. In his defense of antitheistic agnosticism, Hamilton declared: "The last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar—ἀγνώστῳ—to the unknown or unknowable God." It is probable that this inscription represented the highest level to which the unaided philosopher of Athens had attained (Acts 17:23). However, this conception became only a starting point in the God-revealing discourse of the inspired Apostle. There is an approach at this point to an engaging and closely related discussion of the dependability of thought itself as bearing on the contemplation of infinity; but it suffices to indicate that the limitations which antitheistic agnosticism confesses are due to their negative predications concerning God, which result in an utter void quite without substance for rational thinking. The vaguest of all impressions of God is that styled *Absolute*, which pantheism and agnosticism employ. Being without qualities or attributes, it is blank in itself and equally blank as a subject of thought. The lowest fetishism has substance beyond this. Over against this professed ignorance is the fact that God has revealed Himself to men, and this revelation is sustained and enforced by the illuminating work of the Holy Spirit. Added to this, also, is the twofold unveiling in which the Father reveals the Son, and the Son reveals the Father. It is written that the Son said, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. 11:27). By the authority of the Son it is asserted that eternal life is given, to the end that the Father and the Son might be know (John 17:3). When praying for His executioners, Christ said, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34), and the Apostle, when writing of Christ as the manifestation of the wisdom of God, discloses the precise nature of the ignorance of the executioners of Christ when he wrote: "… Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. 2:8). Beyond the mere knowledge of God, which is in the range of theism and common to multitudes, it is

possible to *know* God in that intimacy of a son with his own father. And what shall be said of those who by the Spirit press on to know the "deep things of God"? How, indeed, may "Abba, Father" be interpreted if God cannot be known? Agnosticism with its professed ignorance may well give heed to the words of Christ: "Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness" (Luke 11:35).

Passing beyond the low level of agnosticism, there are two distinct fields of theistic research—(a) that which is within those facts which obtain in the sphere of creation, or nature, and is subject to human reason; and (b) that which, though incorporating all that is disclosed in nature, is extended to include the limitless, absolute, and all-satisfying revelation set forth in the Scriptures of Truth. The former investigation is rightly designated *naturalistic theism*, and the latter *Biblical theism*.

Theology Proper enters every field from which any truth may be gained relative to the existence and character of God, or the mode of His Being. However, in view of the basic twofold division of the human family into *saved* and *unsaved* with their varying, attending abilities to comprehend divine truth there is peculiar advantage in a division of the general subject of theism into that which is *naturalistic* and that which is *Biblical*. The unsaved, natural man, though unable to receive the things of God, is, nevertheless, everywhere confronted with effects which connote a Cause and with design which connotes a Designer. To such a one, naturalistic theism with its restricted appeal to creation and reason is peculiarly adapted. To the devout student who, being saved, is able to receive the "deep things of God," there is none of the ultimate or consummating satisfaction in naturalistic theism that he experiences in Biblical theism. He should, notwithstanding, neglect no part of the divine revelation. All that belongs to naturalistic theism is of vital importance to the theological student in view of the fact that, to a limited degree, God is revealed in His creation (Ps. 19:1–6; Rom. 1:19, 20), and in view of the fact that unregenerate men, especially the educated, are groping in the sphere of those truths which belong in the circumscribed realm of naturalistic theism. To discover, exhibit, and defend all that reason affirms and that revelation discloses relative to that which may be known concerning God, is a task which Systematic Theology assumes. It is the function of naturalistic theism to adduce such arguments and to reach such conclusions as are within the

range of *reason;* while it is the function of Biblical theism to recognize, classify, and exhibit the truth set forth by *revelation*. These two fundamental sources of erudition, though wholly dissimilar as to the method they employ and the material they utilize, do, nevertheless, coalesce as the essential parts of the one grand theme—Theology Proper.

In the following discussions the author assumes no originality in the presentation of rational argument or in the discovery of revelation. Much that is presented has been the contention of writers on these subjects from the earliest times. In fact, so general are many of these lines of thought, as found in the vast literature which the present generation inherits, that to quote an original author would be difficult indeed, if not impossible. Since reason is native to man and revelation is largely an acquisition without which the majority of men have had to live and labor, it is proper that the findings of reason should be weighed before those of revelation.

The book of nature is as much God's book as is the Book of revelation. The universe is His work and therefore must attest His Being, and, as far as it can advance, unfold His ways. The voice of nature and the voice of revelation proceeding from the same source must harmonize; nor can either be slighted with impunity. It is not contended that the book of nature is comparable in extent, exactness, or elucidation, with the Book of revelation. Pious minds, wholly satisfied with the Scriptures of Truth, should not be indifferent to the testimony of nature; nor should the superficial and profane disregard the pleadings of reason. The sincere student of truth will hardly do so. He will not avert his eye from the light of God. As their names denote, philosophy is "the love of wisdom" and science is "the interpretation of nature"; therefore, no worthy philosopher will ignore the Source of all truth and no sincere scientist will shrink from the investigation or right evaluation of the claims of naturalistic theism. The proposition that *there is a God* introduces at once the cause of all causes, the finality of all philosophy, and the alpha and omega of all science. Consistency dictates that the student who is *en rapport* with the sequence which he observes between secondary causes and their effects, should not discontinue abruptly his investigation at the point where they are consummated in the discovery of the First Cause—even God. If the facts and forces of nature are engaging to the serious mind, how much more engaging should be the Person and power of the God who created nature! And how much is added to the

importance of this investigation into the proposition *there is a God* when the moral and saving values are included! It was Pilate's error hurriedly to inquire "What is truth?" and then as hurriedly to pass on without waiting for the incomparable answer which might have come from the lips of Him who is the embodiment of all truth.

When the evidence that there is a God is being pursued along the highway of reason, the laws of logic and of deduction are as essential as the truth which is involved. Palpable contradictions and absurdities are to be rejected, while every proved fact must be accepted and acted upon with fairness and uprightness. How else may any trustworthy progress be made?

The naturalistic theistic arguments, or arguments based on reason, attempt but a limited field of demonstration. The existence, personality, wisdom, and power of God are in view; but no proof from nature or reason can be educed to prove or establish the fact of the love and saving grace of God. All that is related to redemption belongs to revelation, and constitutes an imperative message, which is as much needed by those who believe in a God through nature or reason as it is by those to whom no knowledge of God has come.

Arguments in proof of the existence of God which are restricted to the limitations of naturalistic theism are subject to a twofold general classification, namely, the *argumentum a posteriori* and the *argumentum a priori*.

An *argumentum a posteriori* is inductive in its procedure and conforms more naturally to the processes of human reason. This form of argument moves from phenomena back to ground, from particulars back to principle, from consequent back to antecedent, and from effect back to cause. There are three primary *a posteriori* arguments usually offered in naturalistic theism—the *cosmological*, the *teleological*, and the *anthropological*. The *a posteriori* argument is employed when from the mechanism of a delicate and intricate instrument or work of art the fact of the master mind is implied with its power to design and form. As the Apostle has declared, "Every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God" (Heb. 3:4); that is, as the house proves the fact of a builder, so the universe proves the fact of a Creator.

The *argumentum a priori* is deductive in its procedure since it advances from ground to phenomena, from principle to particulars, from antecedent

to consequent, and from cause to effect. This form of reasoning is employed by the astronomer when from the laws which govern the movement of the solar system he determines the time of the return of a comet or of an eclipse; or when the paleontologist determines by the principles of comparative anatomy the size and form of prehistroic animals from some geological fossil. The *a priori* argument is one which is based on something which has gone before as an assumed reality, an innate belief, or intuitive impression. To postulate as a premise that miracles are impossible with its syllogistic conclusion that there are therefore no miracles, is to advance an *a priori* assumption and the argument based on that assumption is *a priori* in character. The *ontological* argument is the only *argumentum a priori* which teachers have advanced in the field of naturalistic theism. The *ontological* argument is exceedingly difficult, being too refined for the general rank and file of mankind to follow. Indeed great metaphysicians have declared themselves to be unconvinced as to its value as evidence. Over against this, as great or greater metaphysicians have stressed its worth.

The *cosmological* argument traces the cosmos back to its Maker. The *teleological* argument recognizes the rational ends in creation, while the *anthropological* argument differs from the *cosmological* and the *teleological* in the sphere of its logical principles, tracing from the mind and spirit of man back to the Creator. The *anthropological* argument is an extension into a specific realm of the more general features of the *cosmological* and *teleological* arguments. Though each of these three *a posteriori* arguments are distinct as to their field of proof, all three are required together to complete the full theistic argument. At best this complete argument, it will be observed, can attempt to prove but a limited body of truth concerning God. But much, indeed, is wrought if by these rationalistic lines of evidence the fact of the existence of God is indicated. To this, *Biblical theism* has very much to add as to the Person, attributes, purpose, and ways of God.

These *naturalistic theistic* arguments are now to be weighed separately and in the order already suggested.

I. The Cosmological Argument

The universe is a phenomenon or an effect which connotes an adequate cause. The cosmological argument adduces evidence that God exists and is

the First Cause of all things. Four theories have been entertained by philosophers and metaphysicians as to the origin of the material universe: (a) that the constitution of nature is eternal and its forms have existed forever; (b) that matter has existed forever, but its present constitution and form has been subject to self-development, which was the contention of Epicurus, and is the avowed credence of the modern atheist; (c) that matter is eternal, but its present arrangement and order is the work of God, which was the teaching of Plato, Aristotle and many others; (d) that matter is a created thing, being caused to exist from nothing by the engendering power of God, which is the Biblical revelation. The last of these four philosophies is not to be confounded with the impossible notion that the universe has evolved itself out of nothing. Its declaration is that God has by infinite power caused nonexistent matter to exist. It is written: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1:1), and, "… so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. 11:3). Leland declares: "Few, if any, of the ancient pagan philosophers acknowledged God to be, in the most proper sense, the Creator of the world. By calling him … 'the Maker of the world,' they did not mean, that he brought it out of nonexistence into being; but only that he built it out of pre-existent materials, and disposed it into a regular form and order" (*Necessity of Revelation*, cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 274).

The cosmological argument depends upon the validity of three contributing truths: (a) that every effect must have a cause; (b) that the effect is dependent upon its cause for its existence; and (c) that nature cannot produce itself. The essential, fundamental character of these contributing truths as well as the conclusive deduction that the universe is caused by the direct creation of a self-existent, intelligent, and eternal Cause will appear as the pursuance of this form of argument advances.

On the meaning of the word *cause*, a quotation from Dr. Charles Hodge is germane: "The common doctrine on this subject includes the following points. (1) A cause is something. It has real existence. It is not merely a name for a certain relation. It is a real entity, a substance. This is plain because a nonentity cannot act. If that which does not exist can be a cause, then nothing can produce something, which is a contradiction. (2) A cause must not only be something real, but it must have power or efficiency. There must be something in its nature to account for the effects which it

produces. (3) This efficiency must be adequate; that is, sufficient and appropriate to the effect. That this is a true view of the nature of a cause is plain." Dr. Hodge goes on to illustrate these points by human experience. He writes: (1) … We are causes. We can produce effects. And all three of the particulars above mentioned are included in our consciousness of ourselves as cause. We are real existences; we have power; we have power adequate to the effects which we produce. (2) We can appeal to the universal consciousness of men. All men attach this meaning to the word cause in their ordinary language. All men assume that every effect has an antecedent to whose efficiency it is due. They never regard mere antecedence, however uniform in the past, or however certain in the future, as constituting a causal relation. The succession of the seasons has been uniform in the past, and we are confident that it will continue uniform in the future; yet no man says that winter is the cause of summer. Every one is conscious that cause expresses an entirely different relation from that of mere antecedence. (3) This view of the nature of causation is included in the universal and necessary belief, that every effect must have a cause. That belief is not that one thing must always go before another thing; but that nothing can occur, that no change can be produced, without the exercise of power or efficiency somewhere; otherwise something could come out of nothing.—*Systematic Theology*, I, 209

The vital distinction between cause and effect inheres in the very nature of human speech. "The language of every nation is formed on the connection between cause and effect. For in every language there are not only many words directly expressing ideas of this subject, such as cause, efficiency, effect, production, produce, effectuate, create, generate, etc., or words equivalent to these; but every verb in every language, except the intransitive impersonal verbs, and the verb substantive, involves, of course, causation or efficiency, and refers always to an agent, or cause, in such a manner, that without the operation of this cause or agent, the verb would have no meaning. —All mankind, except a few Atheistical and skeptical philosophers, have thus agreed in acknowledging this connection, and they [the skeptics] have acknowledged it as fully as others in their customary language" (Dwight, *Theology*, I, 5, cited by Watson, *op. cit.*, I, 280–81).

The intuitive credence that every effect must have a cause is the basic principle upon which the cosmological argument advances to its certain conclusions. *Ex nihilo, nihil fit*—out of nothing, nothing can arise—is an axiom which has been recognized by philosophers of all the ages. To assert that anything has caused itself to exist is to assert that it acted before it existed, which is an absurdity. Nonexistence cannot engender existence. Had there ever been a situation in eternity when there was neither matter nor spirit, no being of any description—intelligent or unintelligent, created or uncreated—, the universe itself a boundless vacuity, thus it must have

remained forever. But two basic ideas are possible, namely, (a) that the universe with all its organized system and complex forms has existed forever—which theory, though void of any semblance of justification, has been the greatest impediment to the rational belief in a First Cause throughout all generations; and (b) that the universe is both designed and created by God and for worthy ends. The former is the atheist's contention, while the latter is that of the theist.

Reasoning from the assumed premise that there is no God, the atheist is compelled to predicate of matter that it is eternal and, therefore, self-existent. Matter is composed of innumerable particles which are unrelated or without dependence on each other. Thus to each particle must be attributed the element of eternal self-existence. Added to inert matter must be all chemical forces, nature's laws, and the principle of life in all its forms. The atheist cannot modify the demands of his philosophy based on the assumed premise that there is no God. Should he retrench by the slightest concession from his claim to the eternal self-existence of matter or allow it to pass as a hypothesis rather than an infallible certitude, the whole structure of atheism falls. The atheist boasts of his incredulity and slavish bondage to reason; yet if the idea that matter is self-existent and eternal be found to be no more than a conjecture or theory, all is surrendered. In fact, the notion that matter is a self-existent and eternal entity should be capable of demonstration, if true, and be all but an axiomatic proposition. This it is not. The atheistic philosophy rests on an unprovable hypothesis which has been weakened to the point of extinction by the later findings of science. The assertion that the creation of matter is impossible is based on the observation that the creation of matter is impossible to man. But who has ever substantiated the claim that the creation of matter is impossible to the infinite God? The claim that God created all things offers no contradiction, but merely assigns more ability to God than resides in man. Cudworth asserts: Because it is undeniably certain, concerning ourselves, and all imperfect beings, that none of these can create any *new substance*, men are apt to measure all things by their own scantling, and to suppose it universally impossible for any power whatever thus to create. But since it is certain, that imperfect beings can themselves produce *some things* out of nothing pre-existing, as *new cogitations*, *new local motion*, and *new modifications* of things corporeal, it is surely reasonable to think that an

absolutely perfect being can do something more, *i.e*. create *new substances*, or give them their whole being. And it may well be thought as easy for God or an omnipotent Being to make a whole world, matter and all, … as it is for us to create *a thought* or to move a finger, or for the sun to send out rays, or a candle light, or lastly, for an opaque body to produce an image of itself in a glass of water, or to project a shadow: all these imperfect things being but the *energies, rays, images*, or *shadows* of the Deity. For a substance to be made out of nothing by God, or a Being infinitely perfect, is not for it to be made out of nothing in the impossible sense, but it comes from him who is *all*. … But nothing is in itself impossible, which does not imply a contradiction: and though it be a contradiction for a thing to be and not to be at the same time, there is surely no contradiction in conceiving an imperfect being, which before was not, afterward to be.—Cited by Watson, *ibid*., I, 325–26

As a blind rejection of truth, the atheist's assertion that matter is self-existent and eternal is equalled by the unproved and absurd impression that nature is capable of self-production, that chance is adequate to account for the universe, or that necessity is the ground on which all things exist. Doubtless, in their determined rejection of God, men have encouraged themselves by turning to these false and God-dishonoring notions. However, the cosmological argument for the existence of God as the First Cause of all things stands unlessened in its evidential value.

By the same logic or reasoning which demonstrates that the existing universe cannot produce itself by acting before it existed, so the First Cause is not self-created, but is eternal and therefore self-existent, since He depends on nothing outside Himself, being caused by nothing. The proposal of a sequence of secondary causes, that is, that each cause is the effect of a prior cause, offers no solution of the problem of the origin of things. It is true that the mind may be stultified by the indefinite extension of such a sequence; but reason avers that there is an Original—a First Cause. This idea of the sequences of secondary causes eventuating in a first cause is illustrated by Wollaston: "Suppose a chain hung down out of the heavens from an unknown height, and though every link of it gravitated toward the earth, and what it hung upon was not visible, yet it did not descend, but kept its situation; and upon this a question should arise what supported or kept

up the chain, would it be a sufficient answer to say, that the first or lowest link hung upon the second, or the next above it; the second, or rather the first and second together, upon the third; and so on *in infinitum?* For what holds up the whole? … And thus it is, in a chain of causes and effects, tending, or (as it were) gravitating towards some end. The last, or lowest, depends, or (as one may say) is suspended, upon the cause above it. This again, if it be not the first cause, is suspended as an effect upon something above it" (*Religion of Nature Delineated*, cited by William Cooke, *The Deity*, 2nd ed., p. 40). To this Dr. Paley adds: "A chain composed of an infinite number of links can no more support itself, than a chain composed of a finite number of links. If we increase the number of links from ten to a hundred and from a hundred to a thousand, etc., we make not the smallest approach, we observe not the smallest tendency toward self-support" (cited by Watson, *op. cit*., I, 283). There is a First Cause self-existent and eternal, and that First Cause is wise enough to conceive of creation in all its marvel, and powerful enough to bring it into being. The statement of the cosmological argument by Locke is thus: "I exist: I did not always exist: whatever begins to exist must have a cause: the cause must be adequate: this *adequate* cause is unlimited: it must be God" (cited by Watson, *ibid*., I, xv). Similarly, the statement of the argument by Howe is conclusive: "(1) Somewhat hath existed from *eternity*: hence (2) must be uncaused: hence (3) independent: hence (4) necessary: hence (5) self-active: and hence (6) *originally vital*, and the *source of all life*" (cited by Watson, *ibid*.).

From the foregoing it will be observed the cosmological argument is stressed in proof of various qualities in God, namely, *self-existent, eternal, all-wise, powerful, unlimited, self-active, vital,* and *the source of all life*. Though these conclusions are reached quite apart from revelation and by reason alone, the illation is complete. Space cannot be given here to trace the extended discussion which precedes each of these arguments. This should be undertaken as collateral reading on the part of the student. A quotation from John Howe (1630–1705), English Puritan divine, will serve to state some aspects of the cosmological argument and also to disclose the manner in which the great logicians of the past ordered their attack upon atheism. To quote: We therefore begin with God's existence; for the evincing of which, we may be most assured, *First*, that there hath been somewhat or other from all eternity; or that, looking backward, somewhat of real being must be confessed eternal. Let such as have not been used to think

of any thing more than what they could see with their eyes, and to whom reasoning only seems difficult because they have not tried what they can do in it, but use their thoughts a little, and by moving them a few easy steps, they will soon find themselves as sure of this as that they see, or hear, or understand, or are any thing.

For being sure that something now is, (that you see, for instance, or are something, you must then acknowledge, that certainly something always was, and hath ever been, or been from all eternity; or else you must say, that, some time, nothing was; or that all being once was not. And so, since you find that something *now* is, there was a time when all being did *begin* to be; that is, that till that time there was nothing; but now, at that time something first began to be. For what can be plainer than that if all being *some time* was not, and *now* some being is, every thing of being had a beginning. And thence it would follow, that some being, that is, the first that ever began to be, did of itself start up out of nothing, or made itself to be when before nothing was.

But now, do you not plainly see that it is altogether impossible any thing should do so; that is, when it was as yet nothing, and when nothing at all as yet was, that it should make itself, or come into being of itself? For surely making itself is doing something. But can that which is nothing do any thing? Unto all doing there must be some doer. Wherefore a thing must be before it can do any thing; and therefore it would follow, that it was before it was; or *was* and *was not*, was *something* and *nothing*, at the same time. Yea, and that it was diverse from itself; for a cause must be a distinct thing from that which is caused by it. Wherefore it is most apparent, that some being hath *ever* been, or did *never begin* to be.

Whence, farther, it is also evident, *Secondly*, that some being was uncaused, or was ever of itself without any cause. For what never was from another had never any cause, since nothing could be its own cause. And somewhat, as appears from what hath been said, never was from another. Or it may be plainly argued thus; that either some being was uncaused, or all being was caused. But if all being was caused, then some one at least was the cause of itself: which hath been already shown impossible. Therefore the expression commonly used concerning the first being, that it was of itself, is only to be taken *negatively*, that is, that it was not of another; not *positively*, as if it did some time make itself. Or what there is positive signified by that form of speech, is only to be taken thus, that it was a being of that nature, as that it was impossible it should ever not have been; not that it did ever of itself step out of not being into being.

And now it is hence farther evident, *Thirdly*, that some being is independent upon any other, that is, whereas it already appears that some being did never depend on any other, as a productive cause, and was not beholden to any other, that it might come into being; it is thereupon equally evident that it is simply independent, or cannot be beholden to any for its continued being. For what did never need a productive cause, doth as little need a sustaining or conserving cause. And to make this more plain, either some being is independent, or all being is dependent. But there is nothing without the compass of all being whereon it may depend. Wherefore to say, that all being doth depend, is to say, it depends on nothing, that is, that it depends not. For to depend on nothing, is not to depend. It is therefore a manifest contradiction to say that all being doth depend; against which it is no relief to urge, that all beings do circularly depend on one another. For so, however the whole circle or sphere of being should depend on nothing; or one at last depend on itself, which negatively taken, as before, is true, and the thing we contend for—that one, the common support of all the rest, depends not on any thing without itself.

> Whence also it is plainly consequent, *Fourthly*, that such a Being is necessary, or doth necessarily exist: that is, that it is of such a nature as that it could not or cannot but be. For what is in being, neither by its own choice, nor any others, is necessarily. But what was not made by itself, (which hath been shown to be impossible,) nor by any other, (as it hath been proved something was not,) it is manifest, it neither depended on its choice, nor any other's that it is. And therefore, its existence is not owing to choice at all, but to the necessity of its own nature. Wherefore it is always by a simple, absolute, natural necessity; being of a nature to which it is altogether repugnant and impossible ever not to have been, or ever to cease from being. And now having gone thus far, and being assured, that hitherto we feel the ground firm under us; that is, having gained a full certainty, that there is an eternal, uncaused, independent, necessary Being, and therefore actually and everlastingly existing; we may advance one step farther.
>
> And with equal assurance add, *Fifthly*, that this eternal, independent, uncaused, necessary Being, is self active; that is, (which is at present meant,) not such as acts upon itself, but that which hath the power of acting upon other things, in and of itself, without deriving it from any other. Or at least that there is such a Being as is eternal, uncaused, &c, having the power of action in and of itself. For either such a Being as hath been already evinced is of itself active or unactive, or hath the power of action of itself or not. If we will say the latter, let it be considered what we say, and to what purpose we say it …—*Living Temple*, cited by Watson, *ibid*., I, 281–84

Having indicated the untruth of the atheist's assertion that matter with all its forms is eternal—which conjecture the atheist advances in support of his credence that there is no God, the *argumentum a posteriori* in its cosmological form thus begins with the recognition of the universe as a phenomenon or effect which connotes a cause, and proceeds to indicate that that cause is *self-existent, eternal, all-wise, powerful, unlimited, self-active, vital*, and *the source of all life*. If there be not a God, from whence does the phenomenon or effect, which the universe is, arise? To what First Cause may all these so evident attributes be ascribed?

II. The Teleological Argument

The teleological argument, being *a posteriori*, adduces evidence that God exists from the presence of order and adaptation in the universe. The term *teleology* is the compound of τέλος and λόγος and thus signifies *the doctrine of ends* or *rational purpose*. The principle which is germane to the cosmological argument is not abandoned, but, building upon that principle, the teleological argument proceeds to establish, by rational evidence, the intelligence and purpose of God as manifested in the design, function, and consummation of all things. By so much the existence of God is declared.

The teleological argument hardly could be stated better than it is by the Psalmist: “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?” (Ps. 94:9, 10). The fact of design, which is exhibited in every created thing, exposes the acumen and rational purpose of the Creator. This manifest intent which characterized all of God’s works is illustrated—as nearly as the finite can illustrate the infinite—by the fact of design and purpose which is exhibited in the achievements of men, which achievements, because of this design, display the acumen and rational purpose of men. In this age, which is characterized by mechanical development beyond any other, men are justly impressed with that which human ingenuity and inventiveness have effected. But man really originates nothing, and his most cherished feat of devising is never more than a discovery and utilizing of provisions and forces which were already wrought into the creation which God has effected. When man glories in his discovery of the secrets of nature, it is pertinent to inquire who has so created and constituted nature with its unified and systematized marvels, so wonderful, indeed, that no human mind can comprehend its telescopic extent or discern its microscopic perfection. From this array of incomprehensible wonders, man snatches an occasional fraction of something, which fraction at best could be no more than a feeble representation of that whole of which it is a part. It may be concluded, then, that it is the function of the cosmological argument to indicate the evident existence and power of the Creator as these attributes are displayed in the cosmos He has made; to the same end, it is the function of the teleological argument to indicate the evident existence and all-comprehensive design and reason of the Creator as displayed in the order, construction, and end of all things which enter into the constituted universe.

Probably there is no division of naturalistic theism so engaging or so capable of almost endless illustration and expansion as the teleological argument. As to the structure or trend of the argument, the following is quoted from Bowne: If, then, knowledge be possible, we must declare that the world-ground proceeds according to thought-laws and principles, that it has established all things in rational relations, and balanced their interaction in quantitative and qualitative proportion, and measured this proportion by number. “God geometrizes,” says Plato. “Number is the essence of reality,”

says Pythagoras. And to this agree all the conclusions of scientific thought. The heavens are crystallized mathematics. All the laws of force are numerical. The interchanges of energy and chemical combination are equally so. Crystals are solid geometry. Many organic products show similar mathematical laws. Indeed, the claim is often made that science never reaches its final form until it becomes mathematical. But simple existence in space does not imply motion in mathematical relations, or existence in mathematical forms. Space is only the formless ground of form, and is quite compatible with the irregular and amorphous. It is equally compatible with the absence of numerical law. The truly mathematical is the work of the spirit. Hence the wonder that mathematical principles should be so pervasive, that so many forms and processes in the system represent definite mathematical conceptions, and that they should be so accurately weighed and measured by number.

If the cosmos were a resting existence, we might possibly content ourselves by saying that things exist in such relations once for all, and that there is no going behind this fact. But the cosmos is no such rigid monotony of being; it is, rather, a process according to intelligible rules; and in this process the rational order is perpetually maintained or restored. The weighing and measuring continually goes on. In each chemical change just so much of one element is combined with just so much of another. In each change of place the intensities of attraction and repulsion are instantaneously adjusted to correspond. Apart from any question of design, the simple fact of qualitative and quantitative adjustment of all things, according to fixed law, is a fact of the utmost significance. The world-ground works at a multitude of points, or in a multitude of things, throughout the system, and works in each with exact reference to its activities in all the rest. The displacement of an atom by a hair's breadth demands a corresponding re-adjustment in every other within the grip of gravitation. But all are in constant movement, and hence re-adjustment is continuous and instantaneous. The single law of gravitation contains a problem of such dizzy vastness that our minds faint in the attempt to grasp it; but when the other laws of force are added the complexity defies all understanding. In addition we might refer to the building processes in organic forms, whereby countless structures are constantly produced or maintained, and always with regard to the typical form in question. But there is no need to dwell upon this point.

Here, then, is a problem, and we have only the two principles of intelligence and non-intelligence, of self-directing reason and blind necessity, for its solution. The former is adequate, and is not far-fetched and violent. It assimilates the facts to our own experience, and offers the only ground of order of which that experience furnishes any suggestion. If we adopt this view all the facts become luminous and consequent.

If we take the other view, then we have to assume a power which produces the intelligible and rational, without being itself intelligent and rational. It works in all things, and in each with exact reference to all, yet without knowing anything of itself or of the rules it follows, or of the order it founds, or of the myriad products compact of seeming purpose which it incessantly produces and maintains. If we ask why it does this, we must answer,

> Because it must. If we ask how we know that it must, the answer must be, By hypothesis. But this reduces to saying that things are as they are because they must be. That is, the problem is abandoned altogether. The facts are referred to an opaque hypothetical necessity, and this turns out, upon inquiry, to be the problem itself in another form. There is no proper explanation except in theism.—BOWNE, *Philosophy of Theism*, pp. 66–69, cited by Miley, *Systematic Theology*, I, 87–89

On the combining for an advantageous end of otherwise disassociated elements with the impelling evidence of design which the result affords, Paul Janet writes: "When a complex combination of heterogeneous phenomena is found to agree with the possibility of a future act, which was not contained beforehand in any of these phenomena in particular, this agreement can only be comprehended by the human mind by a kind of pre-existence, in an ideal form, of the future act itself, which transforms it from a result into an end—that is to say, into a final cause" (*Final Causes*, p. 85, cited by Miley, *ibid*., p. 90).

In elucidation of this phenomenon of the combination of disassociated elements into one advantageous end, Dr. John Miley gives this illustration: "The hull of a ship, masts, sails, anchors, rudder, compass, chart, have no necessary connection, and in relation to their physical causalities are heterogeneous phenomena. The future use of a ship is not contained in any one of them, but is possible through their combination. This combination in the fully equipped ship has no interpretation in our rational intelligence except in the previous existence of its use in human thought and purpose. The use of the ship, therefore, is not the mere result of its existence, but the final cause of its construction" (*ibid*., I, 90).

The human organism with its relation to the environment in which it functions is a display of design, and therefore denotes both the existence and acumen of the Designer. On this feature of the argument. Paul Janet has written: The external physical world and the internal laboratory of the living being are separated from each other by impenetrable veils, and yet they are united to each other by an incredible pre-established harmony. On the outside there is a physical agent called light; within, there is fabricated an optical machine adapted to the light: outside, there is an agent called sound; inside, an acoustic machine adapted to sound; outside, vegetables and animals; inside, stills and alembics adapted to the assimilation of these substances: outside, a medium, solid, liquid, or gaseous; inside, a thousand

means of locomotion, adapted to the air, the earth, or the water. Thus, on the one hand, there are the final phenomena called sight, hearing, nutrition, flying, walking, swimming, etc.; on the other, the eyes, the ears, the stomach, the wings, the fins, the motive members of every sort. We see clearly in these examples the two terms of the relation—on the one hand, a system; on the other, the final phenomenon in which it ends. Were there only system and combination, as in crystals, still, as we have seen, there must have been a special cause to explain that system and that combination. But there is more here; there is the agreement of a system with a phenomenon which will only be produced long after and in new conditions, —consequently a correspondence which cannot be fortuitous, and which would necessarily be so if we do not admit that the final and future phenomenon is precisely the bond of the system and the circumstance which, in whatever manner, has predetermined the combination.

> Imagine a blind workman, hidden in a cellar, and destitute of all intelligence, who, merely yielding to the simple need of moving his limbs and his hands, should be found to have forged, without knowing it, a key adapted to the most complicated lock which can possibly be imagined. This is what nature does in the fabrication of the living being.
>
> Nowhere is this pre-established harmony, to which we have just drawn attention, displayed in a more astonishing manner than between the eye and the light. “In the construction of this organ,” says Trendelenburg, “we must either admit that light has triumphed over matter and has fashioned it, or else it is the matter itself which has become the master of the light. This is at least what should result from the law of efficient causes, but neither the one nor the other of these two hypotheses takes place in reality. No ray of light falls within the secret depths of the maternal womb, where the eye is formed. Still less could inert matter, which is nothing without the energy of light, be capable of comprehending it. Yet the light and the eye are made the one for the other, and in the miracle of the eye resides the latent consciousness of the light. The moving cause, with its necessary development, is here employed for a higher service. The end commands the whole, and watches over the execution of the parts; and it is with the aid of the end that the eye becomes the light of the body.”—*Op. cit*., pp. 42, 43, cited by Miley, *ibid*., pp. 90–91

The elaboration of the teleological argument by William Paley (1743–1805) as set forth in his *Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity collected from the Appearances of Nature*, has nothing to excel it. In the following brief passage in which he challenges those who suppose the universe to be the result of chance, his clear thinking and exquisite diction are disclosed: “By what art would they make a seed? And which way would they inspire it with a seminal form? And they that think this whole globe of the earth was compacted by the casual (or fatal)

coalition of particles of matter, by what magic would they conjure up so many to come together as to make one clod? We vainly hunt with a lingering mind after miracles; if we did not more vainly mean by them nothing else but novelties, we are compassed about with such: and the greatest miracle is, that we see them not. You with whom the daily productions of nature (as you call it) are so cheap, see if you can do the like. Try your skill upon a rose. Yea, but you must have pre-existent matter? But can you ever prove the Maker of the world had so, or even defend the possibility of uncreated matter? And suppose they had the free grant of all the matter between the crown of their head and the moon, could they tell what to do with it, or how to manage it, so as to make it yield them one single flower, that they might glory in as their own production?" (cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 304).

Again, a quotation from Cicero to the same end but discloses the fact that the naturalistic theistic arguments were in use a century and more before Christ: "Can anything be done by chance which has all the marks of design? Four dice may by chance turn up their aces; but, do you think that four hundred dice, when thrown by chance, will turn up four hundred aces? Colours, when thrown upon canvas without design, may have some resemblance to a human face, but do you think they could make a picture as beautiful as the Coan Venus? A hog, in turning up the ground with his nose, may make something in the form of the letter A; but do you think that a hog could describe, on the ground, the Andromache of Ennius? Carneades imagined that, in the stone quarries at Chios, he found in a stone that was split a representation of the head of a little Pan (or sylvan deity). I believe he might find a figure not unlike; but surely not such a one as you would say had been formed by an excellent sculptor like Scopas. The truth is, indeed, that chance never perfectly imitates design" (*De Divinatione, lib. i., cap. 13*, cited by Cooke, *The Deity*, pp. 134–35).

An interesting illustration of the influence of the teleological argument upon an unnamed skeptic is reported by Dr. William Cooke as follows: Some years ago, I had the misfortune to meet with the fallacies of Hume on

the subject of causation. His specious sophistries shook the faith of my reason as to the being of a God, but could not overcome the repugnance of my heart to a negation so monstrous, and consequently left that infinite, restless craving for some point of fixed repose, which atheism not only cannot give, but absolutely and madly disaffirms.

> One beautiful evening in May, I was reading, by the light of a setting sun, my favourite Plato. I was seated on the grass, interwoven with golden blooms, immediately on the crystal Colorado of Texas. Dim, in the distant west, arose, with smoky outlines, massy and irregular, the blue cones of an offshoot of the Rocky Mountains.
>
> I was perusing one of the academician's most starry dreams. It laid fast hold of my fancy, without exciting my faith. I wept to think it could not be true. At length I came to that startling sentence, "*God geometrizes*." "Vain reverie!" I exclaimed, as I cast the volume at my feet. It fell close by a beautiful little flower, that looked fresh and bright, as if it had just fallen from the bosom of a rainbow. I broke it from its silvery stem, and began to examine its structure. Its stamens were five in number; its calyx had five parts; its delicate coral base, five, parting with rays, expanding like the rays of a Texas star. This combination of five in the same blossom appeared to me very singular. I had never thought on such a subject before. The last sentence I had just read in the page of the pupil of Socrates was ringing in my ears —"*God geometrizes*." There was the text, written long centuries ago; and here this little flower, in the remote wilderness of the West, furnished the commentary. There suddenly passed, as it were, before my eyes a faint flash of light—I felt my heart leap in my bosom. The enigma of the universe was opened. Swift as thought, I calculated the chances against the production of those three equations of five in only one flower, by any principle devoid of reason to perceive number. I found that there were one hundred and twenty-five chances against such a supposition. I extended the calculation to two flowers by squaring the sums last mentioned. The chances amounted to the large sum of fifteen thousand six hundred and twenty-five. I cast my eyes around the forest: the old woods were literally alive with those golden blooms, where countless bees were humming, and butterflies sipping honey-dews.
>
> I will not attempt to describe my feelings. My soul became a tumult of radiant thoughts. I took up my beloved Plato from the grass, where I had tossed him in a fit of despair. Again and again I pressed him to my bosom, with a clasp tender as a mother's around the neck of her sleeping child. I kissed the book and the blossom, alternately bedewing them both with tears of joy. In my wild enthusiasm I called to the little birds on the green boughs, trilling their cheery farewells to departing day—"Sing on, sunny birds; sing on, sweet minstrels! Lo! ye and I have a God."—*Ibid*., pp. 136–38

III. The Anthropological Argument

The anthropological argument follows the same *a posteriori* order as is followed by the two preceding arguments, but unlike the cosmological argument which contemplates the entire cosmos and the teleological argument which observes the element of design as manifest in all the universe, the anthropological argument is restricted to the field of evidence,

as to the existence of God and His qualities, which may be drawn from the constitution of man. There are philosophical and moral features in man's constitution which may be traced back to find their origin in God, and on that ground this argument has been styled either the *philosophical argument* or the *moral argument*. But since the latitude comprehended in the argument is the whole of man's being, the all-inclusive designation—*anthropological argument*—is more satisfactory.

On the basis of the principle declared by the Psalmist—"He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? … he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?"—the anthropological argument indicates that the elements which are recognized as the innate properties of man must be possessed by his Creator. As a ground for proof, the organic constitution of man belongs to the teleological argument, but there are specific features in man's being which supply exceptional proof of the divine finality, and these are properly stated in the anthropological argument.

At the opening of his discussion of the anthropological argument, Dr. A. A. Hodge states: "The Cosmological argument led us to an eternal self-existent First Cause. The argument from the order and adaptation discovered in the processes of the universe revealed this great First Cause as possessing intelligence and will; that is, as a personal spirit. The moral or anthropological argument furnishes new data for inference, at once confirming the former conclusions as to the fact of the existence of a personal intelligent First Cause, and at the same time adding to the conception the attributes of holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. The argument from design includes the argument from cause, and the argument from righteousness and benevolence includes both the arguments from cause and from design, and adds to them a new element of its own" (*Outlines of Theology*, p. 41).

Man is composed of that which is material and that which is immaterial, and these two constituent parts are unrelated. Matter possesses the attributes of extension, form, inertia, divisibility, and chemical affinity; while the immaterial part of man possesses the attributes of thought, reason, sensibility, consciousness, and spontaneity. Were it possible to account for the origin of the physical part of man by a theory of natural development

(which it is not), the immaterial, as to its origin, remains an insoluble problem apart from the recognition of a sufficient cause.

Though in its general organic structure the material part of man is similar to that of the higher forms of animals, it is so refined as to be superior to all features of material creation. The hand of man executes the exalted designs of his mind in all manner of construction and art; his voice answers the demands of an elevated mind for speech; his ear hears and his eye sees into realms of reality beyond and foreign to the beast. The human body is thus a specific proof of a Creator, since it cannot be accounted for otherwise.

The immaterial part of man, which embodies the elements of life, intellect, sensibility, will, conscience, and an inherent belief in God, presents even a more insistent demand for an adequate cause. Life cannot evolve from inert matter, and though the evolutionist claims to trace all that now is back to an original fire mist, or protoplasm, all these forms of life, according to this theory, must have been present in latent form in that original something. Such unproved theories would not be tolerated in any field of investigation other than that wherein the darkness of the natural mind is demonstrated in its inability to receive the things of God. Again, the intelligence of man with its achievements in discovery, invention, science, literature, and art, exacts with relentless requisition an adequate cause. Similarly, and under the same unyielding compulsion, both sensibility and will, with their transcendent capacities, demand a worthy cause. And, finally, the conscience as well as the inherent belief in God can be accounted for on no other ground than that man has come forth from One who possesses all these attributes to an infinite degree. A blind force, however exceptional it may be, could never produce a man with intellect, sensibility, will, conscience, and inherent belief in a Creator. The product of a blind force will never betake itself to the pursuit of art and science, and the worship of God.

According to the evolutionary theory of natural development, the creature is the effect of a natural cause and is molded and fashioned according to forces over which he had no control; yet suddenly this effect arises and exerts authority and power over the very nature that is supposed to have produced him, and bends all natural resources to serve his purpose and will. Is it not pertinent to inquire when man became lord over the creation which is supposed to have wrought him? “Can it be conceived,”

Janet inquires, “that the agent thus endowed with the power of co-ordinating nature for ends is himself a simple result that nature has realized, without proposing to itself an end? Is it not a sort of miracle to admit into the mechanical series of phenomena a link which suddenly should have the power to reverse, in some sont, the order of the series, and which, being itself only a consequent resulting from an infinite number of antecedents, should henceforth impose on the series this new and unforeseen law, which makes of the consequent the law and rule of the antecedent?” (*Final Causes*, pp. 149, 150, cited by Miley, *Systematic Theology*, I, 103.) Writing of the moral aspects of the anthropological argument, Dr. Augustus H. Strong states: The argument is a complex one, and may be divided into three parts. 1. Man’s intellectual and moral nature must have had for its author an intellectual and moral Being. The elements of the proof are as follows:—(a) Man, as an intellectual and moral being, has had a beginning upon the planet. (*b*) Material and unconscious forces do not afford a sufficient cause for man’s reason, conscience, and free will. (*c*) Man, as an effect, can be referred only to a cause possessing self-consciousness and a moral nature, in other words, personality. … 2. Man’s moral nature proves the existence of a holy Lawgiver and judge. The elements of the proof are:—(*a*) Conscience recognizes the existence of a moral law which has supreme authority. (*b*) Known violations of this moral law are followed by feelings of ill-desert and fears of judgment. (*c*) This moral law, since it is not self-imposed, and these threats of judgment, since they are not self-executing, respectively argue the existence of a holy will that has imposed the law, and of a punitive power that will execute the threats of the moral nature. … 3. Man’s emotional and voluntary nature proves the existence of a Being who can furnish in himself a satisfying object of human affection and an end which will call forth man’s highest activities and ensure his highest progress. Only a Being of power, wisdom, holiness, and goodness, and all these indefinitely greater than any that we know upon the earth, can meet this demand of the human soul. Such a Being must exist. Otherwise man’s greatest need would be unsupplied, and belief in a lie be more productive of virtue than belief in the truth.—*Systematic Theology*, pp. 45, 46

Summarizing the scope and value of the *a posteriori* arguments, it may be observed: (a) In the cosmological argument the existence of the cosmos, originating in time, constitutes proof of a First Cause who is self-existent and eternal and who possesses intelligence, power, and will. (b) In the teleological argument the evidence of design extends the proof of the intelligence of the First Cause into details of telescopic grandeur and microscopic perfection far beyond the feeble ability of man to discover or comprehend. And (c) in the anthropological argument, while confirming the proofs advanced in the two preceding arguments, an added indication is secured which suggests the elements in the First Cause of intellect, sensibility, and will; and the moral feature of conscience in man declares his Creator to be actuated by holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

IV. the Ontological Argument

"Ontology is the science or systematic discussion of real being; the philosophical theory of reality; the doctrine of the categories or universal and necessary characteristics of all existence" (*New Standard Dictionary*, 1913). The ontological argument in theism consists in a course of reasoning from God as the absolute First Cause of all things to the things He has caused—specifically, the inherent idea that God exists. God is recognized as the Creator of the human mind in which this conception of Himself is found. The fact of the existence of God is involved in this congenital idea. As the claim of idealism is that material things do not exist, being, as asserted, only an impression of the mind, the ontological argument is a reversal of idealism in that it avers that there is reality or substance where the mind recognizes it to exist. According to this argument the existence of God is certified by the fact that the human mind believes that He does exist. It is an *argumentum a priori* and, as to its value in proof of the existence of God, metaphysicians have always differed. Dr. Shedd uses in his treatment of this one argument two-thirds of the space given to theistic proofs, while Bishop R. S. Foster declares that he had never caught the meaning or force of the argument at all. Anselm (1033?–1109) is given credit for its first enunciation and his statement of it has never benefited by later revisions. The following from the Encyclopaedia Britannica under *Anselm* is clarifying: "In the *Proslogion*, as the author himself tells us, the aim is to prove God's existence by a single argument. This argument is the celebrated ontological proof. God is that Being than whom none greater can be conceived. Now, if that than which nothing greater can be conceived existed only in the intellect, it would not be the absolute greatest, for we could add to it existence in reality. It follows, then, that the Being than whom nothing greater can be conceived, *i.e.*, God, necessarily has real existence" (14th ed.). Gaunilo, the monk, immediately questioned this argument, stating that we readily form the idea of purely imaginary beings, and reality or actual existence cannot be predicated of these ideas. Anselm's reply was that the objection was cogent with respect to imperfect or finite beings, because with them actual existence is not the necessary content of the conception; but that the objection could not apply to the most perfect Being since actual existence is the very essential feature of the impression. Gaunilo declared

that the idea of a “lost island” does not imply that there is such in reality. To this Anselm replied that if Gaunilo will show that the idea of the “lost island” implies *necessary* existence, he will find the island for him and guarantee that it will never be lost again (see Shedd, *Theology,* I, 226–27).

Dr. Samuel Harris writes:

> It is evident therefore that the human mind cannot rid itself of the idea of the absolute. It persists in the implicit consciousness, regulating thought, even when theoretically disclaimed. It is evident that without the assumption, explicit or implicit, that the absolute Being exists, the reason of man cannot solve its necessary problems, nor rest satisfied with any intellectual attainment, nor hold steadfastly to the reality of its knowledge, nor know the continuity, the unity and reality of the universe. The necessary conclusion is that the principle that the absolute Being exists is a primitive and necessary law of thought, a constituent element of reason, and a necessary postulate in all thinking about being.
>
> In this exposition of the origin of the idea of the absolute Being and our belief of its existence, I have set forth the so-called *a priori* argument for the existence of God in its true significance. This is an argument from the idea of the absolute or perfect Being to its existence. In order to the conclusiveness of this argument it must be shown both that the idea of the perfect Being is a necessary idea of reason, and that the existence of the Being is necessarily included in the idea; that is, its existence must be as necessary to the reason as the idea of it. This is what has been shown.—*Self-Revelation of God,* pp. 163–64

Of the same argument Milton Valentine writes:

“The germs of this were involved in Plato’s doctrine of ‘ideas,’ but it was first formulated by Anselm in the eleventh century. From the existence in the human mind of the idea of a ‘most perfect being,’ it concluded that the most perfect being exists—because real existence is a necessary part of the idea of the most perfect being. Descartes, Bishop Butler, Leibnitz, Cousin, and many other eminent writers have used this method of argument; but, standing alone, it has often been shown to be unsound, in confounding real objective existence with the simple idea of it in the mind” (*Christian Theology*, I, 189).

Similarly, Dr. Charles Hodge states: “If this argument has any validity, it is unimportant. It is only saying that what must be actually is. If the idea of God as it exists in every man’s mind includes that of actual existence, then so far as the idea goes, he who has the one has the other. But the argument does not show how the ideal implies the real” (*Systematic Theology*, I, 205).

On the same argument Richard Watson writes: “No instance is however I believe on record of an Atheistic conversion having been produced by this process, and it may be ranked among the over zealous attempts of the

advocates of truth. It is well intentioned, but unsatisfactory, and so far as on the one hand it has led to a neglect of the more convincing, and powerful course of argument drawn from '*the things which do appear*'; and on the other, has encouraged a dependence upon a mode of investigation, to which the human mind is inadequate, which in many instances is an utter mental delusion, and which scarcely two minds will conduct in the same manner; it has probably been mischievous in its effects by inducing a skepticism not arising out of the nature of the case, but from the imperfect and unsatisfactory investigations of the human understanding, pushed beyond the limit of its powers" (*Theological Institutes*, I, 330).

Conclusion

The *argumentum a posteriori* in its three parts has always been valid and vital. The *argumentum a priori* has wrought little or nothing but idle speculation. Of this distinction between the usefulness of the two, Dr. John Dick states: “It is by this argument [the *a posteriori*] that we rise to the knowledge of the uncaused existence of the Author of the universe, and not by abstract speculations on necessity. We should never have known that he exists, but from our own existence and that of other beings around us; and as in this way we ascertain that he does and must exist, it seems absurd to talk of proving his existence *a priori*. Whatever use may be made of this argument to prove his perfections, it cannot be employed in proof of his being. Dr. Clarke himself acknowledges, that ‘the argument *a posteriori* is by far the most generally useful argument, most easy to be understood, and in some degree suited to all capacities; and, therefore, it ought always to be distinctly insisted on’” (*Theology*, p. 83).

To the spiritual Christian to whom God’s illuminating, authoritative “Thus saith the LORD” of the Scriptures has come, little will be added by rationalistic theistic arguments; however, these arguments exist and do contribute to theology that which reason suggests. On this ground these arguments should be pondered by every student of doctrine.

Chapter XII

Antitheistic Theories

The Natural man who does not receive or know the things of God (1 Cor. 2:14), has in all ages sought to answer the problem of a visible universe and by his efforts has unceasingly proved this divine estimation of his limitations to be true. It may be difficult for the spiritually enlightened mind to comprehend the fog of confusion in which the often sincere but unregenerate men are plunged. It should be remembered that argument does not create divine enlightenment. Only by the new birth can one "see the kingdom of God." The cure for spiritual darkness is "the light of the world." The gropings of natural men—and sometimes they are men of great mental powers—are varied and complex. However, they have formulated certain general lines of philosophy, and these, like the false religions of the earth, bespeak the spiritual limitations of fallen man.

Theism means a belief in God and in its naturalistic form is a rational philosophy regarding God which is restricted to the one divine Essence. Biblical theism believes that Essence, according to revelation, subsists in three Persons. As a rationalistic philosophy, naturalistic theism is sustained by the traditional arguments already considered, and may be distinguished from certain antitheistic theories.

The cognizance of nature on the part of man and his restless investigation into the facts of the universe and its origin are traced in the history of philosophy. Many schools of thought have appeared, some of which exist at the present time only in the records which constitute their history. These systems of thought reflect the gropings of the human mind when unaided by revelation. It is recorded that some philosophers rejected revelation when it came to them (Rom. 1:18–32). It is also true that others to whom revelation was denied would have responded to, and rejoiced in, the glorious light which it affords. Plato has said: "The philosophers are able to grasp the eternal and immutable … those who set their affections on that which in each case really exists." Sincerity which welcomes added light is reflected in these utterances. The earlier philosophers were occupied with cosmology and not until Socrates and Plato was there any serious consideration of moral or intellectual phenomena. The fact that Socrates confused knowledge with virtue suggests the immaturity which his

philosophy has evinced. The student of theology will do well to become familiar with the principal antitheistic theories of this and past ages; for these, being more or less native to the unregenerate mind, are ever reappearing in one form or another. Some of these theories are:

I. Atheism

An open and positive denial of the existence of God is indicated by the term *atheism* (ἄθεος—'no God'). The designation is not properly applied to mere ignorance of God. A dogmatic atheist is one who assumes himself informed as to theistic claims yet emphatically denies the existence of God. It is probable that a consistent atheist has never existed. He is a sporadic individual who has forced intuition and reason out of poise in an attempt to maintain an assumed, a negative, premise. Man could not, and therefore does not, ever fully adjust himself to the logical conclusions of atheism. If he did so adjust himself, he would not only repudiate God, all moral value, and spiritual reality, but would likewise repudiate the human constitution on its immaterial side. For the consistent atheist there could be no mind, no conscience, no morality, no sensibility, and no will. The theory of the atheist cannot support its own assertions because of the element of mind which such support requires. To the atheist the material universe is only an accident and all its marvels of coordination and development are fortuitous. He knows no cause for anything, even his own existence. He has no hope for himself in time or eternity. When he denies the existence of God it is by an assumption of knowledge which transcends the limitations which his negative creed allows. To quote John Foster (1770–1843):

> The wonder then turns on the great process, by which a man could grow to the immense intelligence that can know that there is no God. What ages and what lights are requisite for this attainment! This intelligence involves the very attributes of Divinity, while a God is denied. For unless this man is omnipresent, unless he is at this moment in every place in the universe, he cannot know but there may be in some place manifestations of a Deity, by which even *he* would be overpowered. If he does not know absolutely every agent in the universe, the one that he does not know may be God. If he is not himself the chief agent in the universe, and does not know what is so, that which is so may be God. If he is not in absolute possession of all the propositions that constitute universal truth, the one which he wants may be that there is a God. If he cannot with certainty assign the cause of all that he perceives to exist, that cause may be a God. If he does not know every thing that has been done in immeasurable ages that are past, some things may have been done by a God. Thus, unless he knows all things, that is, precludes another Deity by being one himself, he cannot know that

the Being whose existence he rejects does not exist. But he must *know* that he does not exist, else he deserves equal contempt and compassion for the temerity with which he firmly avows his rejection and acts accordingly.—*Essays*, essay i, letter v, cited by Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 1, 113

No more comprehensive definition of atheism has been found than the following by Dr. A. A. Hodge:

> Atheism, according to its etymology, signifies a denial of the being of God. It was applied by the ancient Greeks to Socrates and other philosophers, to indicate that they failed to conform to the popular religion. In the same sense it was applied to the early Christians. Since the usage of the term Theism has been definitely fixed in all modern languages, atheism necessarily stands for a denial of the existence of a personal Creator and Moral Governor. Notwithstanding that the belief in a personal God is the result of a spontaneous recognition of God as manifesting himself in consciousness and the works of nature, atheism is still possible as an abnormal state of consciousness induced by sophistical speculation or by the indulgence of sinful passions, precisely as subjective idealism is possible. It exists in the following forms: 1. Practical, 2. Speculative. Again, Speculative Atheism may be (1) Dogmatic, as when the conclusion is reached either (*a*) that God does not exist, or (*b*) that the human faculties are positively incapable of ascertaining or verifying his existence (*e.g.*, Herbert Spencer, "First Principles," pt. 1). (2) Skeptical, as when the existence is simply doubted, and the conclusiveness of the evidence generally relied upon is denied. (3) Virtual, as when (*a*) principles are maintained essentially inconsistent with the existence of God, or with the possibility of our knowledge of him: *e.g.*, by materialists, positivists, absolute idealists. (*b*) When some of the essential attributes of the divine nature are denied, as by Pantheists, and by J. S. Mill in his "Essays on Religion." (*c*) When explanations of the universe are given which exclude the agency of an intelligent Creator and Governor, the moral government of God, and the moral freedom of man, *e.g.*, the theories of Darwin and Spencer, and Necessitarians generally.—*Outlines of Theology*, pp. 46, 47

II. Agnosticism

Theism is to be distinguished also from agnosticism, which is the view that there is no sufficient ground for either an affirmative or negative answer to the question: Does God exist? Therefore, it is claimed, judgment on this interrogation must be suspended. In reality it is an unwillingness to accept the impressions of the mind on certain subjects as dependable, or to be convinced by a licit process of reason. The leading agnostics of the past are Sir W. Hamilton, Dean Mansel, Herbert Spencer, and Huxley. The last-named coined the term *agnosticism* about 1870. It is evident from the etymology of the word that it may apply to any degree or shade of unbelief on any subject. It is used, however, with a restricted meaning. To quote the Encyclopaedia Britannica:

“Whereas scepticism, as a technical term in philosophy, denotes varying degrees of doubt as to whether some or all of the psychological processes, purporting to yield knowledge, really do so, agnosticism rather asserts that, of certain kinds of objects or facts, we possess assured knowledge, while as to certain other kinds of alleged existents we have, and can have, none. The kinds of alleged objects, knowledge as to which the agnostic believes to be impossible, are such as are the primary concern of metaphysics and theology: God, the soul and its immortality, and—more generally speaking—the ultimate realities of which phenomenal things, such as the sciences study, are appearances. Of these phenomenal things, we have ever-increasing and irrefragable knowledge; as to the things *per se*, the ontal or noumenal existents, of which the ‘things’ of common sense and science are the knowable shadows or appearances, we can never have knowledge pure and subjectively undefiled. If we know *that* they are, we cannot know *what* they are; if we can assert their existence, we are ignorant as to their essence” (*s.v.*, Agnosticism, 14th ed.).

Again, as the etymology of the word implies, agnosticism is simply *not knowing*. Its objective is to discredit certitude in the field of human knowledge. It is an attack upon man’s mental powers and engenders a distrust in the common facts and forces of human existence. It is negative in every particular and therefore destructive in its effect upon truth which is gained by the normal functions of the human faculties. Agnostics discard reasonable proofs, which process, if followed consistently, would eliminate the very proofs they advance for their own theories. Of this form of unbelief Dr. George Park Fisher writes:

> It is obvious that Agnosticism is the destruction of science. All the investigations and reasonings of science proceed on the foundation of axioms,—call them intuitions, rational postulates, or by any other name. But these, according to Agnostics, denote simply a certain stage at which the process of evolution has arrived. What is to hinder them from vanishing, or resolving themselves into another set of axioms, with the forward movement of this unresting process? What then will become of the doctrines of Agnosticism itself? It is plain that on this philosophy, all knowledge of realities, as distinct from transitory impressions, is a house built on the sand. All science is reduced to *Schein*—mere semblance. It is impossible for the Agnostic to limit his knowledge to experience, and to reject as unverified the implications of experience, without abandoning nearly all that he holds true. If he sticks to his principle, his creed will be a short one. Consciousness is confined to the present moment. I am conscious of remembering an experience in the past. This consciousness as a present fact I cannot deny without a contradiction. But how do I know that the object of the

> recollection—be it a thought, or feeling, or experience of any sort—ever had a reality? How do I know anything past, or that there is a past? Now, memory is necessary to the comparison of sensations, to reasoning, to our whole mental life. Yet to believe in memory is to transcend experience. I have certain sensations which I attribute collectively to a cause named my "body." Like sensations lead me to recognize the existence of other bodies like my own. But how do I know that there is consciousness within these bodies? How do I know that my fellow-men whom I see about me have minds like my own? The senses cannot perceive the intelligence of the friends about me. I infer that they are intelligent, but in this inference I transcend experience. Experience reduced to its exact terms, according to the methods of Agnosticism, is confined to the present feeling,—the feeling of the transient moment. When the Agnostic goes beyond this, when he infers that what is remembered was once presented in consciousness, that his fellow-men are thinking beings, and not mindless puppets, that any intelligent beings exist outside of himself, he transcends experience. If he were to predicate intelligence of God, he would be guilty of no graver assumption than when he ascribes intelligence to the fellow-men whom he sees moving about, and with whom he is conversing. — *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief,* rev. ed., pp. 78, 79

Agnosticism is better expressed by the phrase, "I *will not* believe," than by the phrase, "I *cannot* believe."

III. Evolution

"In general," writes the late Dr. Leander Keyser, "evolution is the theory that the cosmos has been developed from crude, homogeneous material to its present heterogeneous and advanced status by means of resident forces" (*A System of Natural Theism*, p. 106). Evolution is either *theistic*. or *atheistic*. The former recognizes God as the Creator of original materials, but contends that evolution is the method by which all development from a supposed primordial state to the present completeness has been wrought. The latter—atheistic evolution—rejects the Person of God, denies His work in creation, and contends that matter is eternal or self-developing.

From the beginning fallen man, having no knowledge of revelation and no disposition to esteem the work of God, has speculated on the problem of the origin and development of the universe as he beheld it. With all its strain upon credulity, the evolutionary theory is the best solution of this problem which the natural man can devise. That it is a godless system is self-demonstrated. "God is not in all his thoughts." No place is made for Him as a factor in this system, nor is His Word ever referred to by quotation. It could not be otherwise. The Biblical doctrine of creation accounts for all things upon the fact of divine creation, which is a principle diametrically

opposed to that proposed by the theory of evolution. On the other hand, the promoters of the evolutionary theory seek to avoid every consideration of the supernatural, attempting, as they do, to reduce the works of God to natural processes. The Biblical doctrine of creation faces toward God; the evolutionary theory, regardless of the supposition of theistic evolution that God created that from which the universe is said to have evolved, faces away from God.

Evolutionists distinguish between living and non-living things and recognize that each of these realities presents its own problem of origin and development. In fact, the evolutionary theory is not properly concerned with origin. It has rather to do with the unfolding or expansion of things from an assumed beginning. As to the origin of the material universe, few, indeed, are prepared to defend the notion that it is eternal or that it is self-wrought. Matter, being unintelligent and inert, could neither exert itself nor could it have acted with a purpose. Only intelligence no less than infinite and capacity equal to the task could have achieved such a beginning. The immensity of the undertaking and the acumen it connotes are not lessened by the assumption that all once existed in the form of a fire mist or protoplasm. It is doubtful if it is less an effort to make an egg out of which a chicken might come than to make the full-developed chicken. The fire mist or protoplasm which holds this universe potentially within it, would be a miniature of the whole. So far as the evolutionary theory extends, the problem of the cause of the miniature remains unsolved.

In the introduction to its treatise on *evolution,* the Encyclopaedia Britannica states: “From the earliest times man must have speculated on the nature and origin of the multitude of living creatures, both plants and animals, which people the surface of the earth. Some have assumed”—the writer humbly interposes what he believes to be a better phrase, namely, that they *believe* on absolute authority—“that the diverse forms with their different shapes and sizes, properties and habits, were each specially created, probably to fill a particular place and serve a special purpose; others preferred to consider them as the graduallv developed products of nature. According to modern doctrine, evolution and the diversity we see around us are due to the action in the past of ‘natural causes,’ which can be observed still at work in the present. This conception has been applied to the whole cosmos including both living and non-living things.”

On the extent to which evolution is now received by educated individuals, the same introduction goes on to remark:

> The idea of evolution has penetrated many other departments of thought. Anthropology and ethnology are Permeated with it, and so are history and comparative religion. Modern Psychology recognizes that the human mind is unintelligible without an evolutionary background. The idea of evolution has re-emphasized our kinship with the animals; it has dethroned man from his Position as lord of creation; but in Place of the old idea of fixity it has given us the idea of the Possible advancement of the human race, and of man as the trustee of future evolutionary Progress. And again, It is now universally held by competent biologists that all organisms, living or extinct, have arisen from remote common ancestors by a Process of gradual change or evolution, and further, that living matter or "life" itself, in all Probability arose from non living matter in the first stages of this evolutionary Process. The only doubt which remains concerns the exact steps in the Process, and the nature and relative importance of the various factors which have contributed to it.–14th ed., VIII, 916–17

The above statement that "life itself in all probability arose from non-living matter" is a pure conjecture. It is, no doubt, the best solution of the origin of life that godless, impious minds can devise. Here the true scientific method of proceeding only upon *proved* facts seems cast to the winds. Evolution is an inference based on a pure hypothesis Even though all men of learning were to embrace this inference, it has no right to assert itself to be a final and authoritative science, as evolution now does, until it is verified by *facts*. In defining a *fact*, the New Century Dictionary states: "A deed or act … also, something that has really happened, or is actually the case; a real occurrence, or state of things, as distinguished from something merely alleged or believed; hence, a truth known by actual observation or authentic testimony" (1936 ed.). The evolutionary hypothesis does not answer to one of these requirements and therefore is void of *facts* on which a science might be grounded. Over against this, having established the truth that the Bible is the Word of God by a demonstration which does conform completely with all that goes to substantiate a fact, it is scientific to believe that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." That statement presents a proved fact which is based on "authentic testimony" and is therefore scientific. However, because of the spiritual darkness resting on the human understanding concerning God and all His works, the Scriptures with equal finality and clarity assert: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. 11:3).

In the intellectual world, as in all walks of life, men choose between the only alternatives, namely, the direct creation of all things by God as asserted by His own authoritative Word, or the evolution of this complex and marvelous universe without a cause or a guiding purpose, out of nothing. The choice is finally between God and nothing. And what darkness is evinced on the part of those who choose *nothing*!

Any attempt to analyze the theories of naturalistic evolution should take into account the fact that, in spite of its antiquity, it is a presentday belief and not to be classed with abandoned notions of past ages. The doctrine is not new, having been held, in crude form, by many ancient philosophers. Latterly it appears with the assumed importance which shrewd and cultured men assign to it. In Huxley's day—nearly a century ago—he gave to this theory the weight of his great influence. He stated: "The matter of life is composed of ordinary matter, differing from it only in the manner in which its atoms are aggregated." And again, "I must carefully guard myself against the supposition that I intend to suggest that no such thing as Abiogenesis has ever taken place in the past or ever will take place in the future. With organic chemistry, molecular physics, and physiology yet in their infancy, and every day making prodigious strides, I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call 'vital,' may not some day be artificially brought together" (cited by Hodge, *Theology*, II, 5). The most recent authoritative statement concerning the present claims of naturalistic evolution will be found in the latest edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, where it is asserted—a portion of which statement has been quoted earlier in this work—: "Finally there is the pragmatic value of the evolution theory. The biologist in studying living things, finds that the idea of evolution works and helps him to interpret his facts and to discover new facts and principles; while no other theory so far put forward helps him at all. The idea of evolution is as important a biological tool as, for instance, the microscope … It is often asserted by irresponsible people that 'Darwinism is dead.' This is very far from being the case. In so far as Darwinism was a reasoned assertion of the fact of evolution, it is much more firmly grounded today than it was in Darwin's own time. and every year brings fresh evidence in its support. Only in regard to the nature of the variations which are to be selected has the theory of evolution by Natural

Selection suffered any important modification; in other respects it remains unshaken" (VIII, 916).

There are certain obvious phenomena for which the evolutionary theory offers no explanation, namely, the origin of matter; matter has never evolved life; species remain separate wherever observed and no transmutation of species has ever been observed; motion; life; consciousness; Christ; Christian experience; a future life. So far from being subordinate issues, these are the essential facts of all creation. It will not suffice to claim at this point that evolution is a principle which cannot concern itself with details. The above-named realities are fundamental. Science to be worthy of its name must proceed on the basis of *proved* facts. Scientific men who embrace the unproved theories of naturalistic evolution outrage the requisitions of their profession. As Dr. Miley declares: "Evolution then is an inference from a mere hypothesis. This is not the method of science. Hypothesis is an utterly insufficient ground for any science. No theory can claim a scientific position until it has verified itself by facts" (*Systematic Theology*, I, 135). The explanation of this strange departure on the part of many learned men from the acknowledged fundamental basis of science is that they have no choice. Since "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2:14), they find no solution to the problem of origin in the revelation that God created the universe. To such a mind, it is evidently easier to believe in an unproved theory that something evolved out of nothing; that matter produced life, than to believe that God created all things by His own sufficient power and for His own all-wise ends. Spiritual illumination, and not argument, is the cure for the incapacity of the unregenerate man. How abnormal these things are! How perverted is the intellectual experience of a person who sees "foolishness" in the sublime creative acts of God, but sees no foolishness in the sodden notion that tadpoles and monkeys are the progenitors of men! Faith alone and not scientific reasoning discovers the things of God. "Through faith," and not all men have faith, "we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. 11:3). The doctrine of divine creation is not only the starting point of revelation, but all subsequent Scripture recognizes that teaching and builds upon it.

IV. Materialism

"The doctrine that the facts of experience are all to be explained by reference to the reality, activities, and laws of physical or material substance. In psychology, this doctrine denies the reality of the soul, as psychical being; in cosmology, it denies the need of assuming the being of God as Absolute Spirit, or of any other spiritual ground or first principle: opposed to *spiritism*. Materialistic theories have varied from the first, but the most widely accepted form regards all species of sentient and mental life as products of the organism, and the universe itself as resolvable into terms of physical elements and their motions" (*New Standard Dictionary,* 1913). To this the Encyclopaedia Britannica adds: "It may perhaps be fairly said that materialism is at present a necessary methodological postulate of natural-scientific inquiry. The business of the scientist is to explain everything by the physical causes which are comparatively well understood and to exclude the interference of spiritual causes. It was the great work of Descartes to exclude rigorously from science all explanations which were not scientifically verifiable" (14th ed. *s.v.*).

The world awaits the introduction of a balanced and unprejudiced science which gives to the spiritual its transcendent place above matter. The blind grovelings of modern evolutionists who, for want of spiritual light, are forced to seek the origin of life as an emanation from "physico-chemical complexity" (whatever that may mean—cf. Encyclopaedia Britannica on *evolution*) is burying itself in the muck from which it is unable to lift its eyes. As God is greater than the works of His hands, so man's spirit, being a direct impartation from God (Gen. 2:7), surpasses in importance the mere "earthen vessel" in which it dwells. The history of science is one of endless admissions of misunderstanding and error. In the field of that which is merely physical, certain progress has been made; but in the field of that which concerns life and spiritual being, there has been no progress, nor can there be until scientific men welcome revelation as a valid source of information. If all science hesitates over the problem of mere animation, when will its high priests awaken to an appreciation of the greater marvel of "the gift of God [which] is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord"?

V. Polytheism

The belief and teaching that there is more than one God is distinguished as *polytheism*, and, by so much, is a great disregard of the first commandment of the Decalogue. It has been the claim of infidels and modern evolutionists that, in their earlier developments from crude animal existence, men have believed in many gods. On the contrary, the intra-Biblical and extra-Biblical evidence demonstrates that men began with a belief in one God and from that belief they departed, being unwilling to "retain God in their knowledge." No better or more accurate history of this drift could be written than is recorded by inspiration in Romans 1:18–32. To quote Dr. A. A. Hodge again:

> Polytheism … distributes the perfections and functions of the infinite God among many limited gods. It sprang out of the nature-worship represented in the earliest Hindu Veds, so soon and so generally supplanting primitive monotheism. At first, as it long remained in Chaldea and Arabia, it consisted in the worship of elements, especially of the stars and of fire. Subsequently it took special forms from the traditions, the genius, and the relative civilizations of each nationality. Among the rudest savages it sank to Fetichism as in western and central Africa. Among the Greeks it was made the vehicle for the expression of their refined humanitarianism in the apotheosis of heroic men rather than the revelation of incarnate gods. In India, springing from a pantheistic philosophy, it has been carried to the most extravagant extreme, both in respect to the number, and the character of its deities. Whenever polytheism has been connected with speculation it appears as the exoteric counterpart of pantheism.—*Outlines of Theology*, pp. 47, 48

Polytheism presents no similarity whatsoever to the Biblical doctrine of a Trinity of Persons representing one Essence. The Trinitarian belief is grounded in the primary fact that there is one God—Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah (Deut. 6:4), and contends that the one God subsists in three Persons. The Bible is, to the last degree, a monotheistic revelation.

VI. Idealism and Realism

Regarding these two opposing systems of thought, the New Standard Dictionary (1913 ed.) asserts: "idealism: That system of reflective thinking which would interpret and explain the entire universe, things and minds and their relations, as the realization of a system of ideas, or as the progressive evolution of an ideal. It takes various forms as determined by the view of what the idea or ideal is, and of how we become sure of it. Idealism is customarily regarded as, and in particulars often is, the antithesis of *realism*; but the extremes of each are obliged, while denying many, to admit not a

few of the claims of the other. On the other hand, while agnosticism admits the possibility of reality as independent of consciousness, it denies the possibility of knowing such reality. Idealism, therefore, differs from agnosticism by refusing to admit the possibility of a non-ideal reality."

Regarding realism as related to philosophy, it is similarly stated: "The doctrine that the objects of human cognition have real existence, and not merely existence in the subject mind which perceives or otherwise cognizes them. Opposed to *nominalism*, *phenomenalism*, and *skeptical* or *subjective idealism*."

Thus it is declared that, in the case of idealism, nothing exists except in the thought or impression which the mind sustains; and, in the case of realism, all objects of which the consciousness is aware are realities. It is needless to point out that realism alone is sustained by the Word of God, while idealism has in past ages served for useless and endless speculation.

VII. Pantheism

As the term implies, pantheism is the belief that God is everything and that everything is God, thus confounding God with nature, matter with spirit, and the Creator with the things He has created. Two widely different approaches have been made to pantheistic philosophy. One is that matter originates everything and is God, life and spirit being only modes of the existence of the all-inclusive Absolute. The other is that spirit is everything and that matter has no substantial existence beyond the mental impression, or delusion, that it exists. In either instance, God is all. Thus both idealism and realism are represented in the two forms of this philosophy. As seen in the hoary religions of Brahmanism and Buddhism, this belief has led to the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, which also contends that the soul derives all existence from God and eventually, after countless reincarnations, returns to, and is absorbed into, God. In the "Veids" it is taught that "the whole universe is the Creator, proceeds from the Creator, and returns to him." Similarly, from the same source: "Thou art Brahma, thou art Vishnu, thou art Kodra, etc.; thou art air, thou art Andri, thou art the moon, thou art substance, thou art Djam; thou art the earth, thou art the world! O Lord of the world, to thee humble adoration! O Soul of the world, thou who superintendest the actions of the world, who destroyest the world,

who createst the pleasures of the world! O Life of the world, the visible and invisible worlds are the sport of thy power; thou art the sovereign, O Universal Soul; to thee humble adoration!" (cited by Cooke, *The Deity*, rev. ed., p. 170).

The human mind seems to need no more than a thread of suggestion on which to build by imagination mystery upon mystery and fable upon fable, seeming never to challenge itself with the fact that the thing thus imposed is a monstrous delusion. Over against this, revelation has provided a stabilization for the human mind which, otherwise, like the departed demon of Luke 11:24, "walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none," is prone to deify and worship anything from a "creeping thing" to the universe itself. The extent to which pantheism as a philosophy may go is reflected in innumerable writings—ancient and modern. Lucan said: "Whatsoever thou seest is Jupiter." Seneca inquires, "What is God?" and answers, "He is all that you see, and all that you do not see" (cited by Cooke, *ibid*., pp. 171–72). The following versification by Dr. Mason Good of a poem ascribed to Orpheus represents the philosophical thought of its day:

> Jove first exists, whose thunders roll above;
> Jove last, Jove midmost, all proceeds from Jove.
> Female is Jove, immortal Jove is male;
> Jove the broad earth—the heaven's irradiate pale.
> Jove is the boundless Spirit, Jove the fire
> That warms the world with feeling and desire.
> The sea is Jove, the sun, the lunar ball;
> Jove king supreme, the sovereign source of all.
> All power is his; to him all glory give,
> For his vast form embraces all that live.
>
> —cited by Cooke, *ibid*., p. 171

Pantheism has become the inheritance of every nation on earth and has cursed the streams of human thought beyond all estimation. It assumes the eternity of matter and the absurdity that matter has power to originate life and spirit. In its idealistic form it contradicts human consciousness and destroys the very ground upon which reason is based and the fundamental method of its own procedure. It breaks down the most essential distinctions between existing things, by which alone they are identified. According to pantheism, the potter and the clay are one and the same thing—if they exist

at all. The promoters of these notions of necessity contradict in their daily lives the very speculations they propound. They cannot state a theorem, or even commence to do so, without departing from their major idea. Every effort to build this theory assumes the principle that destroys it. Attempting to support it, they dig down its supposed foundations. The theory obliterates all distinctions. It levels all elements to one item. There is no recognition of the fact that God is infinite while creation is finite; that God is omnipotent while creation is impotent; that God is immutable while creation is mutable; that God is eternal while creation experiences both birth and death. Error is incidental to other minds, but unavoidable and essential to the pantheistic teachers. Though it recognizes a god such as human speculation conceives, pantheism is the mother of atheism and the grossest idolatry. It is promoting the notion that matter is God and God is matter and it is a short step from this to the assertion of the fool that there is no God. It is but a step, likewise, to the worship of any inanimate or animate thing, since the theory contends that it is all a part of God. The system leads to blasphemy and licentiousness. The basis of every moral distinction is obliterated by it. If all nature is God, then human action is not distinct from God but is the very action of God. The whole category of human crime becomes as worthy as virtue itself. The terms by which evil is described are only conventional ideas. Reason is assassinated and virtue defamed. Such is the fruit of modern pantheistic philosophy current in educational centers today. The student of doctrine may well ponder the following utterance which is a normal offspring of pantheistic philosophy: “The belief in a personal living God is the chief foundation and origin of our worm-eaten social state; and further, that so long as mankind shall hang by a single hair to the idea of heaven, there is no happiness to be looked for on earth. Man himself is the religion of futurity. God stands in need of man, but man has no need of God” (cited by Cooke, *ibid*., p. 186). These revolting assertions are the very creed of atheism and communism, which are clutching the throat of the social interests of the world and which hate the things of God with a perfect hatred.

The following extended quotation from Dr. William Cooke, published in 1862, summarizes the evil character of this philosophy:

> Whether we contemplate the system theoretically or practically, it is the most outrageous monstrosity which the human mind has ever yet fabricated or can fabricate. It is the ultimatum of absurdity and immorality. It was generated by conceit, fostered by pride, and matured by the most consummate depravity. Viewed by the eye of philosophy, it is arrant nonsense; by the eye of morality, it is disgustingly obscene; and, by the eye of religion, it is horrid blasphemy. It is repugnant to our reason, and revolting to our moral sense; it is a foul disgrace to the intellect and character of man, which it is both humiliating and loathsome to contemplate; and the disgrace is deepened when we think of the men, the country, and the age with which the system has sprung up in modern times. A maniac could not equal its folly, nor a demon exceed its wickedness. The Prince of Darkness himself … could not desire a more complete abasement of the human intellect, a more entire wreck of the human character and happiness, a more perfect subversion of the authority and designs of Almighty God. Its universal prevalence would consummate the wishes of that apostate and malignant spirit, in dissolving all the bonds of society, uprooting the foundations of social order and happiness, and in filling the earth with lust, violence, and blood. We wonder not at the spread of socialism, communism, libertinism, anarchy, and hatred to religion; we wonder not the vices are open, crimes unblushing, and the vilest of men are held in reputation. There is a cause! Learning and talent have prostituted their powers in advocating an atheistic lie, and have sent it abroad through society; and the lie thus sanctioned, and ministering to the vilest passions of human nature, has produced the effects we deplore.– *Ibid*., pp. 187–88

VIII. Deism

This term, from the Latin *Deus*, meaning ‘God,’ is closely allied to the Greek word *Theos*. As a philosophy, the contention is that God is personal, infinite, holy, and the Creator of all things; but that He purposely abandoned His creation when completed with the intent that it should be self-sustaining and self-promoting by the forces resident in it. God is not immanent in creation but transcends it. Deism rejects the Scriptures or any suggestion that God is providentially working since creation. According to this system, there is no possibility of reaching God by prayer, or of holding communion or fellowship with Him. It is “the religion of nature” since it contends that all that can be known of God is restricted to such deductions as can be made from creation. There is no moral influence flowing out of Deism and this its followers have demonstrated. Carlyle thus described the Deist conception of God: “An absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath at the outside of the universe, and seeing it go” (cited by Strong, *Theology*, p. 204).

IX. Positivism

The philosophy elaborated by Auguste Comte (1798–1857) which is based on the assumption that man's knowledge is restricted to phenomena, and of these man can know only in part. It rejects all consideration of metaphysics or speculative philosophy. The theistic arguments as to First Cause and design as well as the conclusions of human reason are refused.

X. Monism

"The doctrine which refers the explanation of all the existences, activities, and developments of the universe, including the physical and psychical or spiritual beings, to one ultimate principle or substance: opposed to philosophical *dualism* and *pluralism*. If this principle or substance is conceived of in terms of personal life, the doctrine takes the form of *idealistic monism;* if in terms of matter and physical mechanism, it is called *materialistic monism;* if in terms which deny the reality of both finite personal life and finite physical existences, but affirm that both are only the phenomenal manifestations of an impersonal ground, the doctrine becomes *pantheistic monism*" (*New Standard Dictionary*, 1913 ed.).

XI. Dualism

"A system or theory which asserts a radical duality or twofoldness of nature, being, or operation. In the history of reflective thinking, four species of *dualism* have developed, which are to some extent interdependent but are not identical, according to the subject-matter of reflection. These are (1) *theological dualism*, or the doctrine that there are two eternal and opposing principles, or divine beings, one good and the other evil. This view was characteristic of Zoroastrianism and certain Gnostic systems, but is opposed by monistic religions like Christianity and Mohammedanism. A special form arose in early Christian controversy, in the doctrine attributed to Nestorius, which held that the Logos dwelt in Jesus as a distinct person, thus regarding Christ as having two personalities, rather than as being one divine-human person. (2) *Philosophical dualism*, or the theory which considers the ultimate being of the universe, or 'World-Ground,' to be twofold or to be constituted of two independent and irreducible elements, as opposed either to idealistic or materialistic monism. (3) *Psychological* or

psychophysical dualism, the theory that the body and mind of man are two different existences … (4) *Ethical dualism*, or the system of morals which demands and justifies one kind of conduct toward one's fellows in the same social group and another kind of conduct toward other men" (*ibid*.).

XII. Pluralism

Aside from its general use relative to the plural aspect of things, the term *pluralism* has a specific philosophical meaning in which the essential unity of the world is denied. It contends that "inasmuch as the mind makes its own world, for practical purposes, there are as many worlds as there are minds to make them" (*ibid*.).

Conclusion

Such in general are the naturalistic arguments pro and con for the existence of God, and the philosophical issues which they engender. From this, as important as it is, the spiritual mind turns with relief to the complete, satisfying, and authoritative revelation of God as set forth in His own Word.

Biblical Theism

Chapter XIII

THE PERSONALITY OF GOD

THE PROGRESS in the pursuance of the systematic development of theological truth thus far attained is to be observed in that, under Bibliology, the Bible has been proved to be the Word of God written and, under *naturalistic theism*, the conclusive evidence as to the existence of God which reason affords has been presented. These are cardinal aspects of theological verity and on the ground of these established realities Biblical theism may be approached. It is asserted again that Systematic Theology draws its material both from *reason* and *revelation*. It is also asserted that the Bible, being the Word of God written, and its declarations are, so far as further discussions in this work on theology are concerned, to be accepted as final. There may be problems of *interpretation*, but no problem of *trustworthiness* will be considered. Similarly, the fact of the existence of God, as established by reason, is in no way open to further question.

A spiritual mind, awake to the value of an inerrant revelation, will naturally and properly respond more fully to the truth which revelation delivers, and be but little moved by the results of reason. Nevertheless, the evidence drawn from reason is mighty within its own sphere and assuring, in that when revelation and reason are rightly appraised they are not only agreeable but are supplementary. Truth must always agree with itself regardless of the various angles by which it may be approached or the fields in which it is found. Should reason offer conclusions which are disagreeable to revelation, it must be inferred that reason is wrong since it has no infallible guide apart from revelation.

At no point does the devout soul feel its limitations more than when confronted with the responsibility of a due apprehension of the Person of God. Fallen man is incapable, apart from divine illumination, of comprehending the sovereign Creator, or the limited, dependent creature in the proportionate importance of each; and the saved receive such knowledge of God as they experience, only through the illuminating work of the Holy Spirit. Moses possessed the heritage of truth which belonged to the chosen people and was educated in all that constituted the wisdom of

Egypt, yet when standing before the burning bush he must be told to remove his shoes from his feet.

Biblical theism is not, as *naturalistic theism*, limited to the processes of human reason and to the bare facts concerning the existence of God; it is an unfolding of the details of the marvelous truth concerning God in explicit terms written by divine inspiration and preserved forever. The student must face his individual responsibility in attaining, by prayer and meditation and by the illuminating power of the Spirit, to right thoughts and worthy conceptions of God.

Revealed truth concerning the divine Being may be classified into that which is *abstract*, or that which is within Himself—His Person, His attributes, His decrees, and His names—; and that which is *concrete*, or His manifestation of Himself in three Persons. The *abstract* features of truth relative to God are grounded in the fact that God is a *Unity* or *Essence*. The *concrete* features of truth relative to God are grounded in the fact that God subsists in a trinity of Persons, which body of truth is termed *trinitarianism*. Concerning the *abstract* truth relative to God, the following may be observed:

I. The Personality of God

God declares in unerring Scripture that man, quite unlike other mundane things, is created in His own image and likeness. It is written: “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness … So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him” (Gen. 1:26, 27). It therefore follows that there is a similarity to be traced between God and man. After this manner of comparison, the Scriptures proceed in the presentation of the nature and character of God. He is a Person with those faculties and constituent elements which belong to personality. These faculties and elements in God are *perfect* to an infinite degree, but in their *nature* they sustain an extraordinary resemblance to those *imperfect* faculties and elements which belong to man. In opposition to this Biblical conception of God, Archbishop King asserts: “Because we do not know what His faculties are in themselves, we give them the names of those powers that we find would be necessary to us in order to produce such effects, and call them wisdom, understanding, and foreknowledge; yet at the same time we

cannot but be sensible, that they are of a nature altogether different from ours, and that we have no direct and proper notion or conception of them" (Sermon on *Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge*, cited by Cooke, *The Deity*, rev. ed. p. 216).

Objection must be entered against this representation. It is true that but little can be known of all that God is, but it is not true that God is so different from man that no proper conception of God is possible. In the matter of faculties and properties there is resemblance, and in mental and moral attributes there is a correspondence in the *nature* of them though they are incomparable as to the degree of *perfection*. Volition, love, truth, faithfulness, holiness, justice, are realities which belong to both God and man, and though the degree which they represent may be separated immeasurably, the *nature* of these characteristics is the same in each sphere.

Again, the above objection, like many in various fields of truth, fails to recognize the finality of the divine averment that man is made in the "image" and "likeness" of God. The possibility of a distinction between the meanings of these two terms—*image* and *likeness*—as used in the Scriptures, need not be discussed at this juncture. The point at issue is that God with no common emphasis asserts that there is a correspondence between Himself and man. Upon the principle which this affirmation publishes, man is justified in tracing the divine characteristics from the pattern, though incomplete, which his own being supplies.

It is not asserted that man's corporal nature is involved in this comparison, since it is predicated of God that He is Spirit (John 4:24). It therefore follows that the tracing of this similitude is to be restricted to the immaterial part of man. Anthropomorphisms are set up when the characteristics of God are stated in terms of human elements. These often extend to the human body and its various properties. With reference to God it is declared: "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms" (Deut. 33:27); "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand" (John 10:29); "Thus saith the LORD, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool" (Isa. 66:1); "The eyes of the LORD run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him" (2 Chron. 16:9); "Behold the LORD's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear" (Isa.

59:1); “For the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it” (Isa. 58:14). Thus reference is made also to the “face” of God (Ex. 33:11, 20), and his “nostrils” (2 Sam. 22:9, 16). Such anthropomorphisms as these are unnumbered in the Bible, and it is to be noted that where physical members are thus ascribed to God, it is not a direct assertion that God possesses these members, or a corporal body with its parts; but that He is capable of doing precisely those things which are the functions of the physical part of man. “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see?” (Ps. 94:9). Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas writes: “Objection is sometimes raised to the Biblical conception of God as anthropomorphic, but the objection is not sound because we must use human language, and the conceptions of man and personality are the highest possible to us. It is obviously better to use anthropomorphic expressions than zoo-morphic or cosmo-morphic, and when we attribute to God emotions and sensibilities we mean to free Him from all the imperfections attaching to the human conceptions of these elements. In revealing Himself God has to descend to our capacities, and use language which can be understood” (*The Principles of Theology*, p. 15). Is it not a most vital purpose in the incarnation that God may be revealed to men in the terms of human personality such as man is able to grasp?

Richard Watson states: “When it is said God is a spirit, we have no reason to conclude that a distant analogy, such a one as springs out of mere relation, is intended. The nature of God and the nature of man are not the same, but they are similar, because they bear many attributes in common, though, on the part of the Divine nature, in a degree of perfection infinitely exceeding” (*Institutes*, chapter iv). Dr. Chalmers comments: “The mind of man is a creation, and therefore indicates by its characteristics the character of Him to the fiat and the forthcoming of whose will it owes its existence” (*Natural Theology*, I, 306). And after the same manner Robert Hall asserts: “The body has a tendency to separate us from God by the dissimilarity of its nature; the soul, on the contrary, unites us again to him, by means of those principles and faculties which, though infinitely inferior, are of a character congenial to his own. The body is the production of God; the soul is his image” (sermon on *The Spirituality of the Divine Nature*). Theodorus Mopsuestenus offers this vivid illustration: “When God created man, his last and best work, this was as if a king having built a great city, and

adorned it with many and various works, after he had perfected all, should command a very great and beautiful image of himself to be set up in the midst of the city, to show who was the builder of it" (*Ap. Petav.*, t. iii., lib. ii., cited by Cooke, *op. cit.*, pp. 219–20).

Discoursing to the same end, Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee writes:

> Of God man can speak only in a human manner; and, if our nature is truly related to that of God, how can we conceive of Him without the admixture of a single trait derived from ourselves? This is the deep significance of Jacobi's words: "In creating man God theomorphosised; therefore man necessarily anthropomorphosises." "God condescends to us, in order that we may rise to Him." Anthropomorphism and Anthropopathism is therefore by no means the antipode, but rather the imperfect approximating expression of eternal truth; and in the interpretation, also, of Holy Scripture, our part is simply to trace out, as far as possible, the truth underlying such expressions. In doing so we must take care that we explain the anthropomorphic conceptions. by the more purely spiritual ones, not the converse, and that we are guarded by a certain spiritual tact against "thinking after an earthly manner" … of the supreme majesty of God. Thus regarded and explained, even the anthropopathic expressions of Scripture become the means of a better knowledge of God; a sublime accommodation to human wants and weaknesses, sanctified for the eye of faith, since God's own Son has appeared as man on earth. Anthropomorphism belongs thus also to the necessary form of the revelations of God; and let him who takes offence at the husk see that he does not lose the kernel, to retain—a merely apathetic God.—*Christian Dogmatics*, I, 255

It is equally certain that the weakness and sin of man cannot be predicated of God, and, similarly, there are characteristics in God which could not be expressed in the terms of human life. But man's mental and moral properties do serve to demonstrate the significant and momentous fact that the attributes which are the same in nature, if not in their degree of perfection, are resident in both God and man. To the devout student there is left no latitude for rationalistic speculation as to whether there is a norm or pattern extant of the Person of God. By unmistakable terms God has affirmed that man is by creation's design set forth as an exhibit of certain elements which are in Himself—a tangible disclosure to the extent that man is made in the image and likeness of God. The true impression as to the Person of God is not gained in the line of pantheistic reasoning, which reasoning recognizes no distinct powers or qualities in God; nor is it gained in the line of the superficial notion that God is no more than the sum of His capacities and therefore divisible into as many parts as may correspond to the number of His attributes. God is a *Person*, and no less so because of the fact that He is immaterial and infinite. His capacities flow out of what He is,

but His competency is not the measure or equivalent of Himself. There is always a danger that the human conception of God will pause and be satisfied with the apprehension of the divine performance, and not go on to behold the more consequential features of His divine Person. Sir Isaac Newton has expressed it thus: “It is not eternity and infinitude, but the eternal and infinite Being” (cf. Watson, *Institutes*, I, 268). It is not enough to discern the works of God or His characteristics; the heart must come to know God as a Person.

Voltaire stated: “God made man in his own image, and man has returned the compliment” (cited by S. Harris, *God the Creator and Lord of All*, I, 176). The fallacy of this arresting sentence is that man is accredited with having created God in the same sense in which God has created man. Only by an *argumentum a posteriori* does man reason from his own capacities as a person to the Person of his Creator. This argument is in no way to be construed as a making of God on the part of man; it is merely a drawing of conclusions from what God has made. Human reason reflects divine reason and, regardless of the disparity as to degree, it is to be concluded on divine authority that reason in God is of the same nature as reason in man; that sensibility in God is of the same nature as sensibility in man; and that volition and love in God are of the same nature as volition and love in man. If in his investigation into the works of God man should discover that the essential, motivating parts of his own being are not in their nature corresponding to the essential motivating parts of the divine Being, and therefore subject to the same principles and laws which invariably govern all personality, then all human knowledge is dissolved into the mists of illusion, if not delusion.

The usual conception is that the primary reality is matter, or the force of things tangible, and that the things of the spirit are phantasmic and unreal. Biblical theism, on the other hand, contemplates the Person of God as the primary reality and all else—even man—as a medium of the divine revelation and expression of divine achievement. The first four words of the Bible are decisive and empirical—“In the beginning God.” If the Creator of all things shall say of one specific fragment of His creation, “I have made this an image and likeness of myself,” it becomes His creatures to accept this declaration as true and to act upon it. Such acceptance not only gives

God the primary position in His universe, but recognizes that He is a *Person* with all that term implies.

It is therefore to be concluded that the personality of God is to be studied in the light of man's own being and consciousness. This procedure is according to an essential principle of science, namely, that things which manifest the same qualities are the same in fact. Nothing is clearer than that personality is a unity. It gathers all its past into itself by the faculty of memory, its present by its immediate consciousness, and its future by its method of planning and by the faculty of anticipation. Apart from the recognition of this unity of all parts in one personality there could be no analysis of human life or any science of psychology. Animal life, into which man can penetrate only to a limited degree, owing to his inability to place the animal consciousness in the light of his own, presents no evidence of rational intelligence, freedom of choice, or purpose in worthy ends which belong to personality.

Those elements which combine to form personality are: intellect, sensibility, and will; but all of these acting together require a freedom both of external action and of choice of ends toward which action is directed. Intellect must direct, sensibility must desire, and will must determine in the direction of rational ends. There can be no personality, either human, angelic, or divine, apart from this complex of essentials. As the elements of personality which are in God are discovered, there are variations to be expected from the norm which human personality supplies; but no departure will be found from the fact that these fundamental elements are present. Apart from these there could be no personality. By the cosmological argument it has been seen that there is a Creator possessed of self-determining will. By the teleological argument it has been seen that there is a Creator possessed with mental powers which design and determine means to an end. And by the anthropological argument it has been seen that there is a Creator possessed of sensibility. To this the Scriptures bear plentiful testimony. This witness of the Bible is that man, angels, and God are all possessed with those essential elements which together constitute personality. Of God it is declared that He is intelligent or omniscient: "Great is our Lord, and of great power: his understanding is infinite" (Ps. 147:5); "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18); "Neither is there any creature that is

not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do" (Heb. 4:13). In like manner, it is declared of God that He possesses sensibility. He loves righteousness and hates iniquity. He is of tender compassion. His infinite love has moved Him to the supreme sacrifice by which redemption is provided for fallen man. "God is love" (1 John 4:16). And finally, the element of will is seen to be present in God: "But our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased" (Ps. 115:3); "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure" (Isa. 46:10); "And he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. 4:35).

Bearing on the fact of the personality of God, Dr. John Miley states: "If God is not a personal being, the result must be either atheism or pantheism. It matters little which. The dark and deadly implications are much the same. There is no God with self-consciousness or the power of rational and moral self-determination, no personal divine agency in the universe. A blind, necessitated force is the original of all. The existence of the world and the heavens is without reason or end. There is no reason for the existence of man, no rational or moral end. God has no interest in him, no rational or moral rule over him. The universal sense of moral obligation and responsibility must be pronounced a delusion. There should be an end of worship, for there is wanting a truly worshipful being. All that remains is the dark picture of a universe without divine teleology or providence" (*Systematic Theology*, I, 173).

Under that aspect of Biblical theism now being considered, the conception of God as of one essence is alone in view. In later developments of this theme there will be due attention given to the fact that God subsists in three Persons, and that personality must be ascribed to each in the full measure of divine perfection. God has ever sought to reveal Himself to man, not as an influence or blind force, but as a living Person with whom man may hold communion. The invitation to such communion presupposes and necessitates a likeness of nature between those who participate. "And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 1:3). The Father and the Son reveal each other as Persons (Matt. 11:27), and the Father and Son send the Spirit whose mission is clearly that

of a person (John 14:16–17, 26; 15:26; 16:7–11). The foundational truth of all Scripture is the fact that God is one God who subsists in three Persons.

Chapter XIV

The Attributes of God

Though Wholly inadequate, man's conception of God is measured by those characteristics which he attributes to God. The Bible presents a revelation which, though limited by the restrictions that language must ever impose, is of a Person, and this revelation attributes to Him those exalted qualities which are His. These qualities thus attributed are properly styled *attributes*. To declare His Person and the sum-total of His attributes, would constitute a final definition of God which man might never hope to form.

To the question *Can God be defined?*, some writers have returned a negative answer and this in recognition of the fact that no definition can completely exhaust the idea in question—especially when that idea is characterized by infinity. However, a definition of a thing is not required to represent a cognition of all its parts. Enough will have been said if so many of its elements are named as shall distinguish it from all other things. According to this more reasonable estimation of a worthy definition, God can be defined. A distinction is evident at once between the definition which rationalistic philosophers advance who, disregarding revelation, attempt to define God within the limited field which reason supplies, and the definition formulated by men who acknowledge the authoritative message which the Bible presents. The rationalistic philosophers have defined God as "a self-existing being, in whom the ground of the reality of the world is found." Or, again, "God is a being who has the ground of his existence in himself." To this some add that God is *independent*, *infinite*, *necessary* as to His existence, and *eternal*. Those forms of definition are drawn from the *argumentum a posteriori*, and those who offer these elucidations, do so almost wholly from reason apart from revelation. One philosophical definition of God which has met with general approval is, "God is the most perfect being, and is the cause of all other beings." The intent of this definition is to state that God is the Supreme Being, exalted over all, to whom none can be compared. This definition is seriously lacking in that there is no reference in it to things moral. Kant objected to this conception on the ground of this defect and added that God is *free* in Himself and *pure moral will*.

Turning to the Scriptures, it will be observed immediately that God is not specifically defined in any one assertion, but His existence and attributes are assumed and do appear only as the text in various places and in manifold terms sets forth what He is and what He does. A true Biblical definition of God will be secured only as an induction of all the Scripture is secured (cf. Gen. 1:1; Job 11:7–9; 36:26; 37:5, 23; Ps. 77:19; 92:5; 97:2; 145:3; 147:5; Prov. 25:2; Isa. 40:28; Jer. 10:10–16; Matt. 11:27; Rom. 11:33, 34; etc.).

It is true, as previously observed, that God, of necessity, is disclosed—even in the Bible—in the expressions which belong to human life and experience. He is presented in anthropomorphic and anthropopathic terms. As is to be anticipated, when the finite mind enters upon the contemplation of the infinite, the knowledge gained is, at best, but partial, and, related to this, there are two distinct and almost paradoxical lines of truth equally sustained by the Scriptures. (1) David, alluding to the divine understanding, said: “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it” (Ps. 139:6). And the Apostle, writing of the glory of God, declares: “Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting” (1 Tim. 6:16). So, also, he refers to “the image of the invisible God” (Col. 1:15), and to “the King eternal, immortal, invisible” (1 Tim. 1:17). Yet (2) He is revealed in Christ. John states: “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth” (John 1:14). And “no man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him” (John 1:18). Yet, even though God is thus exalted to an incomparable degree of excellence, men are told to be holy and perfect as God is holy and perfect (Matt. 5:48; 1 Pet. 1:16).

With reference to a definition of God, it is probable that nothing more comprehensive or Biblical has been formed than that incorporated into the Westminster Confession of Faith, which thesis has the notable superiority of being the combined work of many devout and scholarly men rather than the work of any one man. This Confession declares:

I. THERE is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of his own immutable and most righteous will, for his own glory; most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and withal most just and terrible in his judgments, hating all sin, and who will by no means clear the guilty.

II. God hath all life, glory, goodness, blessedness, in and of himself; and is alone in and unto himself all-sufficient, not standing in need of any creatures which he hath made, nor deriving any glory from them, but only manifesting his own glory in, by, unto, and upon them: he is the alone fountain of all being, of whom, through whom, and to whom, are all things; and hath most sovereign dominion over them, to do by them, for them, and upon them, whatsoever himself pleaseth. In his sight all things are open and manifest; his knowledge is infinite, infallible, and independent upon the creature, so as nothing is to him contingent or uncertain. He is most holy in all his counsels, in all his works, and in all his commands. To him is due from angels and men, and every other creature, whatsoever worship, service, or obedience, he is pleased to require of them.

III. In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.—*Westminster Confession of Faith*, Chap. II

The attributes of God present a theme so vast and complex and so beyond the range of finite faculties that any attempt to classify them must be only approximate as to accuracy or completeness. So, also, the attributes are so interrelated and interdependent that the exact placing of some of them is difficult if not wholly impossible. It is evident that no feature of Systematic Theology has occasioned more confusion and disagreement among theologians than has the attempt to order the category of the divine attributes. In general, theologians have separated these attributes into divisions under varying terminology. One group of attributes represents, it is claimed, those characteristics which are said to be within God and not found elsewhere in creation; the other group represents those characteristics in God which, to a limited degree, are found in angels and human spirits, or which reach out objectively from God to other beings. Some of these twofold divisions are: incommunicable and communicable; natural and moral; immanent or intransitive and emanent or transitive; passive and active; absolute and relative; negative and positive. Obviously there are shades of distinctions implied in these various designations. It is intended under the term *incommunicable* to represent those attributes which admit of

no extension or degrees and belong only to God. Among these self-existence, simplicity, infinity, eternity, and immutability are named. The so-called communicable attributes, which, to a limited degree, are found in created beings, are wisdom, benevolence, holiness, justice, compassion, and truth, etc. The natural attributes are supposed to indicate that which is constitutional in God, while the moral attributes are those which function by virtue of the divine will. The immanent or intransitive attributes are those within God's own Being, while the emanent or transitive reach out from God and produce certain effects. The absolute attributes are said to concern God's relation to Himself, while the relative attributes concern His relation to others. The negative attributes, it is claimed, are those which are free from finite limitations, while the positive attributes are those which, to a limited degree, belong to the creature. Much misunderstanding has been involved when this latter distinction has been proposed. It has been implied that since the term *negative* in this instance suggests something that is not in God, these attributes might refer to some divine limitation. On the contrary, the term denotes something that is in the creature which is not in God. Of God it may be predicated that He is incorporal while man is corporal; He is immutable while man is mutable; He is independent while man is dependent, etc. The so-called negative attributes are sometimes classed under four general heads, namely, self-existence, immensity, eternity, and plenitude.

An attribute is a property which is intrinsic to its subject. It is that by which it is distinguished or identified. The term has two widely different applications, which fact is evidenced by the twofold classifications already named. It seems certain that some qualities which are not specifically attributes of God have been included by some writers under this designation. A body has its distinctive properties, the mind has its properties, and in like manner, there are specific attributes which may be predicated of God. The body is more than the sum-total of all its properties, which is equally true of the mind; and God is more than the sum of all His attributes. However, in each case these peculiar definitives retain an intrinsic value in the sense that the body, the mind, or God Himself cannot be conceived apart from the qualities attributed to them. By abstract thinking, God may be conceived apart from His attributes; but it remains true that He is known by His attributes and apart from them He would not

appear to be what He is. On the other hand, while any true conception of God must include His attributes it is required that the attributes themselves must be treated as abstract ideas.

In their search for accurate, discriminating designations, theologians have exhausted the whole range of terminology which language affords. In each grouping, some vital truth serves as its basis. The difficulty is that, owing to the inexhaustible and individual character of each fact concerning God, the basic truth in which the classification is made to rest proves to be insufficient to some degree.

Enough has been presented on the various classifications of the attributes of God as men have arranged them. The plan of this thesis is to present the attributes somewhat in their independent and individual nature, attempting only to distinguish between those revealed facts concerning God which *constitute* His essential Being and those facts concerning Him which *characterize* His essential Being. Wholly satisfactory terms by which this distinction and division within the facts concerning God may be drawn, are not to be found. God is the subject, while His attributes are those facts which may be predicated of Him; but predicates are not the subject. The ocean and sky are blue. The color *blue* thus is seen to be a predicate of ocean and sky, but the color *blue* is neither ocean nor sky. If this distinction be kept in mind, it matters little whether the terms *attribute, predicate, or definitive* are extended to represent all the facts concerning God—those which constitute His Being along with those which characterize Him. It should be observed, also, that though the emphasis must of necessity fall upon the constitutional facts of His Being, there is no detraction intended from the immanence and the characterizing facts. The whole of the divine essence is in each attribute and the attribute belongs to the whole essence. The attributes belong eternally to the essence. The essence has not first existed apart from the attributes. The consideration of the facts related to God will now proceed after the following order:

I. Personality

Attention has been given previously to the reality of the personality of God; but a reversion to this subject is made since it forms the logical starting point for investigation into certain essential actualities concerning

God. Some writers have included *personality* as one of the characterizing attributes of God, whereas it is evidently to be classed as a constitutional attribute. It is itself the very essence of God's being, and that above all else which constitutes Him the subject to whom characterizing attributes may be predicated.

As before stated, personality has its component parts, namely, *intellect*, *sensibility*, and *will*. Each of these, it has been demonstrated, is present in God to an infinite degree, and, since these qualities belong to the personality of God, they are not, in their primary usage, to be classed as characterizing attributes.

1. Omniscience. Intellect in man has its corresponding feature in God, but when predicated of God it is properly termed *omniscience*. Obviously, a vast difference exists between the two. Intellect in man is hardly more than the capacity or readiness to acquire knowledge, which knowledge, when acquired, as compared with omniscience, is even less than elementary, while the understanding of God is all-inclusive and infinite. There are two patent measurements of the divine knowledge: (1) *omniscience*, which includes all things concerning Himself and all His works; and (2) *foreknowledge*, which may be restricted to things specifically foreordained. Investigation into the relation which obtains between foreknowledge and foreordination is reserved for its logical place in Soteriology.

The finite mind cannot grasp the complete truth concerning omniscience any more than it can grasp divine omnipotence, omnipresence, or divine love. Whatever omniscience is, only omniscience can know in the absolute cognition of it. Nevertheless, some portions of this marvelous divine reality may be comprehended and what cannot be known may be received by faith in God's Word.

The omniscience of God comprehends all things—things past, things present, and things future, and the possible as well as the actual. As set forth in the Bible, the works of God are, as to their time relations, declared to be of the past, of the present, and of the future. By divine arrangement, events do follow in sequence or chronological order. Yet, to God, the things of the past are as real as though now present and the things of the future are as real as though past. He it is who "calleth those things which be not as though they were" (Rom. 4:17; cf. Isa. 46:10). Perfectly known unto Him, as

though they were now in process, are all His works from the foundation of the world (Acts 15:18). A man standing on the street is able to see at a given time but the smallest section of a passing procession, and thus man observes the works of God. But as one looking down from a great elevation (Ps. 33:13) sees all the procession at one glance, so God sees all His program of events in their unified whole. From the beginning He knows the end, and from the end He knows the beginning. Omniscience brings everything—past, present, and future—with equal reality before the mind of God. Strictly speaking the distinction of foreknowledge in God is a human conception; for divine knowledge is simultaneous as opposed to succession. It is complete and certain as compared to incomplete and uncertain. It is intuitive and not discursive; yet in this perfection of simultaneous, complete, and intuitive knowledge all future events, both possible and real, are cognized by Him. Charnocke declares: "The knowledge of one thing is not, in God, before another; one act of knowledge doth not beget another. In regard of the objects themselves, one thing is before another; one year before another; one generation of men before another; one is the cause, and the other is the effect; in the creature's mind there is such a succession, and God knows there will be such a succession; but there is no such order in God's knowledge; for he knows all these successions by one glance, without any succession of knowledge in himself" (*God's Knowledge*, cited by Shedd, *Theology*, I, 355).

That God knows all things future which are merely possible and never become actual is disclosed in the Word of God. Every warning from God is a declaration of danger and evil which He knows will follow a wrong choice. Jonah's preaching to the people of Nineveh was concerning a sure destruction which was averted only by the deepest repentance. Christ said, "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day" (Matt. 11:21–23; cf. 1 Sam. 23:5–14; 2 Kings 13:19; Jer. 38:17–20).

The omniscience of God may be studied both in its archetypal and present aspects. His archetypal omniscience relates to that in God which first planned and designed the universe before it was brought into being, or made actual by omnipotent creative power. The archetypes of the universe existed from all eternity in the mind of God, and creation was but the exercise of omnipotence by which reality was given to that which omniscience had conceived. Thus, and thus only, arose the order and system which now exists with its perfection of arrangement, its realized purpose, and its stability. Such engendering on the part of God was not a mere organization or application of existing elements, but was the *creation* of materials suitable to the end in view. This arising of all creation with its laws, its congruity, its adaptation, and its varied and selfperpetuating forms of life—including man made in the divine image—,is a manifestation of archetypal omniscience which staggers all human apprehension. According to archetypal conceptions, man's intuitive genius constructs various mechanisms and is able to anticipate precisely what the results of vast combinations of parts and forces will be, and before any portions are assembled or constructed. Thus it was concerning God, with the additional feature that in divine creation even material itself was created for His incomparable ends.

Though it be true that by archetypal omniscience God discerned the nature of the elements required in the realization of His ends and the precise results of the combination of those elements, any suggestion must be repelled which would intimate that there is in nature any independent power of action. God is the ever-present and all-pervading energy, guiding and directing everything. Not only is it declared of Christ that He created all things visible and invisible, but it is asserted that by Him all things subsist, or hold together (Col. 1:16, 17). He is said to uphold "all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3). Nor is this universe so bounded by laws and forces of nature as to exclude special divine interposition and interruptions. These interventions constitute no exception to the exactness of divine prescience, or foreknowledge. They are a part of the archetypal omniscience of God and are both foreseen and designed by Him from all eternity.

With the same omniscience or prescience God foreknows the actions of all moral agents. A discussion ensues at this point which has divided theologians into opposing camps, one group asserting that divine prescience

is incompatible with free moral action, and the other asserting its compatibility with free moral action. By their assumptions, one side has been encouraged to deny God's complete foreknowledge, while the other side has been by the force of its own logic encouraged to deny man's freedom. It is evident that both positions cannot be wholly true. One or the other or both must be wrong. In the minds of a larger number of theologians no conflict between divine prescience and human freedom exists. Divine prescience of itself implies no element of necessity or determination, though it does imply certainty. A formidable problem does arise concerning the relation between the doctrine of God's decrees and human freedom, which problem must be considered in its proper place.

Metaphysicians may succeed in confusing a person's understanding, but they cannot dispose of that inherent consciousness which every person experiences and which asserts his own freedom to act as he may choose. Doubtless this freedom is circumscribed by larger and unrecognized forces; but, within the range of human self-cognizance, freedom to act is untrammeled. On the one hand, revelation presents God as foreknowing knowing all things including the actions of human agents, and apart from such knowledge God would be ignorant and to that degree imperfect. On the other hand, revelation appeals to the wills of men with the evident assumption that man is capable of a free choice—"Whosoever will may come."

The Biblical teaching, as well as the rational belief that no incongruity exists between divine prescience and free moral action or contingency, is opposed in early times by Aristotle and later by Dr. Adam Clarke and Chevalier Ramsay. Dr. Clarke states: "God has ordained *some* things as absolutely certain. He has ordained other things as contingent. These he knows as contingent." Dr. Clarke, in defense of his belief, asserts: "As omnipotence implies the power to *do* all things, so omniscience implies the *ability* to know all things, but not the *obligation* to know all things … God, though possessed of omnipotence, does not evidently exert it to its utmost extent—does not do all he might do—so, though he could know all things, yet that he chooses to be ignorant of some things, because he does not see it proper to know everything he might know" (*Commentary* on Acts ii, cited by Cooke, *The Deity,* pp. 285–86). Chevalier Ramsay writes: "It [is] a

matter of choice in God, to think of finite ideas" (cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 376).

Aside from the implication which these objections present, namely, that God fears to know the results of free moral action, they introduce a fallacy which is untenable. It is true that omnipotence is of such a nature that it does not commit God to the actual doing of all He is able to do, omnipotence being only the *ability* to act with unlimited power. In contradistinction to this, omniscience is not the mere ability to acquire knowledge, but is the actual possession of knowledge. Dr.Clarke proposes to make God *omniscible* but not *omniscient*. If this supposed parallel between omnipotence and omniscience were true, omnipotence would consist in an infinite act as omniscience consists in the actual comprehending of all things. Richard Watson says of these theories: "The notion of God's choosing to know some things, and not to know others, supposes a *reason*, why he refuses to know any class of things or events, which reason, it would seem, can only arise out of their nature and circumstances, and therefore supposes at least a partial knowledge of them, from which the reason for his not choosing to know them arises. The doctrine is therefore somewhat contradictory. But it is fatal to this opinion, that it does not at all meet the difficulty arising out of the question of the congruity of Divine prescience, and the free actions of man; since some contingent actions, for which men have been made accountable, we are sure have been *foreknown* by God, because by his Spirit in the prophets they were *foretold*; and if the freedom of man can in these cases be reconciled to the prescience of God, there is no greater difficulty in any other case which can possibly occur" (*Theological Institutes*, I, 376–77).

If God be ignorant of the future actions of free agents, there could be no assured divine control of human destiny as pledged in every unconditional covenant God has made, and as guaranteed in every prophecy of the Scriptures. If God does not know the future actions of free agents, then He is ever coming to know things He did not know before and must be changing His plans and purposes constantly. Of that plight Jonathan Edwards writes: "In such a situation, God must have little else to do but to mend broken links as well as he can, and be rectifying his disjointed frame and disordered movements in the best manner the case will allow. The supreme Lord of all things must needs be under great and miserable

disadvantages in governing the world which he has made and has care of, through his being utterly unable to find out things of chief importance which hereafter shall befall his system, which, if he did but know, he might make seasonable provision for" (cited by Cooke, *op.cit*., p. 291).

If the question be asked whether the moral agent has freedom to act otherwise than as God foresees he will act, it may be replied that the human will because of its inherent freedom of choice is capable of electing the opposite course to that divinely foreknown; but he will not do so. If he did so, that would be the thing which God foreknew. The divine foreknowledge does not coerce; it merely knows what the human choice will be. The Socinians asserted that until the human choice was made, it was not a subject of knowledge and therefore even God could not know what the choice would be; but this is to confound human ignorance with divine omniscience. What God foreknows is certain, not because He foreknows it, but because of the fact that He has decreed it. The men who crucified Christ did precisely what a thousand years before had been predicted and therefore determined they would do, even to saying, "He trusted on the LORD that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him" (Ps. 22:8; cf. Matt. 27:43). And as predicted, they parted His garments among them and cast lots for His vesture. "These things [because it was so prophesied] therefore the soldiers did" (John 19:24). Within their own experience, these men said and did precisely what they freely chose to do; yet they said and did only what had been divinely determined and hence divinely foreknown (Acts 2:23).

The challenge that if God foreknew everything and therefore foreknew sin and could have avoided it, should be expanded to include the fact that God knows that men continue in sin, and that new generations of sinners are being born. Similarly, this challenge should consider the fact that the perfect foreknowledge of God was aware of the fact that sin would call for the greatest sacrifice even God could make—the death of His Son. In spite of the sinfulness of sin and the sacrifice it required, God was not overtaken by unforeseen calamity and failure. His purposes are being executed and will be seen in the end to have been holy, just, and good. Much that enters into this stupendous problem is beyond the range of human understanding, but not outside the divine jurisdiction which is ever compatible with infinite holiness.

A far deeper problem exists than that of the reconciliation of divine foreknowledge with the freedom of moral creatures, namely, the very freedom of God Himself if, indeed, His conception be eternally complete within His eternal prescience. Evidently, there is no problem before God as to a choice between two lines of action, for omniscience directs to that which is right, and that which is right has been discerned and determined from all eternity. What any intelligent being knows, is so closely related to what he purposes and does that it is somewhat difficult to isolate issues which are restricted to knowledge alone. The holy character of God cannot change. He possesses no freedom which involves a contradiction of His holy character. When confronted with sinful man His displeasure is expressed and His sure judgments are in view; but when the wicked turn to Him and avail themselves of His grace, His mercy is boundless and His judgments are abandoned. In such a case, holiness is unchanged. Though in the one instance it repels and in the other it favors, it is the same holiness throughout. There is no change in God, but there is adjustment to the changes which are in man.

The practical appeal of omniscience is manifold. By the divine arrangement in creation, men are ever within the observation of God. Man can no more escape from God than he can escape from himself. The Mohammedan's proverb, "Wherever there are two persons present, God makes a third" (cited by Cooke, *ibid*., p. 298), might as well embody the truth that wherever there is one person, God makes a second. The Scripture, "Thou God seest me", announces the fact that none ever escapes His observation. What fatuity is manifest when it is supposed that any sin is secret, and that only because it is hidden to men. The Psalmist speaks of "our secret sins in the light of thy countenance" (Ps. 90:8; cf. Job 42:2; Isa. 29:15; Jer. 23:24; Heb. 4:13). How rich with wisdom is the word of Seneca, "We ought always so to conduct ourselves as if we lived in public; we ought to think as if some one could see what is passing in our inmost breast; and there is One who does thus behold us. Of what avail is it, then, that any deed is concealed from man? Nothing can be hidden from God. He is present with our very souls, and penetrates our inmost thoughts, and, indeed, is never absent from us" (*Seneca*, epist. lxxxiii., cited by Cooke, *ibid*., p. 299). Truly, man's position before God is to "stand in awe, and sin not" (Ps. 4:4).

The omniscience of God guarantees that all future judgments will be according to truth; nothing will be overlooked or falsely valued. Of this Dr. William Cooke writes: “If the transgressor’s eyes could but be opened to the reality of his position, what horror would seize him! A sight more dreadful than Sinai in a blaze—more terrific than the handwriting on the wall of Belshazzar’s palace—a sight more awful than the drama of the world’s conflagration would burst upon his vision—he would see the offended Deity on every side, he would behold himself enveloped with the presence and attributes of the eternal God, his Maker and his Judge” (*Ibid*., p. 301). “Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down: and though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent, and he shall bite them: and though they go into captivity before their enemies, thence will I command the sword, and it shall slay them: and I will set mine eyes upon them for evil, and not for good” (Amos 9:2–4).

The omniscience of God is fraught with great encouragement and comfort to those who are in right relations to Him. Every sincere effort, though fruitless, every suffering through misunderstanding, every trial may be endured in the light of the truth that God sees and knows perfectly. The Old Testament closes with words of great significance: “Then they that feared the LORD spake often one to another: and the LORD hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the LORD, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the LORD of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him” (Mal. 3:16, 17).

Closely akin to divine omniscience, though superior to it, is divine *wisdom*. This, as an attribute of God, implies correct judgment and the right use of knowledge. Indeed, knowledge is the material out of which wisdom builds its structure. God is no less perfect in wisdom than in any other of His attributes. In fact, His wisdom so far transcends that of all other beings that the Scriptures declare Him to be “the only wise God” (Jude 1:25; cf. 1 Tim. 1:17). His wisdom is displayed in the vast, complex, yet perfectly organized universe, in the fact that every purpose of God is the best that infinity can devise, in the perfection of His ways by which all things are by

Him achieved. No part of God's works is lacking in its manifestation of His perfect wisdom. However, in no place has divine wisdom been so displayed as in the plan of redemption. Here God is seen to have solved His greatest of all problems, namely, how He could be just and at the same time be the justifier of sinners. Reference is made to the solution of this problem in 1 Corinthians 1:22–25: "For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

Abundant testimony is borne by the Bible both to the knowledge and wisdom of God:

> "For the eyes of the LORD run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him. Herein thou hast done foolishly: therefore from henceforth thou shalt have wars" (2 Chron. 16:9); "But he knowesh the way that I take: when he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold" (Job 23:10); "O LORD, how great are thy works! and thy thoughts are very deep" (Ps. 92:5); "O LORD, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches" (Ps. 104:24); "To him that by wisdom made the heavens: for his mercy endureth for ever" (Ps. 136:5); "O LORD, thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O LORD thou knowest it altogether. Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it. Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee" (Ps. 139:1–12); "For the LORD taketh pleasure in his people: he will beautify the meek with salvation. Let the saints be joyful in glory: let them sing aloud upon their beds" (Ps. 149:4, 5); "The LORD by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding bath he established the heavens" (Prov. 3:19); "Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them" (Isa. 42:9); "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me" (Isa. 45:4); "For I know their works and their thoughts: it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come, and see my glory" (Isa. 66:18); "He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heaven by his understanding" (Jer. 51:15); "And the Spirit of the LORD fell upon me, and said unto me, Speak; Thus saith the LORD, Thus have ye said, O house of Israel: for I know the things that come into your mind, every one of them" (Ezek. 11:5); "That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. (For

after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things" (Matt. 6:4, 8, 32); "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence" (Eph. 1:8); "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10); "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" (Rom. 11:33).

2. Sensibility. By this term the second element in personality is introduced. Both in philosophical and theological usage, the designation *sensibility* includes the higher forms of feeling and stands as much for the rational and moral as for the lower appetences. Though a difference as to degree and essential purity is recognized between the divine and the human sensibility, the reality of the divine cannot be questioned. To dispose of the vast body of Scripture bearing on this theme by maintaining that divine sensibility as set forth in the Bible is no more than an anthropomorphism, does not meet the exigency; rather, and far more in agreement with the truth, the human sensibility but feebly reflects that which subsists in God to the degree of infinite perfection. The fact that in God the emotions of love and patience, and the attributes of holiness, justice, goodness, mercy, and faithfulness exist, goes far to indicate the true quality of God as in contrast to the errors of deism and pantheism. Too frequent, indeed, have been the efforts of theological writers to remove from the thoughts of men the warm and sentient nature which, by every form of utterance, the Scriptures seek to uphold. Defining God by negatives is justified only when the elements of weakness and imperfection, which are resident in man, are to be eliminated. This procedure is carried too far when God is presented as pure intelligence and action apart from those emotions which sustain the divine attitude and motivate the divine action. Sensibility in God is as well defined as are the other essentials of personality—intelligence and will. Apart from the feeble experience of human love, men could comprehend nothing of the revelation set forth in the words of Christ to His Father, "For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world," and the words of Christ to men, "God so loved the world." It is no limitation in God that He requires an object for His love, or that His love varies with different objects. There is peculiar force in the words addressed to Israel, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love" (Jer. 31:3), and in the words, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Rom. 9:13; cf. Mal. 1:2–4).

The sensibility of God includes His rational Being. In the universe He has expressed His ultimate desire, and of that universe, in its original form, He could say, “It was very good.” Having contemplated the beautiful in creation, none could doubt the aesthetic nature in God. That man derives his aesthetic nature from God, is well stated by Hugh Miller: “I must hold that we receive the true explanation of the *man*-like character of the Creator’s workings ere man was, in the remarkable text in which we are told that ‘God made man in his own image and likeness.’ There is no restriction here to moral quality: the moral image man had, and in large measure lost; but the intellectual image he still retains. As a geometrician, as an arithmetician, as a chemist, as an astronomer—in short, in all the departments of what are known as the strict sciences—man differs from his Maker, not in kind, but in degree—not as matter differs from mind, or darkness from light, but simply as a mere portion of space or time differs from *all* space or *all* time. I have already referred to mechanical contrivances as identically the same in the divine and human productions; nor can I doubt that, not only in the pervading sense of the beautiful in form and color which it is our privilege as men in some degree to experience and possess, but also in the perception of harmony which constitutes the *musical* sense, and in that poetic feeling of which Scripture furnishes us with at once the earliest and the highest examples, and which we may term the *poetic* sense, we bear the stamp and impress of the divine image” (*Testimony of the Rocks*, pp. 259–60, cited by Miley, *Theology*, I, 197). Similarly Bowne writes:

> We hold, therefore, that God is not only pure thought, but he is also absolute intuition and absolute sensibility. He not only grasps reality in his absolute thought, but he sees it in his absolute intuition, and enjoys it in his absolute sensibility. We cannot without contradiction allow that there is any thing in the world of the thinkable which is excluded from the source of all thought and knowledge. Our notion of God as pure thought only would exclude the harmonies of light, sound, and form from his knowledge; and limit him to a knowledge of the skeleton of the universe instead of its living beauty. The notion of God as sensitive appears as anthropomorphic only because of mental confusion. To the thoughtless, sensibility implies a body; but in truth it is as purely spiritual an affection as the most abstract thought. All the body does for us is to call forth sensibility; but it in no sense produces it, and it is entirely conceivable that it should exist in a purely spiritual being apart from any body. There can hardly be a more irrational conception of the divine knowledge than that which assumes that it grasps reality only as it exists for pure thought, and misses altogether the look and the life of things. On the contrary, just as we regard our reason as the faint type of the infinite reason, so we regard our intuitions of things as a faint type of the absolute intuition; and so also we regard the harmonies of sensibility and feeling as the faintest echoes of the absolute

sensibility, stray notes wandering off from the source of feeling and life and beauty.—*Metaphysics*, pp. 201–2, cited by Miley, *ibid*., pp. 198–99

There are certain modes to be observed of divine, moral sensibility, and all of these, in turn, are well-defined attributes of God.

a. Holiness: The holiness of God is *active*. As a primary motive, it incites all that He does; therefore He is righteous in His ways. Though infinitely holy, He nevertheless maintains a relation to fallen creatures; not a quiescent aloofness from them, but a vital, pulsating nearness. His is not a holiness which is engendered by a sustained effort or preserved by segregation from other beings. The holiness of God is intrinsic, uncreated, and untarnishable; it is observable in every divine attitude and action. It embraces not only His devotion to that which is good, but is also the very basis and force of His hatred of that which is evil. Thus there is in divine holiness the capacity for reaction toward others which is both positive and negative.

The following Scriptures, selected from the great volume of Biblical testimony on this theme, will serve to declare the holiness of God:

> "And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Ex. 3:5); "Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am holy" (Lev. 19:2); "There is none holy as the LORD: for there is none beside thee: neither is there any rock like our God" (1 Sam. 2:2); "Behold, he putteth no trust in his saints; yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight" (Job 15:15); "But thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel" (Ps. 22:3); "God reigneth over the heathen: God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness" (Ps. 47:8); "He sent redemption unto his people: he hath commanded his covenant for ever: holy and reverend is his name" (Ps. 111:9); "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. 6:3); "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (Isa. 57:15); "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5); "And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come" (Rev. 4:8); "And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. 6:10); "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest" (Rev. 15:4).

b. Justice. This is a legal term and refers to the essential character of the divine government in that highest excellence agreeable to which that government ever advances. At this point it is well to observe that God has absolute right and authority over His creatures. In his rebellion against God, the creature steadfastly refuses to recognize the truth concerning the Creator's right and authority. God could have created or not at His pleasure. Other beings than those made might have been made and those made might have been left without existence. He has perfect right to dispose of all His works as it may please Him. If reflection is pursued on these relationships, it will be evident that man's rightful sphere is that of the dependent creature and that man's highest destiny will be reached, not by resisting the Creator, but by a complete conformity to His will. Since the Creator's authority is absolute, it is a superlative cause for gratitude that God is perfect in justice. What wretchedness would be the creature's portion if it were otherwise!

Divine justice is exhibited in the fact that righteous laws are given to men, that these laws are sustained by proper sanctions, and that these laws are given an impartial execution. No favoritism is ever indulged, though infinite favor is extended to those who come under the righteous provisions for salvation made possible through Christ's sacrifice for sin. On this it may be remarked, that at no point is divine justice more observable than in the plan of redemption. What is done on the divine side for lost men through Christ's sacrifice, is wrought in perfect justice—such justice, indeed, as is consonant with infinite holiness. Justice demands that the penalty, having fallen upon Another and that benefit having been embraced as the ground of hope by the offender, shall not fall again upon the offender. Holiness dictates that there shall be no leniency toward evil on the part of God. It is true that He considers our frame and remembers that we are dust; but God never condones sin. God is not said to be merciful or kind when He justifies the one who believes on Christ; He is said to be *just* (Rom. 3:26). To the same end, when forgiving and cleansing the Christian who confesses his sin, God is said to be *faithful* and *just* (1 John 1:9; cf. 1 Cor. 11:31, 32). In His administrative and theocratic dealing with nations—especially Israel—, there are extensions of both His blessings and judgments on into succeeding generations. None of these extensions of judgment or penalty became a finality of divine dealing with the individual in God's retributive justice, which renders to each individual according to his personal relation to God.

One, and only one, provision has been made—and that at infinite cost—whereby the wicked may escape the penalties of outraged justice. To reject this open door of salvation which Christ is and wherein God without impairment to His holy justice can execute complete and perfect grace toward the sinner, becomes at once the final, allcondemning sin.

Finally, the justice of God will be seen in His disposition of all creatures in the end—eternal glory to those who through redemption have come into those relations with Him which give Him freedom to do for them in perfect justice all His infinite love disposes, and eternal reprobation on those who persistently repudiate Him. Justice requires that saints shall be rewarded for faithfulness—some more and some less. With the same consistency, justice demands that there shall be degrees of experience in the estate of the lost. It is written: "For as many as have sinned without law [the law of Moses] shall also perish without law [the law of Moses]: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law … in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel" (Rom. 2:12–16). It is true that the crime increases in God's sight in ratio to the light accorded the sinner. It is not intended in the above passage to imply that those without the Mosaic law (cf. 1 Cor. 9:21) will escape judgment (these have sinned against a law as is stated in verses 14 and 15), but the Jew to whom more light was given will be subject to the greater condemnation. The normal experience is that all shall "perish" (cf. vs. 12, also John 3:16; 10:28). The abnormal experience is that the Jew, to whom the Mosaic law was given. shall suffer greater condemnation. M. R. Vincent writes: "*Both* classes of men shall be *condemned;* in both the result will be *perishing,* but the judgment *by the law* is confined to those who have the law" (*Word Studies* on Rom. 2:12). And Godet adds: "The Jews alone will be, strictly speaking, subject to *a detailed inquiry* such as arises from applying the particular articles of a code" (cited by Vincent, *loc. cit*.). They, one and all, shall be lost eternally (cf. Rev. 20:12–15).

The Scriptures testify to the justice of God: "Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it: for there is no iniquity with the LORD our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts" (2 Chron. 19:7); "Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker?" (Job 4:17); "The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether" (Ps.

19:9); “Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face” (Ps. 89:14); “Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the LORD? and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me” (Isa. 45:21); “Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead” (Acts 17:31); “And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints” (Rev. 15:3).

c. Love. Certain terms—three in all—are used in the Scriptures as comprehensive descriptions of God, namely, *Spirit*—“God is a Spirit” (John 4:24)—; *light*—“God is light” (1 John 1:5)—; and *love*—“God is love” (1 John 4:8). By the word *comprehensive* it is asserted that the terms *Spirit, light,* and *love* refer not merely to peculiar virtues among many which are in God, but that God is Himself precisely what these terms denote. More specifically concerning *love:* God has not attained unto love, nor does He by an effort maintain love; it is the structure of His being. He is the unfailing source of all love. It is, because of this fact, preeminently the thing which He requires. “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” Without the attribute of *love*, God would not be what He is. As no other attribute, love is the primary motive in God, and to satisfy His love all creation has been formed. It is because of the fact that God has no need which He depends on others to supply, that He is ever bestowing and imparting. It is essential, also, that He shall have those upon whom His benevolence may be conferred; hence the innumerable creatures who are above all else the objects of His affection. Christians are addressed under the meaningful title, *beloved,* which title means simply that they are to *be loved* of God.

That infinite love has always existed between the Persons of the Godhead and that God in the most worthy sense loves Himself supremely, cannot be questioned. The divine love thus did not begin to be exercised only when creatures—the objects of His love—were created. Even His love for the creature was in His anticipation. Within God Himself it is true that from all eternity “mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace

have kissed each other" (Ps. 85:10). It is the advent of evil into God's creation that set up a conflict within the attributes of God. Holiness condemns sin while the love of God seeks to save the sinner. Love alone could make the sacrifice requisite that the sinner might be saved. This undertaking should not be interpreted as though one God (Christ) is saving the sinner from another God (the Father). It is within the very nature of God that adjustment between the attributes has been wrought. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). Divine love, though so measureless in itself, is ever amenable to divine reason and divine righteousness. The adjustment between holiness and love, as these attributes are affected by sin, though wrought out in time and at the cross, was anticipated from all eternity. Of Christ it is said that He is a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8). The love of God had its perfect manifestation in the death of Christ (John 3:16; Rom. 5:8; 1 John 3:16). It is not a mere affection, but is rather a free choice of God which may be recognized in all that He does. "God is love."

d. Goodness. This attribute, if contemplated as that which is within God, is akin to His holiness; if contemplated as that which proceeds from God, is akin to love. The infinite goodness of God is a perfection of His being which characterizes His nature and is itself the source of all in the universe that is good. The specific terms employed in setting forth the goodness of God are (a) *benevolence,* which is goodness in its generic sense as embracing all His creatures and securing their welfare; (b) *complacency*, which is that in God which approves all His own perfections as well as all that conforms to Himself; (c) *mercy,* which is God's goodness exercised in behalf of the need of His creatures; and (d) *grace,* which is God's free action in behalf of those who are meritless, which freedom to act has been secured through the death of Christ. The terms, *mercy, love,* and *grace* are too often confused. They appear in the limited context of Ephesians 2:4, 5 and are there used with due discrimination: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) …"

There is a threefold, present, and immediate exercise of divine mercy. First, God is said to be merciful to those who put their trust in Him. To them He is "the Father of mercies" (2 Cor. 1:3), and they are invited to draw near

to His throne of grace where, they are assured, they will now "obtain mercy" (Heb. 4:16). Second, the divine mercy will yet be manifested in behalf of Israel when they are regathered into their own land (Isa. 54:7). Third, mercy is exercised, also, when the individual sinner is called from his lost estate and saved by the grace of God (Rom. 9:15, 18; 1 Tim. 1:13). However, the mercy of God has had its supreme manifestation in the giving of His Son for the lost of this world. Sinners who believe are not now said to be saved through the immediate and personal exercise of divine mercy; but rather, since the mercy of God has provided a Savior who is the perfect Substitute for them, both as a sin-bearer, that they might be forgiven all trespasses, and as the righteous ground of a complete justification, God is said to be "just" when He justifies the one who does no more than to "believe in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26). Thus, from every angle of approach, God is seen to be "rich in mercy."

e. Truth. The character of God is in view when He is called the God of truth. He not only advances and confirms that which is true, but in faithfulness abides by His promise, and executes every threat or warning He has made. Apart from the element of *truth* in God there would be no certainty whatsoever in this life, and men would wander on in comfortless perplexity not knowing whence they came or whither they are going. Without *truth* in God, a revelation is only a mockery. On the contrary, as asserted in the Bible, "Let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom. 3:4). Though men deceive, the veracity of God can never be questioned in the slightest degree.

Truth in God is surety that what He has disclosed is according to the nature of things and that His disclosures may be depended upon with plenary certainty. This certainty characterizes alike every revelation from God by whatever means. God has given to men their senses which, under normal conditions, give true and accurate information regarding objects which God would have men recognize. The very philosophers who contend that matter does not really exist but is only an impression within the mind, do themselves contradict their notions by avoiding the dangers and forces of nature. Again, reason, though not sufficient in itself, is, where its conclusions are grounded on facts, another disclosure of divine reality. The final setting forth of God's truth is in the Bible. It, being the Word of God,

is true in all its parts. There is a vast array of truth, themes, and subjects about which man of himself could know nothing. The Bible supplies this dependable information. “The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times” (Ps. 12:6). He is declared to be a covenant-keeping God. Some of His covenants contain only promises and some contain promises and warnings. He is faithful to every word He has said. “God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?” (Num. 23:19). “He is faithful that promised” (Heb. 10:23). In case man fails in his part of a conditional covenant, God is freed from that covenant. If He then does otherwise than proposed in the covenant, He is not untrue. Having promised Abraham without a condition that Abraham’s seed would be delivered from Egypt (Gen. 15:13, 14), it is written: “And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt” (Ex. 12:41). It is ever true, because God is true, that “there failed not ought of any good thing which the LORD had spoken.”

God is equally true in the execution of all threatenings, but there is implied a release for those who turn to Him. He declares: “At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them” (Jer. 18:7, 8). In like manner, it is declared that God reckons the unsaved to be already under condemnation, and that, “he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” But, on the other hand, it is promised, “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life” (John 3:36). There is no greater certainty of perdition than is found in the fact that God, who cannot lie, has said that it shall be so.

The faithfulness of God is the unfailing source of comfort and assurance to those who are right with Him, or partakers of His covenants of promise. It was a word of great meaning when Christ said, “I am the … truth” (John 14:6).

3. WILL. The third essential element in personality is *will*, and of the will of God very much may be observed. Will is that in God which puts into

effect all He has designed. Evidence that will belongs to God is established by the fact that it belongs to personality, that it belongs to perfection, that it belongs to independence, that it has been exercised in creation, and that it is directly ascribed to God in the Scriptures (John 1:13; Rom. 8:27; 12:2; 1 Cor. 1:1; Eph. 1:5). The will of God may be considered as *free* and *omnipotent*.

a. Freedom. The will of God is *free*. It acts in the way of wisdom, is exercised by infinite power, and upholds only His righteous purposes and ways; yet it is free in the sense that it is independent of all His creatures as well of all their actions. When reflecting upon this aspect of the will of God, theologians sometimes distinguish between the *decretive* will of God and the *preceptive* will of God. The decretive will is yet to be considered more fully in the next section of this treatise. This aspect of the divine will is His efficacious purpose concerning all that is, or will be, in the creation He has wrought. Over against this, the preceptive will of God is that which merely commands but does not compel His creatures. These two aspects of will are not in conflict. Preceptive will may be resisted, as it too often is. Each rejection of His command, though foreknown, is not approved by Him. Preceptive will offers a precept which men may receive or reject. The will of God does not determine what is right or wrong. The idea sometimes obtains that God by sovereign decree might cause wrong to be right and right to be wrong. What God wills is right because it expresses His holy character. However, it was concerning things, some of which were good and some evil, that Christ prayed: "Yea, Father: for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight" (Matt. 11:26, R.V.).

Another distinction in the free will of God is that some of His purposes are secret, termed *voluntas beneplaciti*, and some are revealed, termed *signi*. God commanded Abraham to offer his son, yet it was in the secret will of God that Abraham would be spared that ordeal. The distinction between *beneplaciti* and *signi* is stated in Deuteronomy 29:29: "The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law" (cf. Ps. 36:6; Rom. 11:33, 34).

b. Omnipotence. The infinite power of God, which is termed *omnipotence*, is employed in the realization of all that God wills. Much that God does is by

a direct volition apart from means and agencies. God said, “Let there be light: and there was light.” This is omnipotence operating through volition. The will of man is restricted to thoughts, purposes, volitions, and certain bodily movements. Man can cause nothing to exist by the force of his will. The divine ability to bring a universe into existence out of nothing by volition is the grand manifestation of power. Such power belongs alone to God. He is able to do whatever He wills, but He may not will to do to the full measure of omnipotence. His will is directed in the way of holy and worthy ends. He cannot contradict himself. John Howe has said, “It belongs to self-existent being, to be always full and communicative, and to the communicated, contingent being, to be ever empty and craving” (cited by Watson. *Institutes*, I, 363).

Mr. Richard Watson has written somewhat at length on divine omnipotence. The following is vital:

> In the revelation which was thus designed to awe and control the bad, and to afford strength of mind and consolation to the good under all circumstances, the omnipotence of God is therefore placed in a great variety of impressive views, and connected with the most striking illustrations.
>
> It is presented by the fact of *creation*, the creation of beings out of *nothing*, which itself, though it had been confined to a single object, however minute, exceeds finite comprehension, and overwhelms the faculties. This with God required no effort—“He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.” The *vastness* and *variety* of his works enlarge the conception. “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work.” “He spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea; he maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south; he doeth great things, past finding out, yea, and wonders without number. He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in the thick clouds, and the cloud is not rent under them; he hath compassed the waters with bounds until the day and night come to an end.” The *ease* with which he sustains, orders, and controls the most powerful and unruly of the elements, presents his omnipotence under an aspect of ineffable dignity and majesty. “By him all things consist.” He brake up for the sea “a decreed place, and set bars and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed.” “He looketh to the end of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven, to make the weight for the winds, to weigh the waters by measure, to make a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder.” “Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, meted out heaven with a span, comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the winds in a balance?” The descriptions of the Divine power are often *terrible*. “The pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at his reproof; he divideth the sea by his power.” “He removeth the mountains, and they know it not; he overturneth them in his anger, he shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble; he commandeth the sun and it riseth not, and sealeth up the stars.” The same absolute subjection of creatures to his dominion is seen among the

intelligent inhabitants of the material universe, and angels, men the most exalted, and evil spirits, are swayed with as much ease as the least resistless elements. “He maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.” They veil their faces before his throne, and acknowledge themselves his servants. “It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers,” “as the dust of the balance, less than nothing and vanity.” “He bringeth princes to nothing.” “He setteth up one and putteth down another,” “for the kingdom is the Lord’s and he is governor among the nations.” “The angels that sinned, he cast down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.” The closing scenes of this world complete these transcendent conceptions of the majesty and power of God. The dead of all ages shall rise from their graves at his *voice;* and the sea shall give up the dead which are in it. Before his *face* heaven and earth flee away, the stars fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven are shaken. The dead, small and great, stand before God, and are divided as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; the wicked go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.

Of these amazing views of the omnipotence of God, spread almost through every page of the Scripture, the power lies in their *truth*. They are not eastern exaggerations, mistaken for sublimity. Every thing in nature answers to them, and renews from age to age the energy of the impression which they cannot but make upon the reflecting mind. The order of the astral revolutions indicates the constant presence of an invisible but incomprehensible power:—the seas hurl the weight of their billows upon the rising shores, but every where find a “*bound* fixed by a perpetual decree;”—the tides reach their height; if they flowed on for a few hours, the earth would change places with the bed of the sea; but under an invisible control they become refluent. “He toucheth the mountains and they smoke,” is not mere imagery. Every volcano is a testimony of that truth to nature which we find in the Scriptures; and earthquakes teach, that before him, “the pillars of the world tremble.” Men collected into armies, and populous nations, give us vast ideas of human *power:* but let an army be placed amidst the sand storms and burning winds of the desert, as, in the east, has frequently happened; or before “*his frost*,” as in our own day, in Russia, where one of the mightiest armaments was seen retreating before, or perishing under an unexpected visitation of snow and storm; or let the utterly helpless state of a populous country which has been visited by famine, or by a resistless pestilential disease, be reflected upon, and it is no figure of speech to say, that “all nations are before him *less than nothing* and *vanity*.”

Nor in reviewing this doctrine of Scripture, ought the fine practical uses made of the omnipotence of God, by the sacred writers, to be overlooked. In them there is nothing said for the display of knowledge, as, too often, in heathen writers; no speculation without a *moral* subservient to it, and that by evident *design*. To excite and keep alive in man the fear and worship of God, and to bring him to a felicitous confidence in that almighty power which pervades and controls all things, we have observed, are the reasons for those ample displays of the omnipotence of God, which roll through the sacred volume with a sublimity that inspiration only could supply. “Declare his glory among the heathen, his marvellous works among all nations; for great is the Lord and greatly to be praised. Glory and honour are in his presence, and strength and gladness in his place. Give unto the Lord, ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength; give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name. The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? If God be for us, who then can be against us? Our help standeth in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth. What time I am afraid, I will trust in thee.” Thus, as one observes, “our natural fears, of which we must have many, remit us to God, and remind us, since we know what God is, to lay hold on his almighty power.”

> Ample however as are the views afforded us in Scripture of the power of God, we are not to consider the subject as bounded by them. As when the Scriptures declare the eternity of God, they declare it so as to unveil to us something of that fearful peculiarity of the Divine nature, that he is the fountain of being to himself, and that he is eternal, because he is the "I AM"; so we are taught not to measure his omnipotence by the actual displays of it which have been made. They are the *manifestations* of the principle, but not the *measure* of its capacity; and should we resort to the discoveries of modern philosophy, which, by the help of instruments, has so greatly enlarged the known boundaries of the visible universe, and add to the stars, visible to the naked eye, new exhibitions of the Divine power in those nebulous appearances of the heavens which are resolvable into myriads of distinct celestial luminaries, whose immense distances commingle their light before it reaches our eyes; we thus almost infinitely expand the circle of created existence, and enter upon a formerly unknown and overwhelming range of Divine operation; but we are still reminded, that his power is truly *almighty* and *measureless*—"Lo, all these are parts of his ways, but how little a portion is known of him, and the thunder of his power who can understand?" It is a mighty conception to think of a power from which all other power is derived, and to which it is subordinate; which nothing can oppose; which can beat down and annihilate all other powers whatever; a power which operates in the most perfect manner; at once, in an instant, with the utmost ease: but the Scriptures lead us to the contemplation of greater depths, and those unfathomable. The omnipotence of God is inconceivable and boundless. It arises from the infinite perfection of God, that his power can never be actually exhausted; and in every imaginable instant in eternity, that inexhaustible power of God can, if it please him, be adding either more creatures to those in existence, or greater perfection to them.—*Ibid*., I, 360–63

II. Constitutional Attributes

In the previous discussion, the attributes of God related to personality have been contemplated with little or no regard for their classification as either *constitutional* or *characterizing*. Insuperable difficulty must be confessed by every attentive student who attempts an arbitrary classification of all the attributes of God. The present grouping of the attributes includes those which are distinctively *constitutional* and these complete the list of the characteristic predicates of God. These are predicables of His essential Being. They are not communicated to other beings. The fact that they are peculiar to God and absent in all others at once creates a difficulty not met with in the study of attributes which are, to some degree, reflected in the creature's sphere. Having some vital relation to good as in contrast to evil, man may by analogy reason from his ideals of that which is good on to the perfect righteousness of God; but such a basis of reason or such a source of impression does not exist when the constitutional attributes are investigated. The entire theme is abstract, theoretical, and abstruse, so far as human experience is involved. The designation, *constitutional attributes*, is

employed only for want of a better term. There is a very worthy question to be raised as to whether simplicity, infinity, omnipresence, immutability, eternity, and sovereignty are attributes at all. These predicables arise outside the perfection of His personal attributes and are equally a reality of each. The holiness, love, and justice of God are all infinite in their scope, and that which characterizes other attributes can hardly itself be an attribute. These constitutional attributes are:

1. Simplicity. By this term it is indicated that the divine Being is uncompounded, incomplex, and indivisible. Man is a compound of spirit and matter. Angels, if they are without bodies adapted to the sphere in which they exist, would be nearer the ideal of divine simplicity than men, but would lack the perfection of simplicity which belongs to God alone. Complexity is not the highest ideal in any being. As in works of art, the more simplified a thing is the more its properties satisfy and abide. Thus it is with God. He being the perfect One, is to be worshiped as the finality and infinity of simplicity. On the simplicity which God is, Dr. A. A. Hodge writes:

> The term simplicity is used, *first*, in opposition to material composition, whether mechanical, organic, or chemical; *second*, in a metaphysical sense in negation of the relation of substance and property, essence and mode. In the first sense of the word human souls are simple, because they are not composed of elements, parts, or organs. In the second sense of the word our souls are complex, since there is in them a distinction between their essence and their properties, and their successive modes or states of existence. As, however, God is infinite, eternal, self-existent from eternity, necessarily the same without succession, theologians have maintained that in him essence, and property, and mode are one. He always is what he is; and his various states of intellection, emotion, and volition are not successive and transient but co-existent and permanent; and he is what he is essentially, and by the same necessity that he exists. Whatever is in God, whether thought, emotion, volition, or act, is God.
>
> Some men conceive of God as passing through various transient modes and states just as men do, and therefore they suppose the properties of the divine nature are related to the divine essence as the properties of created things are related to the essences which are endowed with them. Others press the idea of simplicity so far that they deny any distinction in the divine attributes in themselves, and suppose that the only difference between them is to be found in the mode of external manifestation, and in the effects produced. They illustrate their idea by the various effects produced on different objects by the same radiance of the sun.
>
> In order to avoid both extremes theologians have been accustomed to say that the divine attributes differ from the divine essence and from one another, 1st, not *realiter* or as one thing differs from another, or in any such way as to imply composition in God. Nor 2d, merely

nominaliter, as though there were nothing in God really corresponding to our conceptions of his perfections. But 3d, they are said to differ *virtualiter*, so that there is in him a foundation or adequate reason for all the representations which are made in Scripture with regard to the divine perfections, and for the consequent conceptions which we have of them.—*Outlines of Theology*, pp. 136–37

When attempting to define simplicity as manifest in God, confusion sometimes arises. (1) Simplicity of Being in God is not a contradiction of the Trinity of Persons in which mode He subsists. The fact of the Trinity does not predicate three Essences; it rather predicates one Essence and the one Essence is *simple* in itself. The whole of the Essence is in each Person. (2) The attributes of God are not detached portions of His Being which when compounded compose God. His Essence is in every attribute and each attribute sets forth some fact related to His uncompounded Essence. As J. F. Bruch has stated: "The Divine attributes belong to God, not as though they made up His nature, as though His whole being consisted only of the combination of the same; but because they are the *forms* and *outward expressions*, in which His Being is revealed and becomes manifest" (cited by Van Oosterzee, *Dogmatics*, I, 253). And (3) God, being infinite simplicity, is not diffused as an efflux of particles might go out from a source to form new entities of existence. As Creator, He is the Author of all things. He breathed into man the breath of life and man was so made that he manifests the "image" and "likeness" of God; but human life is not a part of God as a contributing element in the Being of God. Whatever is God retains its uncomplicated character as God, indivisible and undiminishable. Nothing can be compounded without the possibility of its being divided. Added to this is the fact that a thing which is compounded is the workmanship of some other being and God is the First Cause of all things and Himself compounded or created by none. The simplicity of God is essential to the very mode of His Being.

2. Unity. Closely allied to the attribute of simplicity is that of unity, the difference being that though God were compounded in contradistinction to His simplicity, He would still be a *unity*, or *one* in Himself. He would still be a unity or single entity if He, like man, were composed of matter and spirit. If there were but one man in the world, to him the word *unity* would apply, and if there could be but one man in the universe to him the designation *essential unity* would apply. Similarly, the word *unity* is to be

distinguished from the fact that God is a Spirit since He could be more than pure Spirit and yet retain His unity.

The theological import of the word *unity* as applied to God is that God is one essence. Trinitarianism is not tritheism. Unitarians are no more committed to the doctrine of divine unity than are Trinitarians. "The LORD our God is one LORD" (Deut. 6:4). The entire Bible emphasizes the fact of the unity of God and in no portion more than in the Decalogue. In like manner it is written: "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me" (Deut. 32:39); "Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God" (Isa. 44:6); "There is none other God but one" (1 Cor. 8:4). This sublime theme could hardly be stated more convincingly or adequately than it is in the Athanasian Creed. It declares "that we worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity; neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance; for there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one; the glory equal, the majesty coeternal. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God" (cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 474).

The unity of God is a predicable. It does not determine what God is in Himself. It has to do only with His mode of existence. Unity, therefore, by some theologians is refused a place among the attributes of God. The logical place for its full consideration is under the treatment of the Trinity (which see).

3. INFINITY. This, a negative predicate of God, is negative only in the sense that God is infinite and, therefore, *not* finite. The fact of the infinity of God relates itself to all attributes in that they are what they are to an infinite degree, or without termination. God transcends all limitations which time or space impose. He cannot be imprisoned either in time or space. In like manner, He knows all things perfectly. He is able to bring things to pass, even to create as He wills apart from means or material, and always in measureless perfection. In every moral quality He is complete to infinity.

God has been styled "The Absolute," which is an attempt to express the fact that He exists eternally by no cause whatsoever outside Himself and

that He alone is the sufficient cause of all that is. This is infinity in its outmost demonstration.

4. Eternity. By the word *eternity*, the relation which God sustains to duration is denoted. God, being the Author of time, is in no way conditioned by it. He is free to act in relation to time and is equally free to act outside its limitations. Acting in time He said to Abraham, "Is any thing too hard for the LORD? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son" (Gen. 18:14). Thus, again, "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son" (Gal. 4:4).

The word *eternity* is employed in two ways: (1) to describe that which is either from eternity past, or that which is unto eternity to come. Creation has no part in the eternity which is past, since it had a beginning. On the other hand, both men and angels have a relation to eternity to come, since they can never cease to exist. (2) Eternity is more properly the designation of eternity as gathered into one conception. It is in this aspect of eternity that God is said to be "the eternal God." He is from everlasting to everlasting. The problem as to how time is disposed of in eternity is beyond the penetration of finite minds. In like manner, it is of little profit to speculate as to how and by what means time began and what, if ever, will be the cause of its end. The pure idea of eternity is too vast for human thought. On this obvious truth, Dr. Samuel Harris has written:

> The eternal Being exists without beginning or end. Existence limited in time must have a beginning and may have an end. A dependent being has no guarantee of itself that it will exist forever. Its existence may be terminated by the power on which it depends. These limitations are denied of God. In respect to these no difficulty is usually felt.
>
> Another limitation of a being in time is that its existence is transitional through a succession of events. This commonly occasions more difficulty. The following statement, so far as it goes, seems to give a real meaning. God as the absolute Spirit exists independent of time. Time, with the universe conditioned by it, is dependent on him. Acting in time God remains through all its succession and changes immutable and the same. He is not in the chain of causes and effects. He does not exist in transition through successive forms of being. In his being and his essential attributes as personal Spirit, he is immutably the same, the eternal One from whom all succession of events issues and by comparison with whom as the unchanging standard succession is possible. He is the I AM. Even in our own being we find an analogy with this. Every personal being persists in identity, while the subject of successive acts and events. A man, in the likeness of God in his rational free personality, is also an I AM; he abides one and the same person, unchanging in his personality and its essential attributes, through all the transitions and changes of his life. Matter is in constant action and flux. Yet even this gives us a faint analogy. We are obliged to think of ultimate atoms unchanged and

unabraded by all the collision and grinding of this energetic action ever since the worlds were made. God is unchanged and eternal not only in his being and his essential attributes, but also in the fulness of his knowledge, without increase or diminution, and therefore without succession. But as God's exemption from limitation in time does not preclude his presence and acting in it, so it does not preclude his knowledge of the distinctions of time and of events as present, past, or future. The universe in its whole existence is archetypal in the reason of God; he sees in it the map or plan of all that is being progressively realized in time. But he sees the difference between a being existing in time and another seen only ideally as about to exist in a distant future or that has existed in the past and exists no longer. If he could not know this he would be limited in time. He would be not only unable to act in it, but even to see into it. But his Reason is an open eye, seeing all which is, has been, or will be, and seeing it in its relation to time as actually measured by events. … God's purpose to realize this archetypal plan in the finite universe in the forms of space and time is an unchanging and eternal plan. Yet immanent and ever active in the universe, he is progressively realizing it by his action in time. And his love, which constitutes his character, is an eternal and unchanging love which he is continuously and progressively expressing in all his action of creation, preservation, providence, and redemption.

The result which we have reached is, not eternity as immeasurable time, but the eternal and immutable God existing in all time and progressively revealing himself in the universe as it exists in time. God is the I AM. The universe is that which becomes. God is eternal. The universe is the progressive and never-completed revelation of him in time and space.

The eternity of God is involved in his self-existence. He is uncaused. Therefore he must be without beginning. He transcends the whole chain of causes and effects. Therefore he can never cease to be.—*God the Creator and Lord of All,* I, 123–24

5. IMMUTABILITY. As defined by the New Standard Dictionary (1913 ed.), immutability is the state or quality of being that which is "not capable or susceptible of change, either by increase or by decrease, by development or by self-evolution; unchangeable; invariable; permanent; as, God is *immutable*." In no sphere or relationship is God subject to change. He could not be less than He is, and, since He filleth all things, He could not be more than He is. He could be removed from no place, nor is His knowledge or holiness subject to change. The Scriptures state:

"I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end" (Ps. 102:24–27); "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my

pleasure" (Isa. 46:9, 10); "For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed" (Mal. 3:6); "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (James 1:17).

Not only is there no change in God Himself, but the moral principles which He has published are abiding. Of this Dr. Miley writes: "Sacred history discloses a changing frame-work of expediency in the older dispensations of revealed religion, and a great change from the elaborate ceremonials of Judaism into the simple forms of Christianity, but the same moral principles abide through all these economies. Change within the sphere of expediency is entirely consistent with the unchangeableness of God, while the changeless moral principles are a profound reality of his immutability. That he regards the same person now with reprehensive displeasure, and again with approving love, is not only consistent with his immutability, but a requirement of it in view of the moral change in the object of his changed regards" (*Systematic Theology*, I, 221).

As intimated by Dr. Miley, certain passages seem at first sight to teach that God is subject to change. The statement set forth in Genesis 6:6, that "it repented the LORD that he had made man", must be considered in the light of Numbers 23:19, "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent." In one chapter-1 Samuel 15—it is recorded that God said "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king" (vss. 11, 35); yet He also said through Samuel, "And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent" (vs. 29). God, though immutable, is not immobile. If He consistently pursues a righteous course, His attitude must be adapted to every moral change in men. "God's unchanging holiness requires him to treat the wicked differently from the righteous. When the righteous become wicked, his treatment of them must change. The sun is not fickle or partial because it melts the wax but hardens the clay,—the change is not in the sun but in the objects it shines upon. The change in God's treatment of men is described anthropomorphically, as if it were a change in God himself,—other passages in close conjunction with the first being given to correct any possible misapprehension. Threats not fulfilled, as in Jonah 3:4, 10, are to be explained by their conditional nature. Hence God's immutability itself renders it certain that his love will adapt itself to every varying mood and condition of his children, so as to guide

their steps, sympathize with their sorrows, answer their prayers. God responds to us more quickly than the mother's face to the changing moods of her babe" (Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 124).

6. Omnipresence or Immensity. The relation God sustains to space is introduced by the terms *omnipresence* and *immensity*. The conception of God which is sustained by the Scriptures is that He is everywhere present. Such an apprehension is indeed hard for the finite mind to form. It is equally declared in the Bible that God—each of the three Persons—is resident in one place at a given time. Of the Father, the statement is: "Our Father which art in heaven" (Matt. 6:9); of the Son it is said that He, upon ascending from the earth, "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Heb. 1:3); and of the Spirit in relation to the Church it is written, "in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22; cf. Ps. 113:5; 123:1; Rom. 10:6, 7; 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19). On the other hand, the Father is said to be in the Son as the Son is in the Father (John 17:21) ; the Father is "above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. 4:6); the Son is present where two or three are met together unto His name (Matt. 18:20; cf. 28:20; Col. 1:27). The Spirit, like the Father and the Son, is said to indwell every believer (Rom. 8:9).

The difficulty for the finite mind arises when both revelation and abstract reason assert the ubiquity, or omnipresence, of God. All other beings known to man, including angels, are restricted to a given place at a given time. When they are here they are not there. Material things occupy some part of space, but never all of it. Space has been defined as "extension void of matter or body, and capable of receiving or containing matter or body" (cited by Dick, *Theology*, 98). It is thus that space exceeds all that it contains. God is the cause of space and is therefore not subject to it (cf. 1 Kings 8:27). Respecting His creation, including space, God is both immanent and transcendent. If space is defined by bounds, He exceeds it by infinity.

It is probable that the terms *omnipresence* and *immensity* represent somewhat different ideas. Omnipresence naturally relates God to the universe where other beings are and as present with them, while immensity surpasses all creation and extends on without end.

There are at least three arguments for the divine immensity and omnipresence which abstract reason advances. (1) The perfection of God demands that He be everywhere present. If some place were void of Him, the human mind could conceive of a greater being who filled all places and thus God would be imperfect to the degree in which He did not answer the idea of immensity. On this important consideration Dr. Dick writes: “The result is, that in our opinion it is better for a being to be in many places than in few, to be in all places than in many. To suppose, therefore, God to exist only in one part of the universe, to be in heaven but not upon earth, to circumscribe his essence within any boundaries however widely extended, would be to conceive of him as similar to his creatures. It would be easy to imagine a being still more perfect, for certainly he would be more perfect who was present at the same time in heaven and on earth. Thus it appears that it is agreeable to reason to ascribe immensity to God” (*Ibid*., p. 99). (2) The very nature of God requires that He be everywhere present. The exercise of His attributes is not restricted to locality but is ubiquitous, hence, as He is where His attributes are, He is Himself ubiquitous. (3) Reason further contends that, since God used no mechanism or agents in creation and since all came into being at the same time, He was present at that time wherever creation took place.

The error of pantheism which claims that God is the sum-total of all life that exists—the soul of the universe—, has before been pointed out; but there is danger that the mind, when attempting to make real the ubiquity of God, will think of Him as diffused abroad in the sense that only a minute part of Him is present in a given place, as human life is but partially present in any particular part of the body which it occupies. God, however, is wholly present in every place. If the divine nature is resident in many places, that is not accomplished by diffusion to the end that each may share a small portion of that nature. He is wholly present as fully as though He were nowhere else—Father, Son, and Spirit—in every human temple in which He dwells, and in every part of His dominion. Dr. Samuel Clarke has well said: “That which we can most safely affirm, and which no atheist can say is absurd, and which nevertheless is sufficient to all wise and good purposes, is this; that whereas all finite and created beings can be present but in one definite place at once, and corporeal beings even in that one place very imperfectly and unequally, to any purpose of power and activity,

only by the successive motion of different members and organs; the Supreme Cause, on the contrary, being an infinite and most simple essence, and comprehending all things perfectly in himself, *is at all times equally* present, both in his simple essence, and by the immediate and perfect exercise of all his attributes, to *every point* of the boundless immensity, as if it were really all but one single point" (*Discourse on Being and Attributes*, p. 46, cited by Dick, *ibid*., p. 100).

It is in no way reasonable for the finite mind to suppose that it can understand the divine mode of omnipresence. The words of the Psalmist express the thoughts of the wisest of men: "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it" (Ps. 139:6). The Scriptures abound with declarations regarding the divine ubiquity, and no passage is more direct and conclusive than Psalm 139:7–12, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee." To this may well be added Amos 9:2, "Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down."

To reasonable men, the omnipresence of God becomes a power to stay the impulse to wrong action. "Thou God seest me" (Gen. 16:13). With similar effectiveness, the omnipresence of God is an indispensable consolation to the righteous. On this aspect of this theme Dr. Dick writes with his unique eloquence:

> Lastly, to the righteous this doctrine is a source of abundant consolation. In every place they meet a friend, a protector, and a father. Does the voice of thunder, or the raging of the ocean, or the fury of the tempest, announce his presence? They have nothing to fear, for love to them presides over the commotions of the elements. Do they perceive Him in the more tranquil scenes of nature, in the silent progress of vegetation, in the smiles of the heavens, and in the regular beneficence which supplies their returning wants, and diffuses so much happiness among all classes of animated beings? Oh! how delightful the thought that He, in whom they repose confidence, is so near that they may always assure themselves of ready and effectual aid! This thought is fitted to enliven every scene, and to sweeten every condition. It will make the springs of joy burst out in the parched and thirsty wilderness, and clothe the naked and cheerless waste with verdure. It will give a relish to a dry morsel, and a

> cup of cold water. It will lighten the pressure of poverty, and soothe the pangs of affliction. It will dissipate the horrors of a dungeon, and console the exile from his country and his friends. How transporting the thought, that we cannot go where God is not! A good man may be bereaved of his reputation, his liberty, his earthly all; but the deadly hatred of his enemies can never so far succeed as to draw from him the mournful complaint, "Ye have taken away my God, and what have I more?" With whatever afflictions his faith and patience may be tried, and whatever change of circumstances a wise providence may appoint him to undergo, although there should be no human heart to sympathise with him, and no kind hand to perform the offices of friendship, he can express his faith and joy in the words of an ancient saint, "Nevertheless I am continually with thee; thou holdest me by my right hand. Thou wilt guide me by thy counsel, and afterward receive me to thy glory" (Ps. 73:23, 24).—Dick's *Theology*, p. 102

7. SOVEREIGNTY. By many writers, *sovereignty* is not included among the attributes of God. It is more properly a *prerogative* of God than an attribute and owes all its reality to the divine perfections which have here been named. Sovereignty is the very foundation of the doctrine of decrees—yet to be attended. However, when contemplating the transcendent completeness of the divine Person, it is required that His sovereignty shall be included.

The sovereignty of God is discerned in the absolute manner in which all things have been assigned their respective places in creation, in appointing to men their day and generation as well as the bounds of their habitation, and in the exercise of saving grace. There is perfect peace and highest destiny for those who, knowing the will of God, are subject to it. There is distress and anguish awaiting those who, knowing the will of God, disregard it. Because of divine sovereignty, the saving gospel of Christ is, in various Scriptures, presented as something to be *obeyed*. Again, the authority of God is displayed in the fact that things which were only possible were not allowed by Him to become actual. In relation to existing things, God is in absolute authority, which may arise from one or more of certain affiliations. (1) He is Creator and His dominion is perfect and final. He is free to dispose of His creation as He will; but His will, as has been seen, is wholly guided by the true and benevolent features of His Person. All majesty and glory belong to God. All material things are His by the most absolute ownership. Men hold property by rights which are only temporary and permitted by God. "For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills" (Ps. 50:10). (2) The authority of God is established over the redeemed by the purchase which that redemption has

wrought. And (3) He is in authority over those among the redeemed who willingly yield their lives to Him. The Scriptures set forth the divine appraisal of God's sovereignty as no words of man could ever do. "The LORD killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up. The LORD maketh poor, and maketh rich: he bringeth low, and lifteth up. He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory: for the pillars of the earth are the LORD'S and he hath set the world upon them" (1 Sam. 2:6–8); "Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all" (1 Chron. 29:11, 12); "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen" (Matt. 6:13).

Conclusion

The attributes of God form an interwoven and interdependent communion of facts and forces which harmonize in the Person of God. An omission or slighting of any of these, or any disproportionate emphasis upon any one of them cannot but lead to fundamental error of immeasurable magnitude. A mighty task is committed to the student of theology to discover these attributes and exhibit them according to truth. On the communion of the attributes of God, Dr. Morris Roach has written: “The failure which we have just noted in an abnormal emphasis of God’s attributes may be corrected by the communion of attributes. Pantheism, polytheism, deism, materialism, idealism, and evolution reveal abnormalities in the character of God to which they subscribe their belief. The errors of all false conceptions of God could be corrected by an explanation of His true character as it is completely and systematically balanced by the communion of these elements of His nature. Christian theology is the only field which gives proper and proportionate thought to the character of God as a product of His attributes. It is not possible to ascribe power to God in the sense of ‘sheer almightiness.’ Character cannot be the product of power. Love alone is not an all-inclusive attribute, and is not, in itself, a sufficient basis for character. Full and complete character cannot be ascribed where only a portion of the attributes of God are considered. Character in God is the product of all His attributes in their objective relationship one with the other” (*The Personality of God*, unpublished dissertation (1933), Dallas Seminary, pp. 174–75). The vast theme of the conflict which sin occasioned between the holiness and love of God must be considered under Soteriology.

In the foregoing, an effort has been made to present some features of the perfections of God. Comparatively little has been said when the incomprehensible character and Being of God are considered. God alone can declare His glory. He is One of whom man should not think without the deepest reverence flooding his heart. God is a terrible Enemy against those who repudiate Him; but to those—even the most sinful—who believe on His Son, He is their God, and all His limitless perfections are engaged in their behalf, and this guarantees that all shall work together for good.

“Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

Chapter XV

Divine Decrees

In its theological implications, the term *decree* betokens the plan by which God has proceeded in all His acts of creation and continuation. That He has such a plan is not only the justified deduction of reason—He being perfect in wisdom—, but is the clear testimony of the Bible. Those numerous passages which assert the *decree*, the *purpose*, the *determinate counsel*, the *foreknowledge*, the *foreordination*, and the *election*, by which God is said to act, combine to establish the truth that, either directly or indirectly and as stated in the Westminster Confession, He originates and executes "whatsoever comes to pass." No deductions concerning God could be more dishonoring or misleading than the suppositions that He is not sovereign over His works, or that He is not working according to a plan which articulates the dictation of infinite intelligence. Could the imagination of man picture a situation before any creative act of God was wrought, when God, as it were, had before Him an infinite variety of possible plans or blueprints from which to choose—each and every one of which represented a possible program of divine action as far-reaching and elaborate as the one now being executed—, it would be reasonable and honoring to God to conclude that the present plan as ordained and as it is being achieved is, and in the end will prove to be, the best plan and purpose that could have been devised by infinite wisdom, consummated by infinite power, and that which will be the supreme satisfaction to infinite love. Such an exercise of the imagination would be at fault in the one particular, namely, that it supposes that the plan and purpose of God which is now in process has not been in anticipation from all eternity. This fact but serves to emphasize the point in view, which is that the present plan is as perfect as its Author. It is most essential to clear thinking on the part of devout minds that all suggestions which tend to imply that God is not following a plan which is worthy of Him, or that He is but partially in authority, or that He has failed and is seeking to salvage something out of the wreckage, or that He is conforming to existing things over which He has no control, shall be rejected and that, in spite of the immediate problems which the presence of sin and suffering create, it shall be accredited to God that, in the end, He shall have wrought that which alone is consonant with infinite wisdom and goodness. Such an

evaluation of the present order is demanded in the light of the revelation, already considered, as to the essential character of God, being the only conclusion which unprejudiced reason can approve.

When weighing the facts of the sovereignty of God in the execution of His eternal purpose, problems arise—problems more difficult than those encountered when weighing the truths concerning God's Person and attributes. In the latter instance, knowable realities are projected into infinity, but without the element of seeming contradiction. In the former instance, or when contemplating divine sovereignty as seen in the control by a holy God over a universe into which sin has entered and in which there is said to be the freedom to act on the part of beings other than the sovereign God, conflicting relationships arise. Some of these problems cannot be solved in this world; they never have been solved here, nor will they ever be. In the previous discussion the issue which the presence of sin in the world engenders was approached in the light of divine *foreknowledge*. It must now be approached in the light of the divine *purpose* and *permission*. When this issue is reduced to its lowest dimensions, there remain but two general overtures: either (1) that God is sovereign and all that ever has existed or will exist is within His plan, or (2) that He is not sovereign and there is more or less in the universe which exists in defiance of His holy character and over which He has no authority. The latter overture, in the extreme form in which it is here presented, is discredited by all devout and thoughtful individuals, though too often some modification of that overture is adopted as a supposed release from the burden which the problem of sin in God's universe imposes. No modifications of divine sovereignty can be allowed without challenging the worthiness of God. Not a vestige of a praiseworthy conception of God remains in the mind of the one who supposes that, to the slightest degree, God has failed, has been defeated, or is making light of sin. Insuperable difficulties arise in the outworking of either of these overtures, but those engendered by the former are far less than those engendered by the latter. It is, therefore, better to approach the difficulties from the position wherein the absolute sovereignty of God and worthiness of all His works are upheld. No doubt should be entertained as to the just and authoritative way in which God achieves His ends. Having established by the investigation of the attributes of God the holy character of God, His infinite righteousness, His omniscience and

omnipotence, it is incumbent upon the rational mind to approach the difficulties, which arise when an adjustment is attempted of all that the sovereignty of God imposes, from the standpoint of all that God has been proved to be. At its best, man's understanding is fallible and this limitation is ever being demonstrated by the shallow and hasty way in which men deal with these difficulties. To suspect the wisdom of men is not a serious matter; yea, they might all be found to be liars without transgressing the bounds of revelation concerning the moral corruption of the human heart. It is, however, a most serious thing to suspect the wisdom, holiness, or authority of God. Moses has recorded in Deuteronomy 29:29 that there are secret things which belong to God, and that there are revealed things which belong to men. It is folly to suppose that the revealed things include all that there is to be known. The theologian is not to be discredited but rather commended who, when confronted with the secret things of God, is able to say, *I do not know*.

Concerning revealed things, it may be said again that very much that belongs in that category has no part in the divine message to the unregenerate, to whom the things of God are, at most, only "foolishness" (1 Cor. 2:14). Likewise, much that is revealed belongs not at all to those regenerate persons who, because of their immaturity or carnality, can receive only the "milk of the word." Some portions of the divine revelation, being divinely classed as "strong meat," are not intended for babes. The extent of harm that has been wrought in certain periods of the church's history by the indiscriminate preaching to all classes of men of the doctrines of *sovereignty*, *predestination*, and *election*, cannot be estimated. Unregenerate men are not burdened with the necessity of ascertaining whether they are elect or not. God speaks to them with absolute faithfulness to the end that they may exercise faith in His Son as their Savior and thereby be saved. The evangelist when declaring his message to lost men properly ignores all problems which arise concerning issues which belong to conditions obtaining before the fall of man. It is enough for the unregenerate to know that they are rightfully condemned and that a perfect salvation is secured for them through the saving grace of God in Christ Jesus. Unlike this, it is incumbent on the student of theology, to whom God's deeper revelation is addressed, to penetrate into that which may be known about how man came to be lost and what could have brought it to

pass in the midst of a universe wherein a holy God rules supreme. Speaking of God's saving grace for the unregenerate, Bishop Moule declares: "Grace is the unmerited complement of need"; but, it may be added, the gospel of grace includes the discussion of no obscure and difficult themes such as surround the doctrine of *election* or the permission of sin in the world. Nor are such themes adapted to backward saints such as the Apostle described when he said: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat" (Heb. 5:12).

I. The Decree of God

The doctrine of divine decree is only another method of assigning to God the position of first cause of all that exists. There is one comprehensive plan in which all things have their place and by which they proceed. The Westminster Shorter Catechism asserts that it is "his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass" (Question 7). God did not, however, decree anything concerning Himself—as to His existence, His attributes, the mode of His subsistence in three Persons, or any inherent relationship or assumption of responsibilities within the Godhead. Nor did God decree regarding His own existence and transitive acts as though He commanded Himself to create, to uphold, or to govern His universe. The decree of God relates to His acts which are not immanent and intrinsic and are outside His own Being.

The term *decree of God* appears first in the singular, since God has but one all-inclusive plan. He sees all things at a glance. For convenience, the separate features of this plan may be called the *decrees of God;* but there should be no implication in this that the infinite understanding of God advances by steps or in a train. And there is no possibility that the one plan will be altered by omissions or additions. Nor is it true that God sustains a distinct and unrelated purpose concerning each aspect of His one intention. With God there is one immutable decree embracing in itself every detail, even the falling of a sparrow. It is the divine cognition from all eternity.

“Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world” (Acts 15:18).

It should be observed that God formed His decree in eternity, though its execution is in time. The decree being eternal, all its parts are, in the mind of God, but one intuition, though in its realization there is succession. Christ’s earthly mission was seen in one conception, yet an interval of thirty-three years fell between His birth and His death. He was “foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times” (1 Pet. 1:20). Augustine states: “God willeth not one thing now, and another anon; but once, and at once, and always, he willeth all things that he willeth; not again and again, nor now this, now that; nor willeth afterwards, what before he willed not, nor willeth not, what before he willed; because such a will is mutable; and no mutable thing is eternal” (*Confess*., XII, xv, cited by Shedd, *Theology*, I, 395). The power to conceive of a thing as a whole before it is executed in the order which its intention requires, is not altogether outside the range of finite minds. There is every reason to believe that Solomon foresaw and designed every detail of the temple before any work was begun. That vision accorded him was as comprehensive concerning those features that were to be wrought out at the end of the process as concerning those which were first in the order of procedure. The capstone is no less evident in the architect’s mind than is the foundation. It is true that human foresight is subject to development and change, which mutability is never true of the divine archetypal vision.

Having thus emphasized the *eternal* character of the divine decree, it may yet be added that the decree of God is *wise*, being the product of infinite wisdom. There is a worthy reason for all that God has ever done or will do. Even His permission of evil will, like the wrath of man, be made to praise Him (Ps. 76:10). “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!” (Rom. 11:33).

Likewise, the divine decree is *free*. “Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?” (Isa. 40:13, 14). Being alone when His decree was made, His determinations were influenced by no other being. Aside from the fact that He must act

according to His wisdom and holiness, He was free to do or not to do. Within the sphere of His perfections, He could do what He would. It is near to impiety to assert that God *could* not have done otherwise than He has done, though it is probable that He *would* not have done otherwise, being guided by that which is worthy of Himself.

Lastly, the divine decree is absolutely *unconditional*. The execution of it is in no way suspended upon conditions which may or may not emerge. The Arminian notion that the will of man is sovereign in its power to resist the Almighty must be denied, since it is everywhere refuted in the history of God's dealing with men. God may, for good reasons, allow man's will to prevail; but He does not have to do so. He has power over every will to cause it to do His good pleasure. "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure" (Isa. 46:10). "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his will" (Eph. 1:11, R.V.). Such a statement could not be made in truthfulness if the execution of His purpose depended upon a cooperation with others which was in their power to withhold. This phase of the theme is yet to be attended more at length.

Reference may be made again to the distinction within the knowledge which God holds concerning future events, by which He recognizes some things as merely *possible* but never to become *actual* and therefore not to be included in His eternal decree, and things which are divinely *determined*. Of the total which all His knowledge and all His almighty power might achieve, He purposed to do some things only, and that purpose made those specific things forever certain. There are those who at this point would intrude another distinction within the knowledge of God. They claim to recognize that certain things—notably the free acts of men—are not at all derived from God, but rather from the creature. To these free acts it is asserted that God could have no relation other than to foreknow what the creature will do. This notion is advanced by those who maintain that God's decrees are conditional, to the end that some are chosen to eternal life on the basis of divine foresight as to their faith and obedience. This theory, if it were true, would support the wholly unscriptural idea that, in the end, men are saved on the ground of their own merit and worthiness. This claim not only opposes the doctrine of salvation by grace alone, but leaves the question as to whether God is the Author of sin unanswered and places God

in the unworthy position of being dependent upon His creatures. The Scriptures, while recognizing a freedom of action in man, do, nevertheless, assert that man is not exempt from the control of his Creator. It may be said that God does know what the actions of men will be when placed under certain circumstances. It is equally true that He is the Author of circumstances. God knew that when placed under the circumstances which obtained, Adam would fall. God could have arranged matters otherwise, but this He did not do. The question as to the relation between the divine and the human responsibility is, in such a development, exceedingly complex. God did not fail to warn Adam, nor, when pronouncing sentence upon him after his sin, did God assume any portion of the responsibility. It may be further observed that had Adam obeyed God, as God commanded him to do, there would have been no need of a Redeemer; yet the Redeemer as well as the need for Him was evidently in the decree of God from all eternity (Rev. 13:8). This problem, yet to be considered more fully, is far reaching, but is not solved by any theory which seeks escape from the difficulties through the exit of a supposed irresponsible divine fore-knowledge.

If no certain knowledge of God were accorded to men, they might be pardoned for supposing that God does not know what He is doing, that He has no power to rescue Himself from the dilemmas into which ignorance would plunge Him or that He maintains no standards of holiness. Such conclusions might be accounted for among heathen people to whom no revelation has come. But God is revealed to men and they are without excuse if they hold conceptions of Him which disregard His perfections. Problems exist, but every such must be approached and solved—in so far as it can be solved—without the slightest departure from the infinite worthiness of God. Certain systems of theology begin with man, center about man, and end with man; and God is introduced only as He conforms to this man-centered notion. On the other hand, certain systems of theology begin with God, center about God, and end with God; and man is introduced only as he conforms to this God-centered idea. It is obvious to which of these two general systems the Bible lends its support, and which, in the end, gives rest and satisfaction to the heart of man. The greatest of all problems emerges when man directs his thoughts to the sovereignty of God and all that sovereignty implies. These problems are never solved by minimizing God, holiness, sin, or human responsibility. Published systems

of theology which either omit the doctrine of divine decree, or oppose the doctrine, are justly reprehensible. They remove the rudder from the ship and set it afloat subject to wind and tide. It is a dishonor even to a man to assert that he does not act with purposed, rational ends in view, or that he does not employ worthy means to realize those ends. The doctrine of divine decree of itself introduces nothing mysterious or profound. It declares that God both designed and willed before He acted, and that all His actions are in harmony with His perfect character and attributes. Problems appear when man, with his own free will, and the fact of sin enter upon the scene.

The term *divine decree* is an attempt to gather up into one designation that to which the Scriptures refer by various designations—the divine *purpose* (Eph. 1:11), *determinate counsel* (Acts 2:23). *fore-knowledge* (1 Pet. 1:2; cf. 1:20), *election* (1 Thess. 1:4), *predestination* (Rom. 8:30), the divine *will* (Eph. 1:11), and the divine *good pleasure* (Eph. 1:9). When reference is made to divine counsels it does not suggest conference on the part of God with other beings, but that His counsels are consummately wise. In like manner, the reference to the divine will does not suggest capricious or unreasonable action. Infinite wisdom directs the divine determination. In this sense His decree is said to be the "counsel of his will." These terms certainly signify that God acts only according to an eternal purpose which incorporates all things.

When seeking to arrive at a right understanding of the doctrine of the divine decree, it is essential to distinguish decree from predestination and predestination from election and retribution. The divine decree embraces all that was or is future. Whatever was to transpire in time was decreed from eternity, whether good or evil, whether great or small, whether wrought directly by God or indirectly through agencies. The decree itself provided for the free actions of creatures and included what men are pleased to call *accidents*. Regarding that which is good in contradistinction to that which is evil, a discrimination is usually made: the one being by divine *appointment* and the other by divine *permission*. The divine decree embraces the entire ongoing of the universe including things material and things immaterial. The term *predestination* is restricted to the creatures of God whether angelic or human and, regardless of the fact that in the Scriptures it is usually applied to those that are good, is, in its larger meaning, properly used concerning the destination of all created beings—some of whom are the

elect and some reprobate. Again, *election* is narrower in its meaning than predestination, since it refers only to those who are in right relations to God and destined to eternal blessings; and over against this is *retribution* which includes in its designation all that are non-elect.

Had not sin entered into the universe and had all creatures remained in their first estate, it is probable that no objection to the doctrine of *divine decree*, with its recognition of sovereignty, would have been elicited. In this connection it is worthy of note that there are vast realms of the universe and spheres of the divine authority wherein the divine sovereignty has not been controverted. Within what is, comparatively, an exceedingly limited portion of the universe, holiness and sin are now in dispute and the duration of this conflict is restricted to that inconceivable fraction of eternity which is represented by time. He who in the eternity past reigned supreme, will yet reign in the eternity to come with all enemies destroyed. It is an improbability of surpassing magnitute— even when subjected to reason alone—that He who reigns in all eternity over the vast domain of the universe, has met His defeat and become impotent rather than omnipotent in the face of moral issues which in His eternal counsels He has permitted to exist for a restricted time. The Scriptures assert the never-failing sovereignty of God, and never more emphatically than when they predict the fast-approaching hour when sin shall be no more. Who, indeed, is determining the hour when sin shall cease? Is it to cease by mere caprice? Or does God sustain no more vital relation to its cessation than to foreknow that it will cease? Who maketh wars to cease? By whose power and authority will Satan be bound and confined to the abyss and finally cast into the lake of fire? Who prepared that lake of fire? Is it a mere accident, about which God only foreknows, that this universe will yet be purged of all evil? Or is it a fable that the Creator will yet pronounce sentence upon His every foe? To God alone be majesty, dominion, and power for ever and ever—Amen!

Having thus ascribed a feeble note of praise to God, it now is necessary —as is incumbent upon all students of Biblical theism—to give attention to the problems which the theme of divine sovereignty engenders. There are issues involved in such a contemplation which are too vast for the finite mind to fathom, and no intelligent, reverent person will be surprised to discover the boundaries of his finite mind. When standing on the border

between the finite and the infinite, between time and eternity, between the perfect, irresistible will of God and the impotent, perverted will of man, between sovereign grace and hell-deserving sin, who among men is too proud to exclaim, *There are some things which I do not understand?*

The perplexing issues which arise are not the burden of any particular system of theology. They belong properly to all, and none is commendable which assumes that it is not concerned with such issues.

It is probable that these questions are difficult largely because of man's limited knowledge of the essential character of sin, of the essential, yet widely different, scope of the human will as compared with the divine will, and of the true and ultimate purpose of God. With these qualifying facts in mind, the problems are, as to their general amplitude, really but two, namely, (1) *the moral problem*, or the fact that evil is present in a universe over which God reigns supreme, and (2) *the problem of the will*, or the seeming irreconcilability of the free will of man with the sovereignty of God. These are now to be examined.

1. Two Basic Problems.

a. The Moral Problem. The permission and presence of sin in the universe over which the infinitely holy God rules interpolates a clash of ideas which in all its involvements no human mind can fully harmonize. Considering the two dissonant realities, namely, God and sin, it is certain that the solution of the difficulty will not be discovered in the direction of any assumption that God was unable to prevent sin from eventuating in the universe, or that He cannot cause it to cease at any moment of time. To the same end, it is certain that the dilemma will not be adjusted or relieved by any supposition that sin is not exceedingly sinful in the sight of God—that which He hates with a perfect hatred. The issue must stand without modification that God, who is actively and infinitely holy and who is utterly free in all His enterprises, being able to create or not create and to exclude evil from that which He did create, has, nevertheless, permitted evil to appear and run its course in angelic and human spheres. This perplexity is also intensified to a measureless degree by the fact that God knew when He permitted sin to be manifest, that it would cost Him the greatest sacrifice it is possible for God to make—even the death of His Son. The Scriptures state with abundant certainty that (a) God is all-powerful and is not, therefore, imposed upon by

sin against His permissive will; (b) that God is perfectly holy and hates sin unqualifiedly; and (c) that sin is present in the universe with all its injury to created beings and that this injury, because of the failure of some to enter into redeeming grace, will continue upon them for all eternity to come.

If the Scriptures assert a thing to be true, it should be so received by every Christian. Should there seem to be a conflict of ideas, as noted above, they fact remains that the Biblical account of each item in the consideration is *true*, the perplexity being attributable to insufficient understanding by the human mind. The Bible attempts no explanation of those dilemmas which men observe. The seeming conflict of ideas evidently has no reality or existence in the mind of God. By attentive contemplation of certain issues, the perplexity may be somewhat relieved.

(1) *The Essential Nature of Sin.* Though the whole field of hamartiology is indicated at this point in this discussion, its full treatment must be reserved for its rightful place as a subdivision of Anthropology. The problem of the presence of sin in God's universe is lessened to no small degree when due consideration is given to the precise nature of sin. Too often it has been assumed that evil is a divine creation and therefore had no actuality until God gave it place among existing things; whereas evil, as an abstract reality, is no more a created thing than is virtue. So long as God has existed, virtue has existed; and so long as virtue has existed, there has been a conceivable opposite to it, though there was not the slightest possibility that the opposite of virtue could find expression until beings were created who had the ability to sin. Such a deduction is not to be judged as even a mild form of dualism, else the foreknowledge of God which foresaw the present conflict between good and evil, and, in fact, the present conflict itself, is dualism. How in the purpose of God could the Lamb be slain, as an offering for sin, from all eternity if the potential fact of evil were not under divine consideration? On the other hand, the problem of how evil could enter the universe and find manifestation by divine permission only, is most difficult to comprehend. So far as the first human sin is concerned, there was a sinister tempter present to whom much responsibility is assigned; but in the case of the first sin of the angels the issue is baffling indeed, for neither outward temptation nor inward depravity was present. Certainly a passive divine permission generates no impelling disposition to evil. This feature of the whole inquiry relative to the permission of sin is doubtless its

intrinsic essence or nature, and is wholly outside the range of finite comprehension.

As to what purpose the presence of sin in the universe may serve, various suggestions have been advanced, none of which, nor all combined, have proved a complete answer to the question. (a) The ultimate purpose of God being to bring men into the similitude of Himself, they, to reach this end, must come to know to some degree what God knows. They must recognize the evil character of sin. This God knows intuitively, but such knowledge can be gained by creatures only through observation and experience. Obviously, if the divine purpose is to be realized, evil must be permitted its manifestation. What the demonstration of sin and the experience of it may mean to angels, is not revealed. (b) There is that in God which no creature had ever seen—though they had viewed His glory, His wisdom, and His power—, namely, His *grace* toward the fallen and sinful. But no demonstration of grace is possible unless there are objects of grace, and there could be no objects of grace apart from the presence and experience of sin. (c) Likewise, the principle of sin—a thing opposite to virtue—must be brought into complete and final judgment. The universe must be purged of the realities of sin and its possibilities. An abstract thing cannot be rightfully judged until it has become concrete. Thus it may be judged in its actual character, as it was judged at the cross. But the very bringing of evil into concrete form involved its present manifestation in the universe.

From these suggestions, proffered by reason, it may be concluded that the primary divine purpose was neither to avoid the presence of sin in the universe, for God could have prevented it, nor to dispose of it before His appointed time, for its whole reality could be terminated and dismissed at any moment by a word of His command. That there may be many sons in glory capable of singing the song of redemption (Rev. 5:9) and that the whole universe may be purged of all evil, are knowledge-surpassing divine purposes; but these desired ends are wholly dependent for their fruition upon the presence of sin in the world. Such contemplation should never lessen the human estimation of the divine hatred for sin, nor be any encouragement to a creature to sin. That sin is infinitely evil is demonstrated by the ruin it has wrought among the angels, the present depravity of humanity with all its woes, and the fact that no cure for sin

could be found at a less cost than the blood of the Son of God. It is near to an unpardonable assumption for the finite mind to presume to evaluate and sit in judgment upon the course which God pursues. He is trustworthy and should be trusted wholly. “He hath done all things well,” and it is the worthy anticipation of every believer that he shall be satisfied when he awakes in His likeness (Ps. 17:15).

(2) *The Permission of Sin.* Calvinistic theologians generally have made a distinction within the whole field of occurrences embraced in the divine decree, dividing these vast issues into two aggregations—the decrees which they are pleased to style *efficacious* and those which they style *permissive*. The efficacious decrees are those which determine occurrences directly by physical causes (Job 28:26), and by spiritual forces (Phil. 2:13; Eph. 2:8, 10; 4:24). The permissive decrees embrace only moral features which are evil. The term *permissive* intimates that God does not actively promote the execution of the decrees that are thus indicated. In contrast to the efficacious, energizing divine purpose which works to the end that men *will* and *do* His good pleasure, He, by way of permission, “in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways” (Acts 14:16); “He gave them their own desire” (Ps. 78:29; cf. 106:15). In respect to His permissive will, it is claimed, God determines not to hinder the course of action which His creatures pursue; but He does determine to regulate and control the bounds and the results of such actions. John Howe has said on this point: “God’s permissive will is his will to permit whatsoever he thinks fit to permit, or, not to hinder; while what he so wills or determines so to permit, he intends also to regulate, and not to behold as an idle unconcerned spectator, but to dispose all those *permissa* unto wise and great ends of his own” (*Decrees*, Lecture I, cited by Shedd, *Theology*, I, pp. 406–7).

Due consideration should be given to the fact that, in permitting sin, God decrees the thing which He hates, and which, as has been noted, would cost Him the greatest of all sacrifices. Such a decree is related to His “good pleasure,” only to the extent that He, for reasons known unto Himself, permits evil its entrance and present procedure. The problem is confessedly a difficult one for all concerned, but it does not stand alone. The permission of evil *continues* with every succeeding hour of human history. That which in His own counsels He did not hinder in the beginning, He does not hinder in all its subsequent development. The manifestation of evil must run its

determined course and arrive at its determined ends. The Arminian approach to the solution of this problem assigns to God no relation to the advent of sin into the universe other than that He foreknew that it would eventuate. This view is wholly inadequate, since foreknowledge on the part of God carries with it, of necessity, all the force of a sovereign purpose. A thing cannot be fore-known that is not certain, and nothing is certain until God's sovereign decree makes it thus. Objection to the doctrine of divine decree is raised by some on the ground that it renders human actions *necessary*. But human action is no less necessary when viewed from the standpoint of foreknowledge than from divine decree. The least of all things which God foreknows can no more be uncertain than the universe itself. God created angels and men with the full cognizance that they would sin. Reason asserts that the responsibility for the issues of His creation must, in the end, rest upon the Creator. On this theme the Scriptures give final revelation. At no point are creatures permitted to trace responsibility from themselves back to God. When God pronounced judgment upon Adam, He did not say *I am partly to blame since I created you*. The blame rested on Adam alone. The race fell in Adam and became what they are, "the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3), and the original sin with all its fruitage is never linked to God in any way. This principle obtains as well in the sphere of rewards which are yet to be given to the faithful. It is to be acknowledged by all that each and every virtue or worthy service is wrought only by the enabling power of the Spirit of God; yet, when conferring His rewards, God is not expected to say, *I claim the larger share in all you did for me*. The honor and credit for service will rest upon the faithful alone as undividedly as though they had wrought it in their own strength.

The divine permission of evil in the human sphere extends beyond the one sin of Adam. It is written that God hardened Pharaoh's heart to the end that a demonstration of divine power might be fully displayed. By that demonstration the whole multitude of the Egyptians came to know something of Jehovah (Ex. 14:4). Again, and as a revelation concerning God's attitude toward sin, the fact is obvious that God commanded Adam *not* to sin, and yet, unless Adam did sin, there would be no need of the Redeemer, of which Redeemer it had been decreed in eternal ages before Adam that He would come (Rev. 13:8). Similarly, God said to King Saul that if he had kept the commandments given to him, his house would have

been established forever (1 Sam. 13:13); yet by decree it was determined and prophecy foretold that the everlasting throne and kingdom for Israel was to come through the tribe of Judah and not through the tribe of Benjamin, to which tribe Saul belonged (Gen. 49:10). To the same end it may be perceived that, in the controversy between Jehovah and Satan as recorded in the first two chapters of Job, Satan admits that he can bring no testing upon Job apart from the permission of Jehovah; and it is stated that Jehovah gave Satan this permission. Again, the experience of an individual who sins is suggestive. After the sin has been committed, the one who sins could say: *God is to be blamed. He could have prevented me from sinning, but He did not.* That, however, the sinner does *not* say, since there is within him a consciousness that he alone is responsible. Martyrs could have prevented the sin of murder on the part of their slayers had they but recanted from their position relative to the truth in question. Even Christ Himself could have prevented an uncounted number of men from the measureless sin of the crucifixion of the Son of God, had He come down from the cross. All this suggests the obvious fact that the mere avoidance of sin is not always the primary issue.

With all these situations in view, the candid mind refuses to predicate sin of God either directly or indirectly.

It may be concluded, then, that sin is in the universe by the permission of God who hates it perfectly and who, being sovereign, had power to keep it from manifestation, had He chosen to do so. That He did not hinder the manifestation of sin, demonstrates that He, being what He is, must have a purpose in view other than the averting of sin. Here as nowhere else in the affairs of the universe, the end justifies the means.

b. The Problem of the Will. This difficulty lends itself to various presentations. It may in general be stated thus: If God be sovereign and only those things occur which are determined in His decree, is there any sphere left in which a creature may exercise his own free will? Or, again, could the human will ever act outside the decree of God, and, if it does not, is its action free?

To the problem stated in these questions, more or less clarifying answers have been made. But before these answers are considered, it is well to give some attention to the precise nature of the issues involved.

As first created, both angels and men were gladly and perfectly subject to the will of God. Such, indeed, is the present estate of unfallen angels and there is no need to inquire concerning them and the exercise of their wills. They are determined to do only that which pleases God. Freedom to do otherwise is accorded them as fully as it was accorded those angels "who kept not their first estate" (Jude 1:6). They continue in His will and doubtless will do so throughout eternity. The first sin to be committed in heaven and in the universe itself was committed by the greatest of all the angels and before—perhaps ages before—the creation of man. The angel who first sinned in heaven is described, both as to his person and divine appointment, in Ezekiel 28:11–15 and under the title of "the king of Tyrus." The nature of that sin is recorded in Isaiah 14:12–14 where that angel is introduced under the title of "Lucifer, son of the morning," and where the precise character of his fivefold sin is revealed. It will be seen that the sin consists in the exercise of the angel's will in opposition to the will of God. No imagination could picture nor could any language express the awfulness of the moment when, for the first time, a creature opposed the sovereign will of his Creator. It was this same being who as the consummation of his own sin had said, "I will be like the most High" (Isa. 14:14), that later appeared in the Garden of Eden and, following the creation of man, there counseled the first man and woman to *be as God* (Elohim, cf. Dan. 5:11). The A.V. translation, "Be as gods," is open to question, since the name of Deity which is used here by the Spirit is *Elohim*. It is a plural name, indeed, but is the original from which the English title *God* is almost universally translated throughout the Old Testament. He who had sinned and fallen by saying, "I will be like the most High," now proposes to unfallen man that he by disobedience *be as God*. Only in the one respect—independence—could either angel or man be as God.

Over against this, it is revealed that the perfect manhood of Christ was wholly subject to the will of His Father. It is written of Him that, "when he cometh into the world, he saith, … Lo, I come … to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5–7; cf. Ps. 40:6–8). There could be no perfect humanity or creaturehood which is not completely subject to the will of God; and the first step in salvation on the part of those for whom redemption is provided is that they shall *obey* the gospel (Acts 5:32; 2 Thess. 1:8; Heb. 5:9; 1 Pet.

4:17). With this provision in view, there is no need that any should be lost who desire to be saved.

The human choice of that which is good, like the choice of that which is evil, originates *within*, as the individual's volition and is *free* in the sense that the individual is not conscious of any necessity being imposed upon him. All human action is included in this conception. Since human action appears to be restrained by nothing other than moral suasion or by emotions, the interrogation is in order as to what extent the human will is free. Over against the sense of freedom to act which the individual experiences, the Scriptures teach that there are far-reaching restraints upon that will. Of the unregenerate it is asserted that they, being children of disobedience, are energized (ἐνεργέω—*energeō*) by Satan (Eph. 2:2), which fact denotes almost unlimited domination over those thus energized. Concerning the regenerate it is revealed that "it is God which worketh [ἐνεργέω] in you" (Phil. 2:13), which fact denotes almost unlimited domination by God over those who are saved. Thus the entire human family —both those who are unsaved and those who are saved—is included, and not one of these is really free from a superior influence. This influence, potent as it is, may be wholly unrecognized within the range of human experience. The Bible plainly asserts that God influences the unregenerate, as, to some extent, Satan and the power of a fallen nature influence the regenerate. The influence of God upon the unregenerate must be exercised if ever they are to turn to Him in saving faith. Christ declared, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6:44); and the Apostle has written by the Spirit, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8; cf. Phil. 1:29). Much perplexity is caused by the statements that God at times hinders spiritual vision and hardens hearts. He commanded concerning Israel: "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed" (Isa. 6:10). This is a judgment upon the nation for their evil ways and serves also as the blinding of that people, as predicted, throughout the present age in which Jews and Gentiles alike are confronted with the saving grace of God and His purpose in the outcalling of the Church (Rom. 11:25). Seven times it is stated that God hardened Pharaoh's heart (Ex. 4:21; 7:3; 9:12; 10:20, 27;

11:10; Rom. 9:17, 18), and three times it is said that Pharaoh hardened his own heart (Ex. 8:15, 32; 9:34; cf. Deut. 2:30. Note, also, Ex. 7:13, 22; 8:19). Thus it is also recorded in 2 Thessalonians 2:11 that God shall give the people of the coming tribulation age "strong delusion" (or, better, "the working of delusion") that they should believe the falsehood. This delusion is to the end that they all may be judged, who received not the love of the truth so that they might be saved. There is no mere *permissiveness* here or in the case of Pharaoh. God is definitely said to be the *cause* of these states of heart, as He is also the *cause* of Israel's blindness. In these instances, as elsewhere and often, God apparently asks not to be relieved from the direct responsibility that He causes all that is predicated of Him. It is certain that in the above-named instances, God does not create the evil heart, but rather brings out into overt action that which is latent within the heart to the end that it may be judged. "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9:18).

The will of the creature is a creation of God and in relation to it God sustains no timidity or uncertainty. He made the creature's will as an instrument by which He might accomplish His sovereign purpose and it is inconceivable that it should ever thwart His purpose. As bearing upon the sovereignty of God over all creatures, the student should read with reverent attention Isaiah 40:10–31 and Job 38:1–41:34.

When exercising his will, man is conscious only of his freedom of action. He determines his course by circumstances, but God is the author of circumstances. Man is impelled by emotions, but God is able to originate and to control every human emotion. Man prides himself that he is governed by experienced judgment, but God is able to foster each and every thought or determination of the human mind. God will mold and direct in all secondary causes until His own eternal purpose is realized. How else could He fulfill His covenants which commit Him to the control of the actions and destinies of men to the end of time and into eternity? His election is *sure;* for whom He predestinates, them—not more or less—He calls; and whom He calls, them—not more or less—He justifies; and whom He justifies, them—not more or less—He glorifies. When predestinating, He assumes the responsibility of creating, calling, saving, and completing according to His own purpose. In calling He moves those to believe to the saving of their souls, whom He has chosen. In justifying He provides a

substitutionary, efficacious Savior by whose death and resurrection He is legally able to place the chief of sinners in as perfect a relation to Himself as that of His own Son And in glorifying He perfects all that infinite love has designed. The precise number that will be glorified will be the precise number and the same individuals—not more or less—that He predestinated. Each one will have believed, have been saved, have been perfected and presented like Christ in glory. Men enter consciously into this great undertaking only at the one point of believing, or responding to the efficacious call. Naturally, it seems to them that they, acting in freedom within the restricted sphere of their consciousness, determine everything. Their action is vital, for no link in God's chain can be lacking. The point where misunderstanding arises is with reference to the fact that, so far as their cognizance serves them, they are certain that they act freely; yet every truly regenerate person will testify that he would not have turned to God apart from that all-important divine drawing of his heart. Divine election is absolute. If this seems to some to be taking things out of the hands of men and committing them into the hands of God, it will at least be conceded that, when thus committed to God, things are in better hands and this, after all, is God's own universe in which He has sovereign right to do after the dictates of His own will. It will also be conceded that the sphere of human action, so far as it can mean anything in the sphere of human consciousness, is left in perfect freedom of action. It should be deemed no crime on the part of God that He discloses to His own elect that His sovereign power and purpose are working through and over all human forces and secondary causes.

Writing of the proposed solutions of the problem which two wills engender, Dr. John Dick states:

> Here we come to a question which has engaged the attention, and exercised the ingenuity, and perplexed the wits of men in every age. If God has fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, the whole series of events is necessary, and human liberty is taken away. Men are passive instruments in the hands of their Maker; they can do nothing but what they are secretly and irresistibly influenced to do; they are not, therefore, responsible for their actions; and God is the Author of sin. To this objection it is replied, that the divine decree is extrinsic to the human mind; that it exerts no force or influence upon our faculties; and that, while it insures the futurition of events, it leaves them to be accomplished in the exercise of our liberty. While it determines that some things should be brought to pass necessarily, it determines that other things should be brought to pass freely. God has decreed, not only that men should act, but that they should act freely, and agreeably to their rational nature. He

determined the act; but men being free agents, it was possible, in respect of their liberty abstractly considered, that they might act differently. When, however, you have reflected upon this answer, and stripped it of its technical form, you will find that it amounts to nothing. It just says, that, notwithstanding the decree of God, man retains his liberty of action; and, consequently, puts us off with an assertion under the pretext of giving us an explanation. Believing that all things are immutably fixed in the divine counsels, we wish to know how the predetermination is consistent with liberty. To what purpose is it to tell us, that God has decreed that some things shall take place necessarily, and other things freely? What information does this answer give us? what doubt does it solve? Still the question remains, How can those actions be free, which were so fixed that they could not be avoided?

It is a more intelligible method to explain the subject by the doctrine, which makes liberty consist in the power of acting according to the prevailing inclination, or the motive which appears strongest to the mind. Those actions are free which are the effect of volition. In whatever manner the state of mind which gave rise to the volition has been produced, the liberty of the agent is neither greater nor less. It is his will alone which is to be considered, and not the means by which it has been determined. If God fore-ordained certain actions, and placed men in such circumstances that the actions would certainly take place agreeably to the laws of the mind, men are nevertheless moral agents, because they act voluntarily, and are responsible for the actions which consent has made their own. Liberty does not consist in the power of acting or not acting, but in acting from choice. The choice is determined by something in the mind itself, or by something external influencing the mind; but, whatever is the cause, the choice makes the action free, and the agent accountable. If this definition of liberty be admitted, you will perceive that it is possible to reconcile the freedom of the will with absolute decrees; but we have not got rid of every difficulty. By this theory, human actions appear to be as necessary as the motions of matter according to the laws-of gravitation and attraction; and man seems to be a machine, conscious of his movements, and consenting to them, but impelled by something different from himself.

Upon such a subject, no man should be ashamed to acknowledge his ignorance. We are not required to reconcile the divine decrees and human liberty. It is enough to know that God has decreed all things which come to pass, and that men are answerable for their actions. Of both these truths we are assured by the Scriptures; and the latter is confirmed by the testimony of conscience. We feel that, although not independent upon God, we are free; so that we excuse ourselves when we have done our duty, and accuse ourselves when we have neglected it. Sentiments of approbation and disapprobation in reference to our own conduct or that of other men, would have no existence in our minds if we believed that men are necessary agents. But the tie which connects the divine decrees and human liberty is invisible. “Such knowledge is too wonderful for us; it is high, we cannot attain unto it”. If every thing in religion were level to the comprehension of reason, there would be no room for faith. It is better to believe humbly, than to reason presumptuously. And presumptuous all those reasonings may be called, which lead to the denial of the immutability of the divine counsels, or of the freedom of the human will; which make man a machine, and God the author of sin.—*Lectures on Theology*, p. 186

2. Predestination. The term *predestination* signifies a predetermining of destiny. The body of truth which this term represents is properly a

subdivision of the doctrine of divine decree. It does not relate to the destiny of material things, but in its broadest meaning it concerns the destiny of all intelligent creatures, including angels and men. For want of specific revelation, little is known concerning the destiny of angels. It is assumed that the holy angels will abide in that estate and they are seen in the eternal city (Heb. 12:22–24). Those angels which kept not their first estate are destined to the lake of fire (Matt. 25:41; cf. Rev. 20:10), and there is no intimation that any redemption is ever offered to them. A far more determining revelation is found in the Bible as to the destiny of men. And as certainly as God foreordains whatsoever cometh to pass, the future of each human being is marked off in God's eternal plan. Like the larger doctrine of divine decree, this particular aspect of predestination is fraught with perplexities, all of which, it may be believed, are due to the restrictions which encompass the human mind. Since divine predestination is taught in the Bible without diminution, it is to be received and believed. Rationalistic attempts to modify this revelation, as might be expected, have resulted in greater complications.

Outside the predetermined destiny which belongs to Israel and the nations who "inherit the earth," the doctrine of predestination falls into two divisions, namely, (1) election and (2) retribution. In its earlier and basic significance the term *retribution* had to do as much with the rewards which accrue to the saved as to the penalties which accrue to the unsaved. Election and retribution are counterparts of each other. There can be no election of some that does not imply the rejection of others.

a. Election. The election which is set forth in the Scriptures, apart from the elect nation Israel—not now under consideration—,is that favor of God, notably a full and free salvation, which is accorded to some, but not to all. Of some it is said that they are "chosen in the Lord" (Rom. 16:13); "chosen … to salvation" (2 Thess. 2:13); "chosen … in him before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4); predestined to the "adoption of children" (Eph. 1:5); "to be conformed to the image of his Son" (Rom. 8:29); "elect according to the foreknowledge of God" (1 Pet. 1:2); and "vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory" (Rom. 9:23). The term *election* should not be construed to mean only a general divine purpose to *provide* salvation for all men. It refers to an express divine purpose to confer salvation on some, but

not all. Nor should the term imply that God will bless those who believe. It rather specifies those who will believe. Some, but not all, are written in the Lamb's book of life. Evasion of the plain words of Scripture secures nothing in the understanding of this most solemn subject. Whatever may be the case of the nonelect, it is written of the saved that He "hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began" (2 Tim. 1:9); "according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love" (Eph. 1:4).

There is no mere arbitrary caprice in divine election, for God in this, as in all He does, is governed by infinite wisdom, holiness, and love. As the ground of His election, He foresaw no difference in character of one over another. His choice is not based on anticipated worthiness. Election is an act of grace apart from works. Neither faith nor good works is the cause of divine election. They are rather the fruit of election. Men are not first holy and then chosen; but are first chosen and then holy. It was that they might be holy that they were chosen. The destiny of Isaac's sons was determined before they had done anything good or bad, that the fact of sovereign election might stand without complication (Rom. 9:11–13). The fact that a supposed *conditional* election is the belief of the majority is due, doubtless, to the reluctance on the part of man to admit that no merit resides in his natural self.

To the same purpose, the election of God is *immutable*. Some have contended that it is in the power of the elect to disappoint the calculations of the Almighty. Such sentiments as these are written: "It is false to say that election is confirmed from everlasting." "Men may make their election void." They may "change themselves from believers to unbelievers," from elect to nonelect. To such teachers, there is no word or work of God that is sure. Nevertheless, God hath said: "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure" (Isa. 46:9, 10).

The supralapsarians hold that God's ultimate purpose in creation is the manifestation of His perfection and that His mercy will be revealed in the

election of some and His justice will be revealed in the reprobation of all others. Thus far a solemn truth is declared; but they then advance to an inconsistency. To reach their desired end, they claim that God first decreed to create man and then to place him in circumstances wherein he would fall, and to send His Son to die for those He chose for salvation. In this arrangement, God is seen to treat the fall of man only as a means to an end. Men were elected or rejected before the decree concerning the fall and without reference to the fall. Thus they were not seen as sinners, but as creatures, and as such they were chosen or rejected without a ground for their rejection or without an occasion for the exercise of grace. The effect of this doctrinal scheme is to rob God of all pity and love and to present Him as One who disregards the suffering of His creatures. Such a doctrine may answer to the cold, erring reason of man, but it wholly disregards the full testimony of the Word of God wherein the compassion of God is stressed.

The sublapsarians contend that, in the order of His elective decree, God first permitted the fall and then determined the destiny of men from that starting point as a meritless position before Him. This conception does at least provide a ground for the exercise of grace and a basis for the condemnation of the lost.

Closely related to the lapsarian controversy is the question whether some who are predestined unto life were so chosen in view of the fact that Christ would die for them, that is, for His sake, or that He did die for them because they were the chosen of God. The latter would seem to be true, since God first loved the world and, because of that love, He gave His only begotten Son.

The doctrine of election is a cardinal teaching of the Scriptures. Doubtless, it is attended with difficulties which are a burden upon all systems of theology alike. However, no word of God may be altered or neglected. No little help is gained when it is remembered that revelation and not reason is the guide to faith. When the former has spoken, the latter is appointed to listen and acquiesce.

b. Retribution. There is that in the purpose of God which is styled *retribution.* As an act of God, the term means that some are rejected whom He does not elect. The word *preterition* has been preferred by some as being less severe. Surely, no thoughtful believer would choose to employ terms in

relation to the doom of the lost which are unnecessarily strong. The theme is one of surpassing solemnity and it is no evidence of compassion when men purposely express themselves respecting the future estate of the unregenerate in harsh and unfeeling terms. It is a theme which should ever bring one to tears. It is intended by the choice of the word *preterition* to imply that God assumes no active attitude toward the nonelect other than to pass them by, leaving them under the just condemnation which their lost estate deserves. Thus it is supposed that, to some extent, God is relieved of responsibility if it is predicated of Him that He *pretermits* rather than *reprobates* the nonelect. Such distinctions are more a delusion of words than a discrimination of facts. Apart from this awful theme and under any circumstances more congenial, such a labored selection of words would hardly be suffered. It is impossible actively to choose some from a company and not, at the same time and by the same process, actively to reject the remainder. Yet a real distinction exists in the divine way of dealing with one class as compared with the other. New and wholly undeserved blessings are extended to the elect, while the nonelect reap only the just recompense of their lost estate. God does for one class what He does not do for the other, but both aggregations pass before His mind and become objects of His determination. Exceedingly painful expressions are used in the Scriptures to describe the divine decision regarding the nonelect. They are “not written” in the book of life (Rev. 13:8); they are “vessels of wrath fitted to destruction” (Rom. 9:22); they were “before … ordained to this condemnation” (Jude 1:4); they “stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed” (1 Pet. 2:8). God is said to love some less than others (Mal. 1:2, 3). Some are called the “election,” and some are called “the rest” (Rom. 11:7). A dispassionate reading of Romans, chapters nine and eleven, will result in the assurance that, whatever men may believe or disbelieve regarding the matter, the Word of God is bold in declaring that some are appointed to blessing and others are to experience condemnation. Human limitations and perverse reasoning can hardly render true judgments on these issues. It is plain that the doom of the nonelect is not apart from a due consideration of their unworthiness. God is presented as an object of adoration and love, which He could not be were He revealed as One who merely exercised authority apart from goodness and justice. The real problem may be stated thus: Was God just in decreeing to reprobate

transgressors of His holy will? In other words, Is evil worthy of eternal separation from God? Upon this issue the human mind can throw no light. What the true nature of sin is as valued by God who is infinitely holy, must be accepted in the terms of revelation. Being against God, sin assumes the quality of infinity. Naturally, the inquiry arises, Could God not have elected to save all? To the same end, another inquiry arises, Would He not have been justified in reprobating all? To all such questions, though sincere, no reply is possible. God is proved to be worthy of unquestioning trust, and assurance is given that He is doing what is best. That conclusion will be embraced by all when the task is done. In the one company, He is demonstrating His grace; in the other, His justice may be seen. The nonelect are judged for their demerit, while the elect, who are in every respect as unworthy, are made the objects of His grace.

One danger which may result from attending upon these themes and which must be due to human misunderstanding, is that the heart may, for the time, lose sight of the revelation that God is of infinite compassion, not desiring that any should perish, and because of that truth no person, no matter how sinful, who desires to be saved, need fail of that eternal grace. The invitation is to all. Nothing is more agreeable to God than the exercise of His grace.

Reason symphonizes with revelation in asserting that every part of God's creation will serve a purpose, and revelation adds that it will redound to His glory; even the wrath of man shall praise Him (Ps. 76:10). Thus it is intimated that no evil shall go beyond the bounds of that which may in the end be to His glory. That the wicked may contribute to God's final glory has been well stated in the Westminster Confession: "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice" (chap. III, sec. VII).

3. Objections to the Doctrine of Divine Decree. Almost endless discussion has emerged over the doctrine of divine decree and its subdivision, predestination. The major disagreement between Calvinistic and Arminian systems centers at this point. No phase of the subject has been

neglected and it is impractical, were it possible, to undertake in this work a review or analysis of these extended arguments. The usual theological library is replete with such material.

Concerning objections in general it may be said: Even reason in its unfallen state would not have been qualified to sit in judgment on supernatural revelation. How much less is fallen reason able so to do! The Holy Spirit has spoken, and the sovereign determination of God is as clearly asserted in the pages of the Bible as are any of the prerogatives of men. After all, what does man know about God or the issues involved in reaching those ends which infinite wisdom has predetermined? It ill becomes the wisest of men to speculate even on what God ought, or ought not, to do. Much that is written on these subjects is distinguished for its shocking irreverence. Objections to the doctrine of divine decree are usually in two classes, namely, (1) those which involve the moral character of God, and (2) those which involve the moral agency of man. Of the latter, no word will be added here beyond what has gone before.

a. The Justice of God. Predestination, it is objected, represents God as a respecter of persons. He would be a respecter of persons if among those that were all deserving He saved some and passed by the remainder; but not one of all the fallen human race has within himself the ground of any claim upon God. Those He saves are saved without the slightest respect to human merit. God acts in saving grace as a *sovereign* and not as a *judge.* The Word of God, which so insistently states the absolute authority and freedom of God, also declares by the mouth of the Apostle Peter, “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons” (Acts 10:34, cf. Lev. 19:15). With immediate issues in view, men inquire why God caused any creature to exist whom He foreknew would be lost forever; but this question implies that God was free to create or not create, it also assumes that the welfare of each human being is the primary divine objective. Though such a supposition is the natural conclusion of a self-centered human being, it has little or no support from the Scriptures. The whole query penetrates far beyond the border of human understanding and can only tend to wrong thoughts concerning God.

b. The Love of God. It is challenged that since God is revealed as loving all men, He could consistently reprobate none. In an attempt to meet this

assertion some Limited Redemptionists have taken the ground that God loves only the elect; but such a conclusion is evidently reached quite apart from the teachings of the Bible. It is not only contrary to the teaching of the Bible, but it dishonors God and hinders all freedom in gospel preaching. There is a real difficulty involved in this challenge; yet it is easily possible that, while having genuine and universal affection for all His creatures and desires for their good—which is the testimony of the Scriptures—, yet for greater reasons unrevealed to men, He does not gratify all His desires. Intelligent men repress their desires and affections in the interests of greater ends. Such action is as possible in the range of divine reason as it is in the range of human reason.

c. Predestination Predetermines that Men Shall Sin. Such a revolting inference might on the surface seem to some minds to have a foundation. Already it has been pointed out that neither the Bible nor the consciousness of men ever accuses God of promoting sin; nor do the Scriptures retreat from the assuring averment that God has preordained all things which come to pass. Such a seeming contradiction is harmonized in God, if not in the mind of man. No more clarifying illustration of this seeming contradiction is to be found than is involved in the death of Christ and God's eternal purpose in that death. God had determined that His Lamb should be slain and predicted that He would be slain at the hands of wicked men. His prediction even anticipated the very words these men would utter at the time of Christ's death (Ps. 22:8). The manner of Christ's death and the precise words of His executioners were not merely foreknown by a foresight which determines nothing. These wicked men did their deed and uttered their words under that necessity which predetermination imposes; but within the sphere of the consciousness of these men, they did precisely what they wanted to do without thought of necessity. They would have resented with vehemence any suggestion that they were fulfilling to the letter the most important decree of God. The strange harmony between predestination and human sin is asserted in Acts 2:23, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."

d. Predestination and the Means to Its Ends. This objection inquires, Will the elect be saved whether they give their salvation concern and conform themselves

to the truth or not? In reply it is stated that predestination includes all the required means and anticipates every step in reaching its ends. If the elect must be called and justified in order to be prepared for the glory, God asserts that He will attend to their call and their justification. The call will include the response of saving faith, which in its experimental exercise will be to each individual as the unaided action of his own free will. Having thus decreed human free will as a necessary step in the fulfilling of all His eternal purpose, it becomes as essential in the sight of God as any other link in the chain.

e. Predestination and Gospel Preaching. The objector questions (a) the need of a proclamation of the gospel to those that are elect, (b) the uselessness of it to the nonelect, and (c) the sincerity in the preaching of the gospel to the nonelect. The first issue has been answered in the preceding paragraph. Regarding the second issue, it may be stated that no man knows who are elect or who are not, therefore the divine instruction to the preacher is that he go into all the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature. Concerning the question of divine sincerity in offering the gospel to those who are nonelect, it may be observed that one of the sins of the unsaved for which a just penalty rests upon them is the sin of rejection of Christ, or of unbelief. It is evident no rejection can be predicated of those who have not had the gospel presented unto them, and therefore have not actually refused it (Rom. 2:12).

f. Predestination and Fatalism. The term *fatalism* may mean that all things are so predetermined by God that no human choice is possible or "that all events, including human choices, are absolutely determined in a mechanical way by their antecedent physical causes; physical determinism" (New Standard Dictionary, *s.v.*). This conception is gained whenever the sovereignty of God is stressed to the exclusion of the free action of men, or when God is left out of the reckoning and men imagine they are driven by blind forces over which they have no control. The most important choice the human heart can ever make is that of the acceptance of Christ as Savior, and the will of man alone is appealed to in this decision. If man is free in the realm of things most vital and eternal, it is to be supposed that He is equally free in matters of lesser import.

g. Divine Decree and Human Suffering. This, the last of the objections to divine sovereignty to be examined, calls the wisdom and goodness of God in question in view of the suffering and death which is in the world. A theodicy is indicated, that is, a defense of the worthiness of God in the face of all the distress and agony that is in the world. Much that has gone before in this discussion has been to the one end that God may be vindicted against the conclusions of human misunderstanding. The contents of any theodicy will naturally be determined by the number of problems presented for consideration. Only the problem of human suffering remains in this inventory. This issue has been before the race since the days of Job. Men have been perplexed, not only by the presence of human suffering in the world where God who is infinite goodness reigns, but by the fact that often the wicked prosper while the godly languish in suffering and loss. As recorded in Psalm 73, the writer of the Psalm testifies that he was "plagued, and chastened" every morning as he beheld the prosperity of the wicked. It was not until he went into the sanctuary that he understood their end. God has revealed Himself to His own in the world. They are able to rise above the present distress because of the surpassing assurance with which their knowledge of God enriches them.

Suffering may be as a discipline for the saint or as a penalty upon the sinner (1 Pet. 3:17). In either case there is but one Hand that bestows—He who never errs or fails—He who can be and should be trusted implicitly—He who out of this midnight of evil will yet bring forth His own righteousness as the noonday. Suffering is a means which God employs to the realization of His most perfect will. He is never wrong; He is never mistaken. "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified. But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men's matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf" (1 Pet. 4:12–16). Even Christ with all His perfection was not spared suffering. It is written: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the

flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin" (1 Pet. 4:1).

Writing on the general theme of objections to the doctrine of divine decree and with a word of timely warning, Dr. John Dick states:

> It can serve no great purpose to muster up objections against the infallibility of the Divine decrees, or the responsibility of man; to listen to them when proposed by others; to revolve them in our minds; to perplex ourselves with attempts to answer them, and to allow ourselves to be disquieted and to doubt because our endeavours are not successful. Although we should prove to our satisfaction, as many have done to theirs, that the decrees of God are not absolute, or that man is not free, all that we have gained is, to confirm our minds in the belief of a falsehood; for both doctrines must be true, as they are expressly declared in the Scriptures. To their authority let us bow; and by their decision let us regulate our thoughts and our conduct. If we still oppose our reasonings to their dictates, we must take our course; but let us beware lest we dispute ourselves into infidelity or atheism, and seek a refuge from our doubts in the rejection of revelation, because it inculcates truths which to us appear contradictory, or in the cheerless conclusion, that we live in a fatherless world, where chance bears sway, that man is the phantom of an hour, the sport of accident and passion, and that, as he knows not whence he came, so he cannot tell whither he is going. In opposition to this comfortless and impious conclusion, let us hold fast the creed which is consonant to reason as well as to revelation, that the Supreme Being manages the affairs of the universe which he created; that all creatures are dependent upon him, and all events are subject to his control: that while good men obey him from choice, the wrath and wayward passions of the bad are subservient to his design; that, while his almighty power bends them to his purpose, he is a moral Governor and Judge, whose righteousness will be displayed in punishing transgressors, even for those actions which were the means of executing his own decrees.—*Lectures on Theology,* p. 195

5. Major Manifestations of the Divine Decree. Various major manifestations of divine decree should be noted specifically:

a. Creation. The Biblical account of creation declares that of His own free will and not of necessity, and by an act rather than by a process, God created from nothing all things that exist. A distinction is indicated between the revelation that a sufficient cause, in the Person of the Eternal God, created all things from nothing, and the atheistic notion that matter is either eternal or self-evolved. The phrase *creatio prima seu immediata* denotes that form of creation which brought all necessary elements into existence. The phrase *creatio secunda seu mediata* denotes a subsequent act of God by which He brought order and form out of the chaos which followed the original creation. This is the order of events as set forth in the opening verses of the Bible. There are three general attitudes toward the Biblical account of creation, namely, (a) that it is only allegorical, (b) that it is the

basis for a spiritualizing process of teaching, and (c) that it is historical. The last-named attitude is the only one which conforms to the narrative as given in Genesis and to the upwards of fifty subsequent statements in all the Sacred Text (cf. Ps. 33:6; 148:5). Throughout the Bible, God is honored as the sovereign Creator, and all things created are absolutely dependent upon Him (cf. Neh. 9:6; Acts 17:28; Rom. 11:36; 1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16; Rev. 4:11). The Bible also asserts that God existed before the things which He created (cf. Ps. 90:2; John 17:5, 24). The Bible as clearly assigns the work of creation to each of the three Persons of the God-head separately—to the Father (1 Cor. 8:6); to the Son (John 1:3; Col. 1:16, 17; Heb. 1:10–12); to the Spirit (Gen. 1:2; Job 26:13; 33:4; Ps. 33:6; 104:29, 30; Isa. 40:13); and to God—*Elohim*, the plural name (Gen. 1:1, 26).

It remains to be observed that since God alone was in existence before the creation of the universe, He must have created all things for His own pleasure and so that He who is worthy might be glorified.

b. The Program of the Ages. The unrestrained, sovereign purpose of God is seen in the ordering of the succession of the ages. That God has a program of the ages is disclosed in many passages (cf. Deut. 30:1–10; Dan. 2:31–45; 7:1–28; 9:24–27; Hos. 3:4, 5; Matt. 23:37–25:46; Acts 15:13–18; Rom. 11:13–29; 2 Thess. 2:1–12; Rev. 2:1–22:31). Likewise, there are well-defined periods of time related to the divine purpose. The Apostle Paul writes of the period between Adam and Moses (Rom. 5:14); John speaks of the law as given by Moses, but of grace and truth as coming by Christ (John 1:17). Christ also speaks of the “times of the Gentiles” (Luke 21:24), which are evidently to be distinguished from Jewish “times and seasons” (Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1). Likewise, He spoke of a hitherto unannounced period between His two advents and indicated its distinctive features (Matt. 13:1–51), and predicted a yet future time of “great tribulation” and defined its character (Matt. 24:9–31). There are “last days” for Israel (Isa. 2:1–5) as well as “last days” for the Church (2 Tim. 3:1–5). The Apostle John anticipates a period of one thousand years and relates this to the reign of Christ, at which time the Church, His bride, will reign with Him (Rev. 20:1–6). That Christ will sit on the throne of David and reign over the house of Jacob forever is declared by the angel Gabriel (Luke 1:31–33), and that there will be an ever abiding new heaven and new earth is as clearly

revealed (Isa. 65:17; 66:22; 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1). In Hebrews 1:1, 2 a sharp contrast is drawn between "time past" when God spoke to the fathers by the prophets and "these last days" when He is speaking unto us by His Son. Similarly, it is clearly disclosed that there are *ages past* (Eph. 3:5; Col. 1:26), the *present age* (Rom. 12:2; Gal. 1:4) and the *age*, or *ages, to come* (Eph. 2:7; Heb. 6:5; note Eph. 1:10, where the future age is termed *the dispensation*—οἰκονομία—of the fullness—πλήρωμα—of times—καιρός).

The use of αἰῶνας in Hebrews 1:2 and 11:3 with its almost universal reference to *time*, either bounded or unbounded, is of particular significance as bearing on the divine arrangements of time-periods. The former with ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας and the latter with κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας have been much disputed. Dean Alford states: "The main classes of interpreters are two. (1) Those who see in the word its ordinary meaning of an 'age of time'; (2) those who do not recognize such meaning, but suppose it to have been merged in that of 'the world,' or 'the worlds.' To (1) belong the Greek Fathers; and some others. On the other hand, (2) is the view of the majority of Commentators" (*N.T. for English Readers*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 599). In several passages, including the two in question, Vincent declares αἰῶνας to refer to "the universe, the aggregate of the ages or periods, and their contents which are included in the duration of the world." The word, he states, "means a period of time Otherwise it would be impossible to account for the plural, or such qualifying expressions as *this* age, or the age *to come*" (*Word Studies*, IV, 59).

Considering the accepted meaning of αἰῶνας, the natural interpretation of the passage in question is that God did by Christ arrange the successive periods, far beyond καιρός within χρόνος, extending indeed to things eternal or from everlasting to everlasting. This interpretation held, according to Alford, by the Greek Fathers, though not free from difficulties, is of more than passing import to those who do discern the fact, force, and fruition of God's time-periods.

c. Preservation. This form of divine activity is but the continuous working of God by which He maintains and consummates the objects of His creation. The doctrine of *preservation* answers the claim of Deistic philosophy, and asserts that the sovereign decree of God will be perfected forever (cf. Neh. 9:6; Ps. 36:6; Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:2, 3).

d. Providence. Again, God is revealed in providence as the sovereign One who, that His eternal purposes may be revealed, molds all events both moral and physical. While preservation continues the existence of things, providence directs their progress. It extends to all the works of God. Dr. A. A. Hodge thus explains Biblical providence:

> God having from eternity absolutely decreed whatsoever comes to pass, and having in the beginning created all things out of nothing by the word of his power, and continuing subsequently constantly present to every atom of his creation, upholding all things in being and in the possession and exercise of all their properties, he ALSO continually controls and directs the actions of all his creatures thus preserved, so that while he never violates the law of their several natures, he yet infallibly causes all actions and events singular and universal to occur according to the eternal and immutable plan embraced in his decree. There is a design in providence. God has chosen his great end, the manifestation of his own glory, but in order to that end he has chosen innumberable sub-ordinate ends; these are fixed; and he has appointed all actions and events in their several relations as means to those ends; and he continually so directs the actions of all creatures that all these general and special ends are brought to pass precisely at the time, by the means, and in the mode and under the conditions, which he from eternity proposed.—*Outlines of Theology*, p. 262

The doctrine of providence may be extended to embrace nearly all that enters into both naturalistic and Biblical theism. It falls naturally into a fourfold division: (a) *preventative* (cf. Gen. 20:6; Ps. 19:13): God uses parents, governments, laws, customs, public opinion, His Word, His Spirit, and conscience as means to a providential impediment to evil. The Spirit, the Word, and prayer avail much for the Christian; (b) *permissive*, which embraces that which God does not restrain (cf. Deut. 8:2; 2 Chron. 32:31; Hos. 4:17; Rom. 1:24, 28); (c) *directive*, by which action God guides the ways of men and often outside their consciousness of that guidance (cf. Gen. 50:20; Ps. 76:10; Isa. 10:5: John 13:27; Acts 4:28); (d) *determinative*, by which action of God He decides and executes all things after the counsel of His own will.

The providence of God so combines with human freedom that, though the ways of God are sure, it is in no sense *fatalism*. Likewise, the providence of God is the opposite of chance. The divine care reaches to the least detail of life as well as to its greater aspects. Certain attributes of God demand the exercise of His providence. His justice prompts Him to secure all moral good; His benevolence prompts Him to care for His own; His immutability insures that what He has begun He will complete; and His power is sufficient to execute all His desire.

e. Prayer. Though God conditions certain actions of His own on prayer, it does not follow that those things thus conditioned are uncertain. This, again, is the problem of the divine and human wills being combined in such a way as to realize the precise divine purpose through the free choice of men. Efficacious prayer is to the glory of the Father (John 14:13), in the name of the Son (John 14:14), and in the enabling power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:26, 27). Compliance with these conditions insures that the human will is in agreement with the divine will. Transforming things, mighty indeed, are wrought by prayer, but only such things as comport with the will and purpose of God. Why, then, should prayer be offered? Only because of the fact that the divine purpose, which the answer to prayer represents, includes the prayer feature. It is as much decreed that it shall be done in answer to prayer as it is decreed that it shall be done at all. "We must add to this that true prayer is not *merely* human, but sustained and carried on by the Divine Spirit as the Spirit of prayer, and that it has to such an extent a prophetic character, in which the Providence of God is one with the presentiment of man. Hence the sealing of prayer by the Amen. … Prayer comes forth from the eternal freedom of the child, and goes back to the eternal freedom of the Father" (Lange, cited by Van Oosterzee, *Dogmatics*, I, 350).

f. Miracles. That in the physical world which surpasses all known human or moral powers and is therefore ascribed to supernatural agencies is called miracle. It is a sufficient power acting outside the range of natural causes and effects. But miracles do not imply that God has introduced something unforeseen in His eternal purpose, for the miracle, like all else, is included in His eternal Plan. Miracles are such only as viewed by men; to God they are but extraordinary events in the providence of God. Though miracles are wonders (Acts 2:19) in the eyes of men and display the power of God, their true purpose is that of a "sign" (Matt. 12:38: John 2:18). They certify and authenticate a teacher or his doctrine. For this reason false doctrine has always resorted to supposed supernatural occurrences to establish its claims. Satan is accredited with miraculous power (2 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 13:13–15). Since the Word of God has been written in its perfection and preserved, there is no further need of signs. The present need is the guidance of the Spirit into all truth, which ministry is provided for all who will yield themselves to Him.

g. Grace. Though many objectives are disclosed, the supreme purpose of God in creation seems to be the demonstration of His *grace*. The manifestation of divine grace as it is in Christ (Titus 2:11) and as it will be displayed by the redeemed in glory (Eph. 2:7), is not only within the divine decree, but is a major feature of that decree.

Conclusion

As intimated at the beginning of this discussion on the doctrine of divine decree, the secret things of God cannot be solved by any finite mind. As much has been attempted as becomes any man, namely, some unnecessary misunderstandings have been examined; and if the problems have been relieved to that extent, the work is not in vain.

In concluding the translation of about sixty-five pages on the decree of God and predestination by Hermann Venema in his *Institutes of Theology*, the translator—Rev. Alex. W. Brown—writes a comment which may well serve as a concluding observation to what has here been written on this so difficult division of theology:

> After the lengthy and ingenious discussion by the author on the subject of predestination, we confess we feel ourselves just where we were. In attempting to reconcile the doctrine of election with the universality of the Gospal offer and with the expressed unwillingness of God that men should perish; he has only shifted the difficulty, he has not removed it. The fact is, they are hopelessly irreconcilable in our present state, and those who have made the attempt had much better have left it alone. It is a truth revealed in Scripture that all who are or who shall be saved are and shall be so in consequence of the eternal purpose of God, in other words, that all believers are elected persons, chosen in Christ before the world began, and that none will believe in Christ and be made partakers of his salvation except those who are the subjects of this divine purpose or decree. It is also revealed in Scripture that there is a divine purpose in regard to those who are not elected or chosen. It is impossible, we think, to admit the one without admitting the other. Election is an act of mind on the part of God in regard to some—reprobation or preterition or whatever other name may be employed is also an act of mind on the part of God in regard to others—he refused to choose them. Do we read for instance that the names of some were written in the book of life? we read also that the names of others were not so written. Do we find some spoken of as vessels of mercy prepared afore unto glory? we find others spoken of as vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. Is it said that some were chosen in Christ before the world began? it is also said that others were of old ordained to condemnation, who stumble at the word, being disobedient, whereunto also they were appointed. Now we must take God's word as we find it and receive its statements as true with whatever difficulties the reception of them may be attended. We may not be able to see how the existence of these decrees can consist with human liberty and responsibility or with the justice and goodness of God. But the fact, is, we have nothing whatever to do with the reconciling of these apparently contrary things. That is God's province, not ours. If we find both clearly revealed, we are bound to receive both. Our reason must be silent before this and every other mystery contained in his word. It must be treated just as Zacharias was treated by the angel. When the priest to whom he communicated the glad news of the birth of a son, asked "Whereby shall I know this?" the angel stops his mouth; "Behold," says he, "thou shalt be dumb." Just as Hagar, while obedient to Sarah, was

entertained as a servant, but when she usurped and contradicted and would not submit was expelled from the household of Abraham, so reason as long as it is subject to revelation is to be kindly entertained as a useful handmaid, but the moment it begins to oppose faith is to be abandoned and cast out as giving law to one who is invested with an authority to which it should meekly and willingly submit. The duty devolving upon those who preach and hear the Gospel in regard to this difficulty is plain. The doctrines of election and reprobation are to be believed because God has revealed them. But in delivering the message of mercy the preacher has nothing whatever to do with them—he must proclaim that message as if there were no such things in existence, and no more allow them to interfere with his presenting to all the offer of a free and full salvation in Christ, than the physician would in discharging the duties of his profession. There is predestination in the latter case as well as in the former—a predestination that embraces both the end and the means. Some are appointed to die, others to recover. But he deals with all, as if his skill in every case were to be followed with success. The same holds true in regard to those who hear the Gospel. The fact that God has chosen some to eternal life and passed by the rest should not be allowed to interfere with the duty that devolves upon them to seek to be saved, any more than the fact of God's decrees extending to all the ordinary occupations of life should interfere in any degree with the attention they should give to these. Their rule of duty in both cases is not what God has purposed but what God has said. All events are foreordained—those which relate to their temporal as well as those which relate to their spiritual condition. But just as, without taking into consideration the fact that the day and hour of their death are fixed before which they will not leave the world, and beyond which all their efforts cannot carry them, they nevertheless labour as strenuously as if the preservation of their life depended solely upon their own exertion; in the same way, without seeking to pry into the mysteries of God's government in spiritual matters, they should render submission to the statement "he that believeth shall be saved", and labour as diligently in the use of means that salvation in this way may be theirs as if success depended wholly upon themselves. Let them give all diligence to prove their calling by closing with the offer of mercy held out to them and by striving to do the will of their heavenly Father, and then they may rest assured of their election.—Pp. 334–35

Chapter XVI

THE NAMES OF DEITY

AS NO ARGUMENT is presented in the Old Testament to prove the existence of God, so in like manner there is no argument advanced to demonstrate that God may be known. Men of those times knew God because of His presence with them. That truth does not imply His bodily appearance. In fact there is little that borders on a physical conception nor, on the other hand, is there much doctrine that establishes the fact of the divine essence. The Old Testament's delineation of God is almost wholly ethical. With reference to the way in which God is revealed, Dr. A. B. Davidson in his *Theology of the Old Testament* states:

> The peculiarity of the Old Testament conception rather comes out when the question is raised,*how* God is known. Here we touch a fundamental idea of the Old Testament—the idea of *Revelation*. If men know God, it is because He has made Himself known to them. This knowledge is due to what He does, not to what men themselves achieve. As God is the source of all life, and as the knowledge of Him is the highest life, this knowledge cannot be reached by any mere effort of man. If man has anything of God, he has received it from God, who communicates Himself in love and grace. The idea of man reaching to a knowledge or fellowship of God through his own efforts is wholly foreign to the Old Testament. God speaks, He appears; man listens and beholds. God brings Himself nigh to men; He enters into a covenant or personal relation with them; He lays commands on them. They receive Him when He approaches; they accept His will and obey His behests. Moses and the prophets are nowhere represented as thoughtful minds reflecting on the Unseen, and forming conclusions regarding it, or ascending to elevated conceptions of Godhead. The Unseen manifests itself before them, and they know it … But, however much the Old Testament reposes on the ground that all knowledge of God comes from His revealing Himself, and that there is such a true and real revelation, it is far from implying that this revelation of God is a full display of Him as He really is. An exhaustive communication of God cannot be made, because the creature cannot take it in. Neither, perhaps, can God communicate Himself as He is. Hence Moses saw only a form, saw only His back parts. His face could not be beheld. Thus to the patriarchs He appeared in the human form. So in the tabernacle His presence was manifested in the smoke that hung over the Ark. So, too, in Eden He was known to be present in the cherubim, who were the divine chariot on which He rode. All these things signified His presence, while at the same time intimating that in Himself He could not be seen.—Pp. 34, 35

Bible names of persons have a meaning, which meaning usually conveys some impression as to the intrinsic character of the one who bore the name. This truth is accentuated by the fact that, when a person acquired some new

significance, the name was changed accordingly—Abram to Abraham, Jacob to Israel, Solomon to Jedidiah. God Himself calls Moses and Cyrus by name. The disclosure of character through a name is true of Deity to an absolute degree. God has not only inspired the pages whereon His names appear, but He has announced or revealed His names specifically to men and with special reference to the meaning of these names. In the beginning Adam gave names to all things God had created, but the names of God are self-revealed. Thus the student enters at this point on no field of idle speculation. Far-reaching revelation is involved, and truth concerning God which is disclosed in no other way and by no other means. A large place, therefore, should be given to this source of truth. All theistic investigation is with the purpose in view that the reality which God is may become known by man, and attention given to the divine names and their meaning will be most advantageous. Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander writes: "In proceeding to consider the Bible revelations concerning God, the first thing that demands our attention is the *Names* by which God there designates Himself. As the Bible professes to make known to us, not God as He is in Himself, but His *Name* or outward manifestation of Himself to His intelligent creatures, so it attaches special importance to the words by which this manifestation is indicated to us. All the names by which the Bible designates God are significant; and thus each of them stands as the symbol of some truth concerning Him which He would have us to receive. All this renders it of importance to us that we should rightly apprehend the import of the Divine Names in Scripture" (*System of Biblical Theology,* I, 25).

Noticeable, indeed, is the occurrence that the names of Deity fall into groupings of three, some of these instances being (1) the three primary names of Deity in the Old Testament—*Jehovah, Elohim,* and *Adonai;* (2) three major compounds with Jehovah—*Jehovah Elohim, Adonai Jehovah, Jehovah Sabaoth;* (3) three compounds with El—*El Shaddai, El Elyon,* and *El Olam;* (4) three general classes of divine names—the one proper and peculiar name *Jehovah,* appellatives such as *Elohim* and *Adonai,* and attributive or epithetical types such as *Almighty* and *God of Hosts*; (5) the full title of Deity in the New Testament—*Father, Son,* and *Holy Spirit;* (6) the full title of the Second Person—*Lord Jesus Christ;* and (7) the trinitarian distinction—*The First Person, The Second Person,* and *The Third Person*.

I. The Primary Names of Deity in the Old Testament

The primary Old Testament titles do not present an individualized revelation of three Persons, but rather three characterizing realities within the Godhead. In addition to various other meanings, the name *Jehovah* exhibits the innermost depths of the divine Being, the name *Elohim*, being plural in its form, intimates the fact of three Persons, and the name *Adonai* proclaims divine authority. As indicated above, the name *Jehovah*—printed in the A.V. by LORD and L with all letters capitalized—is divinely reserved for its ineffable service as the unpolluted and unshared name of Deity. *Elohim* and *Adonai* are less distinctive since these titles are sometimes ascribed to creatures. In the A.V., *Elohim* is printed 'God,' and *Adonai* is printed 'Lord,' with only the initial letter in each instance capitalized. No complete philological study of the various names of Deity will be pursued in this thesis, that exercise belonging properly to the field of original languages.

1. JEHOVAH. Notwithstanding all the research that scholars have given to the name *Jehovah*, but little is known beyond that which is preserved in the Sacred Text. Its original pronunciation has been lost, and that is due largely to the unwillingness of the Jews during many centuries to pronounce the name. Whether their attitude in this be styled superstition or reverence makes no difference with regard to the loss itself. The name *Jehovah* is more fully defined in the Scriptures as to its meaning than all other titles of Deity together. In the Psalms the original is sometimes contracted to *Jah*, which is the concluding syllable of *hallelujah* (cf. Ps. 68:4). Some perplexity has arisen from the fact that this name appears many times in the Scriptures (notably, Gen. 15:2) before it is declared in Exodus 6:3, "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them." This seems to be a contradiction. There are two explanations current: (a) that the name was used freely from Adam to Moses, as the Scriptures record, but that its meaning was not at any time disclosed; (b) that it appears in the text as a prochronism or a prolepsis, by which terms it is intimated that, as Moses wrote the Genesis account, he used the term to designate Deity, but the people of those many generations before did not use the name. This

latter explanation fails at all points where it is recorded that men actually spoke to or of Deity as Jehovah (cf. Gen. 15:2), while the former solution, though not free from its problems, seems to be the more reasonable. However the title is used, it is obvious that Scripture sheds no light, other than by inference, upon the meaning of the name until it is specifically disclosed to Moses. Even Moses himself seems to stand in need of instruction concerning this title when it is explained to him (cf. Ex. 3:14). The new revelation is of Jehovah as the selfexistent One—"I AM THAT I AM"—, and the word *hayah*, cf. *Yahwe*, from which the word *Jehovah* is evidently formed, conveys also the idea of a continuous coming to be, that is, by an ever-increasing revelation. Thus by this cognomen it is revealed that Jehovah is "The self-existent One who reveals Himself." Regarding this phase of this subject, Dr. Gustav Friedrich Oehler writes: "The name signifies, *He who is*, according to Ex. 3:14; more particularly, *He who is what He is*. But as it is not the idea of a *continuous existence* which lies in the verb *havah* or *hayah*, but that of *existence in motion*, of becoming and occuring …, so also the form of the name as derived from the imperfect leads us to understand in it the existence of God, not as an existence at rest, but as one always becoming, always making itself known in a process of becoming. Hence it is wrong to find in the name the abstract notion of ὄντως ὄν. God is rather Jahve in as far as He has entered into an *historical* relation to mankind, and in particular to the chosen people Israel, and shows Himself continually in this historical relation as He who is, and who is what He is. While heathenism rests almost exclusively on the *past* revelations of its divinities, this name testifies, on the other hand, that the relation of God to the world is in a state of continual living activity; it testifies, especially in reference to the people who address their God by this name, that they have in their God a future" (*Old Testament Theology*, p. 95).

The designation *Jehovah* appears in the Sacred Text after the creation of man and is generally used where relationships between God and man are involved, and especially in man's redemption. It is in respect to Israel's redemption from Egypt that the true meaning of the term is elucidated. All divine attributes which share in redemption are betokened—holiness, justice, and love for the sinner. It is with their Redeemer that Israel has to do, and therefore His covenants with them are largely under the *Jehovah* name (cf. Ex. 20:2; Jer. 31:31–34). It was Jehovah Himself who imparted to

Moses the meaning of this title: “And the LORD descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the LORD. And the LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, The LORD, The LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children’s children, unto the third and to the fourth generation” (Ex. 34:5–7); “And he said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the LORD before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy” (Ex. 33:19); “In Judah is God known: his name is great in Israel” (Ps. 76:1). The name, as revealed to Moses, is, first of all, the unveiling of the truth of the *eternity* of Deity. Such a disclosure is to be expected and should be heeded. Jehovah *lives* as no other being lives. He is not caused, but is rather the cause of all that is. He is unchangeable, infinite, and eternal. To these lofty conceptions the Scriptures constantly direct the thoughts of men. He changes not (Mal. 3:6); He as King must reign forever (Ps. 10:16; 99:1; 146:10); He is the Author and Creator of all things and the universal Ruler (Amos 5:8; Ps. 68:4; Jer. 32:27). No instructed Jew who was present missed the fact that Christ asserted of Himself that He is the “I am,” the *Jehovah*, of the Old Testament. The record declares: “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by” (John 8:56–59).

As before noted, confusion occurs regarding the name *Jehovah* from the fact that for many centuries—the very centuries in which a large part of the Old Testament was written—the Jewish people out of sheer reverence refused even to pronounce this name, and when the name was written pointings belonging to another title of Deity were added to the *Jehovah* name by which the reader was directed in the substitution of another designation. Thus the writing of the name *Jehovah* in the text is complex. The avoidance of the actual pronouncement of this name may be judged as mere superstition; but plainly it was an attempt at reverence however much

misguided, and doubtless this practice, with all its confusing results, did serve to create a deep impression on all as to the ineffable character of God.

2. ELOHIM. This, the appellation most frequently used in the Old Testament, appears sometimes as *El*, or *Eloah*. The designation *El* is traced through Babylonian, Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic, as well as Hebrew, writings. To some degree, it belongs to the whole Semitic world. *Elohim* is the plural and *Eloah* the singular, the latter appearing usually in sacred poetry. The derivation of this name is naturally something of a problem. Some trace it to a root which means *The Strong One*, and others to a root which denotes *fear*, and from this it is claimed the essential idea of reverence springs (Gen. 31:42, 53). J. B. Jackson, in his *Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names* (p. viii), declares that "some names are capable of being derived, with equal accuracy, from two, or even three different roots, as *e.g.*, when the root is one with a feeble radical, or doubles the second radical, the inflection of such verbs being to some extent similar". No doubt all that these two root ideas originate as to the meaning of Elohim is true. He is the Strong One who is faithful to all His covenants and to be reverenced and feared because of what He is. An ascription of praise and itself revealing as to the meaning of the name, not unlike that of Jehovah in Exodus 34:5–7, is given in Psalm 86:15, where it is written, "But thou, O Lord, art a God full of compassion, and gracious, longsuffering, and plenteous in mercy and truth."

Until more recent times, theologians believed that the plural form of *Elohim* with its varying combinations with either singular or plural pronouns, adjectives, and verbs, indicated the trinity of Being in one Essence. Oehler gives to Dietrich the credit (1846) for the first denial of the idea that the plural form suggests the trinity of Persons, though Richard Watson refers to Buxtorf (the younger, 1599–1664) as "opposed" to the general belief of the church and Buxtorf implies that he follows certain Jews in thus opposing himself. He does admit, however, that it is as difficult to read *ad extra* powers into this plural form as it is to read ad intra plurality of persons (see Watson's *Institutes*, I, 468). Dietrich's thought, like that of Buxtorf, is that the plural form is not numerical but quantitative and denotes unlimited greatness. Oehler styled it a plural of "infinite fullness," Delitzsch, an "intensive plural" (cited by Oehler, *op. cit.*, p. 88). Others

assert that it is a “plural of majesty.” Dietrich has the support in the present day of all who comprise the modern school of theology, while some theologians and most expositors cling to the original belief. The arguments advanced for this violent departure from the belief of so long standing have been examined and are found to prove nothing beyond a human opinion. Over against this, there are important considerations to be noted: (a) The Bible opens with the assertion that *Elohim* is the Creator and the plural form is recognized by plural pronouns thus: “And God said, Let us make man in our image” (Gen. 1:26); again, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (1:27). The plural pronoun in the one case and the singular in the other are legitimate in that *Elohim* may serve to indicate the plurality of Persons, or the one Essence. In other portions, the Word of God distinctly assigns the work of creation to each of the three Persons separately (Gen. 1:1, 2; Col. 1:16). It is therefore both reasonable and consistent that the plural of divine Persons should be indicated in the Genesis account of creation. Of great significance is Psalm 100:3 on this point, since it also assigns creation to Elohim: “Know ye that the LORD he is God: it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.” (b) Again, the fact of the trinity of Persons in the Godhead is one of the cardinal teachings of the Bible and touches the very center of the divine Being, and the fact that it is the purpose of the divine names to disclose this Being affords the strongest supposition that the doctrine of the Trinity is included in the revelation which the names portend. Assuredly nothing new or disorderly is introduced if one of the divine names is found to disclose the plural form of Being in the Godhead. It could hardly be otherwise. (c) Though the doctrine of the Trinity is not as conspicuous in the Old Testament as it is in the New, it is there, and, if there at all, it will naturally inhere in the names by which God specifically reveals Himself to men. The larger consideration of the doctrine of the Trinity as found in the Old Testament is yet to be attended in a later division of Theology Proper. No sufficient argument having been advanced to the contrary, this thesis proceeds on the basis of the ancient and worthy belief that the trinity of Persons is implied in the plural name *Elohim*.

Deuteronomy 6:4 (R.V.) is a passage of great importance in the present discussion, “Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God [Elohim] is one Jehovah.”

Perhaps the key word to the meaning of this passage is *ʾeḥādh*, here translated 'one.' This word, often found in the Old Testament text, is nevertheless somewhat specific in its meaning. While it is used many times with particular emphasis on the distinct solidarity of the thing represented, it is the word universally used when a thing is in view which is compounded out of unified parts, as, 'evening and morning, *one* day'; 'they two shall be *one* flesh.' It is not possible to prove that *ʾeḥādh* as used in the passage in question represents unification of parts, which in this case would indicate that the plurality in the Godhead is *one* Essence. If it is not thus, the passage asserts that *Jehovah* our *Elohim* is One in the sense that there is no other. This is an important teaching of the Old Testament. If the word *one* is used here in its unifying sense, the passage records that *Jehovah*—always singular in number—our *Elohim*—plural in number—is nevertheless One—plurality in One—Jehovah—singular in number. With such an interpretation, this passage appears of tremendous importance in the general field of the trinitarian teaching of the Old Testament. In any case, the word *one* in this text is not *yaḥadh* which denotes absolute indivisible unity.

Likewise, much importance inheres in the right interpretation of Genesis 3:5 where Satan's words to Adam and Eve are recorded: "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The phrase, "ye shall be as gods," is, for want of consistency on the part of the translators, quite misleading. The use of the word *gods* in the plural and without a capital letter suggests, to some minds, a reference to the angels who are in certain instances, they believe, designated as *sons of God* (cf. Gen. 6:4; Job 1:6; 2:1). But the thought is not restricted to the angels (cf. Isa. 43:6). Again, the word *gods* might be thought to refer to heathen gods; but since there were no heathen at the time Satan appeared in Eden, nor had the notion of "gods many" occurred to anyone's mind, such an interpretation is impossible. The original word which is translated *gods* is none other than *Elohim*. The plural would be justified if it were at all the practice of the translators elsewhere, which it is not. The omission of the initial capital letter is without excuse. Satan who had said, "I will be like the most High". (Isa. 14:14), said to Adam and Eve, "Ye shall be as *Elohim*." The word *Elohim* occurs twice in Genesis 3:5 and there is no more reason for translating it *gods* in the one case than in the other.

To the same purpose, Psalm 138:1 is important as bearing on the plural form of *Elohim*. The text reads “Before the gods will I sing praise unto thee.” The LXX implies that angels are in view. The word is *Elohim* and its plural need not mislead anyone at this point. The omission of the initial capital letter is again misleading. *Elohim*, it is suggested, may be taken in this Scripture to betoken or embody the place of His abode in the holy of holies, and before *Elohim's* place of abode the Psalmist offers praise (cf. Ps. 5:7).

Having pointed out that *Elohim* with the article is indicative of the one true God, Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander writes of the title without the article thus:

> Elohim, however, without the article has the same force, and is so used in a multitude of passages. When used of God it is usually construed with verbs and adjectives in the singular. For this peculiar construction of a plural substantive with singular adjuncts various suggestions have been offered by way of accounting. All are agreed that it is a *constructio ad sensum*; but what is the sense thereby indicated, critics are not agreed. The older theologians held that the fact of the Trinity was thereby indicated, the plural substantive being expressive of the distinction in the Godhead, the singular adjunct intimating that nevertheless God is one. This is now almost universally rejected; but I am not sure that it deserves to be so. It is undoubtedly a law of Hebrew syntax that an object in which plurality is combined into a unity is construed in the plural with verbs and adjectives in the singular. … This being an established usage of Hebrew speech, it does not appear to me at all improbable that it was because the ancient Hebrews knew somewhat at least of the distinction in the Godhead that they construed not only Elohim, but other designations of the Deity in the plural with verbs and adjectives in the singular.—*System of Biblical Theology*, I, 34, 35

Similarly, Richard Watson remarks, after having discussed various passages in which the plural of Deity is implied: “These instances need not be multiplied: they are the common forms of speech in the sacred Scriptures, which no criticism has been able to resolve into mere idioms, and which only the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the unity of the Godhead can satisfactorily explain. If they were mere idioms, they could not have been misunderstood by those to whom the Hebrew tongue was native, to imply plurality … The argument for the trinity drawn from the plural appellations given to God in the Hebrew Scriptures, was opposed by the younger Buxtorf [1599–1664]; who yet admits that this argument should not altogether be rejected among Christians, ‘for upon the same principle on which not a few of the Jews refer this emphatical application of the plural number to a plurality of powers or of influences, or of operations, that is, *ad*

extra; why may we not refer it, *ad intra*, to a plurality of persons and to personal works? *Yea, who certainly knows* what that was which the ancient Jews understood by this plurality of powers and faculties? (*Theological Institutes*, I, 468).

This line of discussion might be pursued indefinitely; but since it anticipates the truth yet to be contemplated under *trinitarianism*, further evidence will be reserved for that thesis.

3. ADON, ADONAI. This name of Deity appears in the Old Testament with great frequency and expresses sovereign dominion and possession. On this name Dr. C. I. Scofield writes:

(1) The primary meaning of *Adon, Adonai*, is Master, and it is applied in the Old Testament Scriptures both to Deity and to man. The latter instances are distinguished in the English version by the omission of the capital. As applied to man, the word is used of two relationships: *master* and *husband* (Gen. 24:9, 10, 12, "master," may illustrate the former; Gen. 18:12, "lord," the latter). Both these relationships exist between Christ and the believer (John 13:13, "master"; 2 Cor. 11:2, 3, "husband").

(2) Two principles inhere in the relation of master and servant: (*a*) the Master's right to implicit obedience (John 13:13; Matt. 23:10; Luke 6:46); (*b*) the servant's right to direction in service (Isa. 6:8–11). Clear distinction in the use of the divine names is illustrated in Ex. 4:10–12. Moses feels his weakness and incompetency, and "Moses said unto the LORD [Jehovah], O my Lord [*Adonai*], I am not eloquent," etc. Since *service* is in question, Moses (appropriately) addresses Jehovah as Lord. But now *power* is in question, and it is not the Lord (*Adonai*) but Jehovah (LORD) who answers (referring to creation power)—"and Jehovah said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? … Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth." The same distinction appears in Josh. 7:8–11.—*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 24

II. Compounds

The supreme name, *Jehovah*, is compounded with *Elohim*, as *Jehovah Elohim*, translated in the A.V. as 'LORD God' (cf. Gen. 2:4; with *Adonai*, as *Adonai Jehovah*, translated in the A.V. as 'Lord GOD'; and with *Sabaoth*, as *Jehovah Sabaoth*, translated in the A.V. as 'LORD of hosts.'

The primary name *Elohim* is compounded with *Shaddai,* as *El Shaddai*, translated in the A.V. as '*Almighty God*' (Gen. 17:1); with *Elyon*, as *El Elyon,* translated in the A.V. as 'Most High,' or 'most high God' (Gen. 14:18); and with *Olam*, as *El Olam*, translated in the A.V. as 'everlasting God' (Gen. 21:33).

Again, Jehovah is compounded with seven appellatives. (a) *Jehovahjireh*, "the LORD will provide" (Gen. 22:14); (b) *Jehovah-rapha*, "The LORD that healeth" (Ex. 15:26); (c) *Jehovah-nissi*, "The LORD our banner" (Ex. 17:8–15); (d) *Jehovah-shalom*, "The LORD our peace" (Judges 6:23, 24); (e) *Jehovah-rā-ah*, "The LORD my shepherd" (Ps. 23:1); (f) *Jehovah-tsidkenu*, "The LORD our righteousness" (Jer. 23:6); and (g) *Jehovah-shammah*, "The LORD is there" (Ezek. 48:35).

III. Old Testament Epithets

God is mentioned metaphorically in the Old Testament as King, Lawgiver, Judge, Rock, Fortress, Tower, Deliverer, Shepherd, Husband, Husbandman, and Father.

IV. New Testament Names of Deity

As these terms and their relationships are yet to be considered under the trinitarian discussion shortly, only a brief outline is introduced here.

The full and final name for Deity is *Father, Son,* and *Holy Spirit*. This may be made more explicit, as, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. The titles of the First Person are largely restricted to combinations associated with the word *Father*. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; the Father of Mercies; He is addressed as Abba, father; Heavenly Father; Father of Spirits; Holy Father; Righteous Father; Father of Lights; and Father of Glory.

There are in all about three hundred titles or designations in the Bible which refer to the Second Person. However, His full and final name is Lord Jesus Christ, *Lord* being the title of Deity, *Jesus* being the title of humanity, and *Christ* being the title of His office as Prophet, Priest, and King, or the Messiah of the Old Testament. It is evident that the selection of the names

and the order of their arrangement in any given text is with divine purpose and manifests divine wisdom in every instance.

There are no names of the Holy Spirit revealed. He is known by descriptive titles as *The Spirit of God, The Spirit of Christ*. There are upwards of twenty such designations.

Conclusion

At the end of this examination into the essentials of theism and before entering upon the engaging investigation into the triune mode of the divine existence, a brief backward look may not be without profit. Having demonstrated the fact of the authoritative and trustworthy nature of the Scriptures and having established the ground of belief in the existence of God to the satisfaction of reason, an effort has been made to set forth from revelation the character and infinity of God as represented in His attributes, His sovereignty as manifested in His decree, and His glory as disclosed in His names. Though of necessity some questions remain unsolved, the overwhelming reality of God's Person, character, and ways has been exhibited and defended. He thus stands forth before the devout and attentive mind as the One who is Supreme over all His creation and its sole object of adoration and glory. Imperfections must always attend such an effort as this. The finite mind cannot fully portray the infinite either by imagination or by word. It should now be clear that God is All in All. Without such belief in the reality which He is, all that seems certain becomes uncertain and incomprehensible. The idea that God exists is not a mere hypothesis; it is the only basis upon which human reason and understanding can build their frail structures. How without remedy all such edifices are demolished when the essential truth concerning God is questioned! In the light of the whole disclosure which theism affords, a personal faith is demanded in rational beings and should be established by theistic study. Such a faith is a treasure needing to be guarded and defended against hostile attacks, and every effort should be made to advance in the knowledge of Him.

Trinitarianism

Chapter XVII

Introduction to Trinitarianism

HAVING INVESTIGATED the fundamental truth of the existence of God and having exhibited some evidence as to His perfections as seen in His attributes, His sovereign purpose, and His self-revelation through His names—all of which is embraced under *theism* and is a general division of *Theology Proper*—, it now remains to inquire whether God is, as to His mode of existence, an *absolute* unity, or subsists as a plurality of Persons. If He subsists as a plurality of Persons, what manner of Persons are these and what is their number?

Recognizing that the word *trinity* is not found in the Sacred Text and that the doctrine which it represents is not directly taught therein, Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander states: But though a truth be not formally enunciated in Scripture, it may be so implied in the statements of Scripture that it becomes the proper and necessary expression of these statements. In this case the doctrine is a conclusion drawn inductively from what Scripture announces, and so is as truly a doctrine of Scripture as any natural law—that of gravitation, *e.g.*—is a doctrine of nature. Whilst, then, we admit that the doctrine of the Trinity does not stand on exactly the same ground as the doctrines formally enunciated in Scripture, we claim for it an equal authority on the ground that it lies involved in the statements of Scripture, and is the proper evolution and expression of these. As a doctrine it is a human induction from the statements of Scripture; but the induction being fairly made, it is as much a part of God's teaching in His word as is any of those doctrines which He has formally enunciated there. The phenomena (to use the Baconian phraseology) with which we have here to deal are, on the one hand, the clearly revealed fact that there is but one God; and, on the other, the no less clearly revealed fact that there are three to whom the attributes and qualities of Deity in the highest sense are ascribed, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Both these statements must be received by all who acknowledge the Scriptures as the rule of faith: the question is, How are they to be construed so as that, without doing injustice to either, a just and harmonious expression of the whole truth contained in them shall be obtained?—*System of Biblical Theology*, I, 94, 95

In this division of Theology Proper, the greatest mystery of all revealed truth is confronted. Mere difficulty in conceiving what is peculiar and befitting the infinite One should offer no objection to a doctrine based on revelation. The nature of God must present mysteries to the finite mind, and the triune mode of existence is perhaps the supreme mystery. M. Coquerel states: "God is the only intelligent Being, for Whom no mystery exists. To be surprised, to be indignant at encountering mysteries, is to be surprised, is

to be indignant at not being God" (*Christianisme Experimental, cited by Crusaders of the Twentieth Century*, W. A. Rice, p. 228). Unavoidably, some anticipation of this problem has been met when considering the plural form of *Elohim*. The mode of the divine existence is an essential feature of knowledge if right conceptions of God are to be formed. So important a disclosure, it may be expected, will claim a large place in revelation, and should, to some extent, be confirmed by reason. It is obvious that, with reference to revelation and in passages too numerous to be adduced, there is clear reference made to distinctions in the Godhead. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are constantly named as separate Persons with specific operations said to be wrought by each. All this appears in narrative, in doctrine, and in worship which is prescribed for the creature in his relation to the Creator. All the divine attributes as well as the properties of personality are ascribed to each Person of the Godhead with so much certainty and frequency, that the fact of a triune mode of existence cannot be doubted by an unprejudiced mind. On the other hand, disclosures equally plain and numerous are made which present God as essentially One. These two averments of the Bible are alike authoritative and, therefore, to the same degree demanding as to their recognition. Though no finite mind has ever comprehended how three Persons may form but one Essence, that precise truth is the testimony of all parts of the Bible. It is not possible to define these distinctions and all they imply. No doubt, there is a distinct consciousness which identifies each Person, yet there is a united possession of attributes and of nature. This disclosure presents a knowledge-surpassing complexity, but is free from the element of contradiction; for a contradiction exists where two contraries are predicated of the same thing and in the same respect. Such contradictions do not appear in revelation and attempts to claim such a thing have failed. The doctrine of the Trinity is drawn wholly from revelation, since creation is incapable of serving as a medium of expression for the issues involved. The doctrine as presented in the Scriptures is therefore believable if not explicable. The *how* of any superhuman reality is not, and probably could not be, apprehended by the finite mind. It is enough to know from a trustworthy source that the reality *does* exist. To understand a proposition is one thing; to understand the truth or fact asserted in that proposition is quite another thing. These two aspects of understanding are constantly distinguished in human experience. No

scientist or philosopher has an explanation to offer as to how mind acts upon matter, nor can they discover the mysteries which are related to life itself—nutrition, assimilation, and growth—, nor can they understand the inner workings of a vast array of proved facts and forces which nature presents. Inability to penetrate into the depths of such phenomena is not considered a reason for rejection of the obvious facts themselves. The triune mode of existence of the three Persons who form one Essence belongs to a category of ultimate facts and the inexplicable feature is not to be confounded with the evidence for the abstract and actual truth itself. No argument has been advanced against the trinitarian conception other than that it does not conform to the limitations of the mind of man. In a defense of Unitarianism Dr. Channing writes of this doctrine as an “outrage on our rational nature,” and “contradicting and degrading our reason.” If Dr. Channing meant by “rational nature” that he could accept only what the human mind understands and therefore human reason approves, it may be asserted that neither Dr. Channing nor any other man has ever confined his actions to such restricted limitations. Each human being employs a never-ending succession of realities and forces concerning which no explanation can be offered. Are not these, as well, to be classed as “outrages upon our rational nature” as much as the inexplicable doctrine of the Trinity?

Revelation concerning a trinity of Persons related in one Essence contradicts no absolute truth. It is evident that as to wholly separated and individually identified subjects, one is not three, nor are three one. Such is a contradiction. The doctrine of the Trinity asserts no such inconsistency. It affirms no more than that a being may be singular in one sense and plural in another. Various illustrations of such realities in nature might be introduced. In the constitution of a human being there is conjunction of unity and plurality. The immaterial and material elements combine to form one individual. Each of these elements is essential to human existence in this sphere. Thus it is seen that a human being may be singular in one sense and plural in another. If plurality and unity are both required in human existence, why should plurality and unity be denied in the case of the divine existence? Should it be supposed that God may include in His creature what He cannot manifest in Himself? By this analogy no attempt is made to demonstrate that a human person combining in himself the material and immaterial is comparable as to elements or order with three persons

subsisting in one divine Essence. The analogy goes no further than to establish a *principle*. In the case of the human being, there is one consciousness with a twofold subsistence; in the case of Deity, there are three consciousnesses and but one nature. The principle that plurality is not incompatible with unity is thus proved. In the one case, being common to human experience, there is no doubt entertained about it; in the other case, being outside the range of human experience, there is unreasoned objection raised. It is probable, if both of these positions were wholly and equally outside the range of human experience, there would be as much perplexity engendered by the presentation of the one as by the other. Which, after all, is the more abnormal: a being purely spiritual subsisting as three persons with one nature, or one person subsisting with two natures which are as widely different from each other as the material and the immaterial? In their abstract form, one proposition is no more complex than the other, and since the conjunction of plurality with unity is the most obvious fact of human life, it should not be styled an insult to human reason when it is asserted by God Himself, and on the authority of revelation, that God represents the conjunction of plurality and unity—one Essence subsisting in three Persons.

The restrictions which are generally imposed upon the scope of Theology Proper, namely, that it comprehends only the Persons of the Godhead apart from their works, are to be observed in this treatise. The doctrine of the Trinity falls into four major divisions: (1) The fact of the Trinity; (2) God the Father, the First Person; (3) God the Son, the Second Person; and (4) God the Holy Spirit, the Third Person. It is anticipated that the third of these divisions, or that concerning the Son, will yet be treated more fully under Soteriology and Christology, and that the fourth division, or that concerning the Holy Spirit, will yet be treated more fully under Soteriology and Pneumatology.

I. Preliminary Consideration

Advancing further in the attempt to apprehend that which may be known relative to the triune mode of existence, two errors are to be avoided: (a) that it may be supposed that the Godhead is composed of three distinct Persons—as Peter, James, and John—who are related to each other only in the loose fashion in which men may associate themselves together relative

to certain ideals and principles, which supposition, in the case of God, would be *tritheism;* or (b) that the Godhead is one Person only and that the triune aspect of His Being is no more than three fields of interests, activities, and manifestations, which supposition would be Sabellianism. Burden is laid upon the student of theology to recognize that, regardless of the mystery involved, he is appointed to discover and defend the truth that the Bible is monotheistic to the last degree, contending, as it does, that there is one God and only one; yet as certainly it asserts that this one God subsists in three definite and identified Persons.

The term *personality* as applied to God is not to be understood or taken in its strict philosophical sense, in which case wholly distinct beings are indicated. God is one Being, but He is more than one Being in three relations. Well-defined acts which are personal in character are ascribed to each Person of the Three. These acts unequivocally establish personality. Language labors under difficulties at this point. The Persons are not separate, but distinct. The Trinity is composed of three united Persons without separate existence—so completely united as to form One God. The divine nature subsists in three distinctions—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Personality is expressed in such terms as *I, thou, he*—and it is thus that the Persons of the Godhead address each other—, and in personal acts; but it is not required that the one God shall be restricted to one Person, though that restriction obtains throughout creation. Therefore, no reason exists for denying this complexity to the Godhead. The term *person* is not generally employed in the Bible, though all that constitutes personality is repeatedly predicated of each member of the Trinity. This will hardly be disputed. In Hebrews 1:3 it is stated that the Son is “the express image” of the *person* of the Father. While the word used here may signify any specific identity such as an essence or person, it does serve to assert the distinction which exists between two Persons of the Godhead and the equality of Them. Various Greek words were reduced to their most exact meaning when the controversy was waged against Arius who denied that Christ was of the same substance as the Father, and against Sabellius who allowed the Deity of the Son and Spirit but denied to Them proper personality. Biblical terms have thus stood the most searching tests and the proof of the doctrine of the Trinity is written large in the history of the church. The conclusion of the church as to the teaching of the Bible concerning relationships within the

Godhead is well stated by Hermann Venema in his *Institutes of Theology:* 1. We say that there are three ὑποστάσεις or subsistences, truly and properly so called, who are mutually distinct—each possessed of intelligence, subsisting by itself, and not communicated or communicable to the others—and whom we call persons, according to the definition we have given of that term. We do not mean by this that there are three modes of subsistence or three modes of manifestation, but, as we have said, three intelligent subsistences really distinct from each other. For a person suggests the idea of one possessed of intelligence and power, and subsisting by himself, and such is our meaning when we say that there are three persons in the Godhead.

> 2. We say that the three persons or subsistences have each really a divine nature—a nature including all the attributes which we have already spoken of as belonging to a perfect Being, such as independence, eternity, immutability, omnipotence, etc.
>
> 3. We say that these subsistences have not a separate but one and the same divine nature. There is but one God, as we have said, and therefore there must be but one divine nature existing in each—the same *numerical* and not merely the same *specific* essence common to the three.
>
> 4. We say, moreover, that the three persons partaking of one and the same essence stand in close relation to each other—the second person being from the first and the third from the first and second. This relation is implied in the names Father, Son, and Spirit—the Father being the source of the one essence which is partaken of by the other two. This participation of essence, in reference to the Son, is called *generation*—and, in reference to the Spirit, *procession* or *spiration*.
>
> Such is a simple and, as far as we can attain to it, a clear explanation of the mystery of the Trinity—from which we may know at least generally what we are to understand by this doctrine—P. 201

Probably no doctrine of the Word of God is more far-reaching in its implications than that of the Trinity. Those who fail to see this and who minimize its importance usually embrace some heresy regarding the two Persons—the Second and the Third. Dr. Joseph Priestley said: “All that can be said for it is, that the doctrine, however improbable in itself, is necessary to explain some particular texts of Scripture; and that, if it had not been for those particular texts we should have found no want of it, for there is neither any fact in nature, nor any one purpose of morals, which are the object and end of all religion, that requires it” (*History of Early Opinions*, cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 452).

This statement, quite characteristic of those who oppose the doctrine of the Trinity, makes “the facts of nature” and “purpose of morals” the “object and end of all religion,” and ignores the whole idea of a divine self-revelation, the work of redemption, and eternal destiny. Obviously, it is in these fields thus neglected that the truth concerning the Trinity has its fullest manifestations. The denial of the doctrine of the Trinity results in

dishonor to Christ, to the Holy Spirit, and to the testimony of the Bible. This threefold dishonor may well be specifically observed: II. Three Dishonors

1. Christ. In the consideration of the doctrine of the Trinity, the crucial question as to the absolute Deity of Christ as Second Person and the Spirit as Third Person is involved. Those who oppose the doctrine of the Trinity automatically reject the Deity of the Son and the Spirit. An important distinction is to be observed between the claim that God as one Essence is only one Person, and the claim that God though one Essence is three equally divine Persons. Both claims could not be true and those, whoever they may be, who are in error in this matter are altogether wrong and little removed from the hallucinations of the pagans. Too long it has been deemed by many that it is an optional matter whether the triune existence of God is recognized or not, the baseless assumption being that if the trinitarian conception is rejected, the "one God" idea still remains to bless mankind, whereas the only reliable source of any knowledge of God is in the Bible and the Bible knows nothing of "one God" who does not subsist in a threefold Personality. Waterland states: "If God be Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the duties owing to God will be duties owing to that triune distinction, which must be paid accordingly; and whoever leaves any of them out of his idea of God, comes so far short of honouring God perfectly, and of serving him in proportion to the manifestations he has made of himself" (cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 453). Over against this assertion that those who deny the triune existence of the Godhead do not worship the God of the Bible, is the alternative that Trinitarians are guilty of idolatry when rendering complete divine honor to the Son and the Spirit, were it proved that the triune existence as a revelation is without worthy evidence in its support.

Dr. Priestley, in accord with some others of a more recent day, sees no place for the Trinitarian claim either in nature or morals; but nature, the Bible declares, is the creation of the Son, is sustained by Him, and exists in a peculiar sense for Him (Col. 1:16, 17). Similarly, while it might be conceived that moral ideas could be derived from the Unitarian notion of God, there could be no redemption for those who fail, apart from that which is wrought by the Son in His substitutionary sacrifice. A moral scheme

which provides no cure for those who fail is the doom of all, since all fail. The sentiment that God might forgive sin as an act of mere generosity is an insult to holiness and divine government. The imperative need of redemption for the world in its present estate is evinced by the fact that God, who knows all that is involved, has provided it at such measureless cost. It was Jehovah who was pierced (Zech. 12:10); God who purchased the Church with His own blood (Acts 20:28); it was ὁ Δεσπότης—'the High Lord'—that bought sinners (2 Pet. 2:1); and the Lord of Glory was crucified (1 Cor. 2:8)—cf. Watson, *Institutes*, I, 459.

Not only does the whole plan of salvation impinge upon the Deity of the Son, but the measure of God's love is reduced to naught if God gave only a creature to man as His love-gift to them (John 3:16; Rom. 5:8; 2 Cor. 9:15; 1 John 3:16). Such an expression of divine love would be feeble indeed. In the same manner, if Christ is only a creature, as opponents of trinitarianism contend, His love for man is little more than an incidental item. To quote Waterland again: "If Christ was in the form of God, equal with God, and very God, it was then an act of infinite love and condescension in him to become man; but if he was no more than a creature, it was no surprising condescension to embark in a work so glorious; such as being the Saviour of mankind, and such as would advance him to be Lord and Judge of the world, to be admired, reverenced, and adored, both by men and angels" (*Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 458). It was Christ's own love which led Him to come to this world as a Savior. No creature could, with any reason, say to the Father: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5).

It is this love of Christ which motivates all Christian love. This is a great theme, but of little force if Christ is not God. Richard Watson has expressed it well: The love of Christ to us also as a motive to generous service, sufferings and death, for the sake of others, loses all its force and application. "The love of Christ constraineth us; for we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." That love of Christ which constrained the apostle was a love which led him to die *for* men. St. John makes the duty of dying for our brother obligatory upon all Christians, if called to it, and grounds it upon the same fact. "He laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for our brethren." The meaning, doubtless, is in

order to save them; and though men are saved by Christ's dying for them, in a very different sense from that in which they can be saved by our dying in the cause of instructing, and thus instrumentally saving each other; yet the argument is founded upon the necessary connection which there is between the death of Christ and the salvation of men. But, on the Socinian scheme, Christ did, in no sense, die *for* men, no; not in their general mode of interpreting such passages, "*for the benefit of men:*" for what benefit, independent of *propitiation*, which Socinians deny, do men derive from the voluntary death of Christ, considered as a mere human instructor? If it be said his death was an *example*, it was not specially and peculiarly so; for both prophets and apostles have died with resignation and fortitude. If it be alleged, that it was to confirm his doctrine, the answer is, that, in this view, it was nugatory, because it had been confirmed by undoubted miracles. If that he might confirm his mission by his resurrection, this might as well have followed from a natural as from a violent death; and beside the benefit which men derive from him, is, by this notion, placed in his *resurrection*, and not in his *death*, which is always exhibited in the New Testament with marked and striking emphasis. The motive to generous sacrifice of ease and life, in behalf of men, drawn from the death of Christ, have, therefore, no existence whenever his Godhead and sacrifice are denied.—*Ibid*., I, 460–61

Thus of the all-sufficiency of Christ, Dr. Richard Graves has declared: "If the Redeemer were not omnipresent and omniscient, could we be certain that he always hears our prayers, and knows the source and remedy of all our miseries? If he were not all-merciful, could we be certain he must always be willing to pardon and relieve us? If he were not all-powerful, could we be sure that he must always be able to support and strengthen, to enlighten and direct us? Of any being less than God, we might suspect that his purposes might waver, his promises fail, his existence itself, perhaps, terminate; for of every created being, the existence must be dependent and terminable" (*Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity*, cited by Watson, *ibid.*, I, 461).

2. The Holy Spirit. Equally involved in this problem is the Deity of the Holy Spirit, who, according to the Scriptures, exercises every power and function of God. William Sherlock, in his *Vindication*, has written convincingly: "Our salvation by Christ does not consist only in the

expiation of our sins, etc., but in communication of Divine grace and power, to renew and sanctify us: and this is every where in Scripture attributed to the *Holy Spirit*, as his peculiar office in the economy of man's salvation: it must therefore make a *fundamental change* in the doctrine of Divine grace and assistance, to deny the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. For can a creature be the universal spring and fountain of Divine grace and life? Can a *finite* creature be a kind of universal soul to the whole Christian Church, and to every sincere member of it? Can a creature make such close application to our minds, know our thoughts, set bounds to our passions, inspire us with new affections and desires, and be more intimate to us than we are to ourselves? If a creature be the only instrument and principle of grace, we shall soon be tempted either to deny the grace of God, or to make it only an external thing, and entertain very mean conceits of it. All those miraculous gifts which were bestowed upon the apostles and primitive Christians, for the edification of the Church; all the graces of the Christian life, are the fruits of the Spirit. The Divine Spirit is the principle of immortality in us, which first gave life to our souls, and will, at the last day, raise our dead bodies out of the dust; works which sufficiently proclaim him to be God, and which we cannot heartily believe, in the Gospel notion, if he be not" (cited by Watson, *ibid.*, I, 461–62).

3. The Scriptures. To assert that the Scriptures teach the divine Unity subsisting in three Persons is not to beg the question. It is rather to disagree with those who fail to account for the Biblical testimony, and it is to agree with the wisest and greatest of men who have their part in the Church of Christ. As to the testimony of the Scriptures bearing on the Trinitarian view, Richard Watson may well be quoted again: But the importance of the doctrine of the holy trinity may be finally argued from the manner in which the denial of it would affect *the credit of the Holy Scriptures* themselves; for if this doctrine be not contained in them, their tendency to mislead is obvious. Their constant language is so adapted to deceive, and even to compel the belief of falsehood, even in fundamental points, and to lead to the practice of idolatry itself, that they would lose all claim to be regarded as a revelation from the God of truth, and ought rather to be shunned than to be studied. A great part of the Scriptures is directed against idolatry, which is declared to be "that abominable thing which the Lord hateth;" and in pursuance of this design, the doctrine that there is but *one* God is laid down in the most explicit terms, and constantly confirmed by appeals to his works. The very first command in the decalogue is, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me;" and the sum of the law, as to our duty to God, is that we love Him "with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and strength." If the doctrine of a trinity of Divine persons in the unity of the Godhead be consistent with all this, then the style and manner of the Scriptures are in perfect accordance with the

moral ends they propose, and the truths in which they would instruct mankind; but if the Son and the Holy Spirit are creatures, then is the language of the sacred books most deceptive and dangerous. For how is it to be accounted for, in that case, that, in the Old Testament, God should be spoken of in plural terms, and that this plurality should be restricted to three? How is it that the very name *Jehovah* should be given to each of them, and that repeatedly and on the most solemn occasions? How is it that the promised, incarnate Messiah should be invested, in the prophecies of his advent, with the loftiest attributes of God, and that works infinitely superhuman, and Divine honours should be predicted of him? and that acts and characters of unequivocal Divinity, according to the common apprehension of mankind, should be ascribed to the Spirit also? How is it, that, in the New Testament, the name of *God* should be given to both, and that without any intimation that it is to be taken in an inferior sense? That the *creation* and *conservation* of all things should be ascribed to Christ; that he should be *worshipped* by angels and by men; that he should be represented as seated on the throne of the universe, to receive the adorations of all creatures; and that in the very form of initiation by baptism into his Church, itself a public and solemn profession of faith, the baptism is enjoined to be performed in the *one name* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? One God and two *creatures!* As though the very door of entrance into the Christian Church should have been purposely made the gate of the worst and most corrupting error ever introduced among mankind,—*trust and worship in creatures as God*; the error which has spread darkness and moral desolation over the whole pagan world—*Ibid*., I, 462–63

In concluding this plea for a right and Biblical recognition of the triune mode of the divine existence, it may be observed that the whole economy of man's redemption serves to bring to man the revelation of God in His threefold subsistence, and dim, indeed, is the spiritual vision which receives no instruction from this limitless disclosure which God has proffered to man.

III. General Definition

In its teaching, the Bible is neither *polytheistic*—gods many—, nor *tritheistic*—gods three—, nor Unitarian—one god who exercises his interests and powers in various ways. The monotheistic doctrine of one God subsisting in a plurality of Persons—three, no less and no more—is that which accords with all Scripture and, though characterized by mystery when approached by the finite mind, is, nevertheless, without contradiction and is perfect in all its adaptation and parts. It is as perfect as the God whom it discloses. Testimony relative to the Trinitarian conception of God might be adduced from the early Fathers and later writers almost without end. The following will suffice: *Augustine*, "All those catholic expounders of the divine Scriptures whom I have been able to read, who have written before me concerning the Trinity, who is God, have purposed to teach, according to the scriptures, this doctrine, that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit intimate a divine unity of one and the same substance in an indivisible equality;

and therefore that there are not three Gods, but one God" *Tertullian*, "He is God and the Son of God, and both are one. And thus Spirit from Spirit and God from God becomes another *in mode of being, not in number;* in order, not state or standing (*i.e.*, as divine); and has gone forth, but has not gone out of (or separated from) the original (divine) source. … They are three, not in substance but in form, not in power but in a specific distinction; but of one substance and power. … Hold fast always the rule which I avow, in accordance with which I testify that the Father, Son, and Spirit are not separated. When I say that they are distinct, only ignorance or perversity will take this as meaning a diversity which issues in separation. … For the Son is other than the Father, not by diversity, but by distribution; not by division, but by distinction. The Father and Son are not the same, but they differ one from the other in their mode of being (*modulo*)." *Athanasian Creed*, "We worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity; neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance." *Gieseler*, "The unity and equality of the persons, which necessarily resulted from holding sameness of essence, was not fully acknowledged at once, even by the Nicenians, but continued to be more clearly perceived, until at last it was expressed by Augustine for the first time with decided logical consequence" (*Church History*, translation revised by H. B. Smith, Vol. I, p. 313). The *Westminster Larger Catechism* states of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit that they "are one true, eternal God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory (Q. 9)." On the numerical aspects of the doctrine, Dr. Samuel Harris says: "We see, therefore, that the prevalent doctrine of the church and its theologians has been that God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is numerically and indivisibly one in his substance or essential being. Therefore, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not three Gods, one in a merely generic unity, as men are one in the unity of the genus; nor in a merely moral unity, as persons of the same moral character and purpose are one. They are distinguished as three only within the numerical and indivisible oneness and onliness of God"—*God the Creator and Lord of All*, I, 324–25, cf. p. 323 also for the above quotations Any true conception of this doctrine must include three major features, namely, "The *oneness* and *onliness* of God; the three eternal distinctions or modes of being of the one only God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and the proper Deity of each of the three—God, the One indivisible Absolute Spirit in each of these peculiar and eternal modes of being" (cf. Harris, *ibid.*, p. 322). As an exercise of his discernment, the student will do well to scrutinize most critically the following definitions of the Trinitarian idea as set forth by various well known theologians and teachers: Dr. John Dick: "While there is only one divine nature, there are three subsistences, or persons, called the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who possess, not a similar, but the same numerical essence, and the distinction between them is not merely nominal, but real" (*Theology*, cited by Wardlaw, *Theology*, II, 6).

A. H. Strong: "In the nature of the one God there are three eternal distinctions … and these three are equal"; (words of E. A. Park cited here) "the doctrine of the Trinity does not on the one hand assert that three persons are united in one person, or three beings in one being, or three Gods in one God (tritheism); nor on the other hand that God merely manifests himself in three different ways (modal trinity, or trinity of manifestations); but rather that there are three eternal distinctions in the substance of God" (*Theology*, p. 144).

Joseph Cook: "(1) The Father, Son and the Holy Ghost are one God; (2) each has a peculiarity incommunicable to the others; (3) neither is God without the others; (4) each, with the others, is God" (cited by Strong, *loc. cit.*).

Augustine: “The Father is not the Trinity, nor the Son the Trinity, nor the Spirit the Trinity; but whenever each is singly spoken of, then they are not spoken of as three, in the plural number, but one, the Trinity itself” (cited by Scofield, *Correspondence Course*, 558–59).

Scofield: “God is one. … He subsists in a personality which is threefold, indicated by *relationship* as Father and Son; by a *mode of being* as Spirit; and by the *different parts* taken by the Godhead in manifestation and in the work of redemption” (*Reference Bible*, p. 1044).

Charles Hodge: The Scriptural facts are, (*a.*) The Father says I; the Son says I; the Spirit says I. (*b.*) The Father says Thou to the Son, and the Son says Thou to the Father; and in like manner the Father and the Son use the pronouns He and Him in reference to the Spirit. (*c.*) The Father loves the Son; the Son loves the Father; the Spirit testifies of the Son. The Father, Son, and Spirit are severally subject and object. They act and are acted upon, or are the objects of action. Nothing is added to these facts when it is said that the Father, Son, and Spirit are distinct persons; for a person is an intelligent subject who can say I, who can be addressed as Thou, and who can act and can be the object of action. The summation of the above facts is expressed in the proposition, The one divine Being subsists in three persons, Father, Son, and Spirit. This proposition adds nothing to the facts themselves; for the facts are, (1.) That there is one divine Being. (2.) The Father, Son, and Spirit are divine. (3.) The Father, Son, and Spirit are, in the sense just stated, distinct persons. (4.) Attributes being inseparable from substance, the Scriptures, in saying that the Father, Son, and Spirit possess the same attributes, say they are the same in substance; and, if the same in substance, they are equal in power and glory” (*Theology*, 1, 444).

Calvin: “God predicates that He is unique (*unicum*), yet so as that He distinctly proposes to be considered in three persons; which unless we hold, there will flutter in our brain only the bare and empty name of God without the true God. Moreover, lest any should dream of a threefold God, or think that the simple essence of God is torn by three persons, we must seek a short and easy definition, which may free us from all error” (*Institutes*, Bk. 1, c. 13, par. 2, cited by W. L. Alexander, *Theology*, I, 99–100).

Dean Swift: “God commands us to believe there is a union and there is a distinction; but what that union is or what that distinction is all mankind are equally ignorant; and must continue so, at least till the day of judgment, without some new revelation. Therefore I shall again repeat the doctrine of the Trinity as it is positively affirmed in Scripture: That God is there expressed in three different names as Father, as Son, and as Holy Ghost; that each of these is God, and that there is but one God. But this union and distinction are a mystery utterly unknown to mankind” (*Works*, Vol. III, p. 434, cited by Alexander, *ibid.*, p. 101).

Dr. Pye Smith: “In the absolute perfect unity of the Divine Essence there are three objects of our conception, or subjects known by different properties, which are in the Scriptures designated by the attribution of such appellations, pronouns, qualities, and acts as are proper to rational, intelligent, and distinct Persons. Instead of Persons the term subsistence is by many preferred. These three Divine Subsistences are not separate Essences (this notion would be Tritheism). Nor mere names, or properties, or modes of action (Modalism or Sabellianism); but this unity of Subsistences is an essential, necessary, and unchangeable property of the Divine Essence. There are Hypostatical Characters or Personal Properties which are distinctive of each Person, and which express the *relations* of each to the others” (*Theology*, p. 277, cited by Alexander, *ibid.*, p. 102).

The Nicene Creed: “We believe in one God, Father Almighty, Maker of all things seen and unseen; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God of God, light of light, very God of very

> God, begotten not made, of one essence with the Father; by whom all things were made, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, etc., and in the Holy Ghost. Those that say that there was a time when He was not, and that He was not before He was begotten, and that He was made of things that are not; or say that He is of a different hypostasis or essence from the Father, or that the Son of God is created, nourished, and capable of being changed, the Catholic Church anathematizes" (cited by Alexander, *ibid.*, p. 98).
>
> The Athanasian Creed: "The Catholic faith is that we venerate one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, neither confounding the Persons nor separating the substance. The Person of the Father is one, of the Son another, of the Holy Spirit another. But the Divinity of Father, Son, and Spirit is one, their glory equal, coeternal their majesty … The Father is neither made, nor created, nor begotten: The Son is from the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten: The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. Therefore there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits. And in this Trinity there is nothing prior or posterior, nothing greater or less; but all the three Persons are coeternal and coequal, so that in all things both a Trinity in unity and a unity in Trinity is to be worshipped" (cited by Alexander, *ibid.*, 98–99).

A satisfactory summarization of this great averment of the Bible is made by Dr. W. L. Alexander as follows: That as respects the distinction in the one Godhead it is real and eternal, and is marked by certain properties peculiar to each Person and not communicable. These properties are either *external* or *internal*; the latter relating to the modes of subsistence in the divine essence, the former to the mode of revelation in the world. The *notae internae* are personal *acts* and *notions*; the former being (1) That the Father generates the Son, etc., and breathes the Spirit; (2) That the Son is begotten of the Father, and with the Father breathes the Spirit; (3) That the Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son. The personal *notions* are (1) Unbegottenness and paternity as peculiar to the Father; (2) Spiration as belonging to the Father and Son; (3) Filiation as peculiar to the Son; (4) Procession (*spiratio passiva*) as peculiar to the Spirit. The *external notes* are (1) The *works* in the economy of redemption peculiar to each: the Father sends the Son to redeem and the Spirit to sanctify; the Son redeems mankind and sends the Spirit; the Spirit is sent into the minds of men and renders them partakers of Christ's salvation. (2) The attributive or appropriative works, *i.e.* those which, though common to the three Persons, are in Scripture usually ascribed to one of them, as universal creation, conservation, and gubernation to the Father through the Son; the creation of the world, raising of the dead, and the conduct of the last judgment, to the

Son; the inspiration of the prophets, etc., to the Spirit.—*System of Biblical Theology*, I, 104

It cannot but prove of practical benefit if the student, having considered the testimony given above, shall attempt the formation of a definition of the Trinitarian idea, avoiding the errors which have been indicated.

IV. The True Emphasis

Since the Second Person of the Godhead is revealed as the concrete declaration or manifestation of God to men (John 1:18; 2 Cor. 4:6; 5:19), the investigation into the doctrine of the Trinity by theologians has too often centered upon the Second Person to the neglect of the doctrine itself. Such action on the part of men is natural, for the whole of the Christian faith is—perhaps more than elsewhere—compressed in the words, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them" (2 Cor. 5:19). With reference to this text, Neander says: "We recognize there in the essential contents of Christianity summed up in brief" (cited by Harris, *God the Creator and Lord of All*, p. 294). It is in the work of redemption that the distinctions between the Persons of the Godhead more clearly arise. This is emphasized by Dr. James Orr in his book *The Christian View of God and the World:* "The doctrine of the trinity is not a result of mere speculation, not a theory or hypothesis spun by theologians out of their own fancies, still less, as some eminent writers would maintain, the result of the importation of Greek metaphysics into Christian theology. It is, in the first instance, the result of a simple process of induction from the facts of the Christian revelation. … The triune conception of God is justified, when it is shown to be the conception which underlies the triune revelation God has given of himself, and the triune activity in the work of redemption" (pp. 303–4, cited by Harris, *ibid.*, p. 322).

It is exceedingly difficult for Jews, Mohammedans, and Unitarians to understand that Christians are as much committed to the doctrine of *one* God as are they, and, more so, since it is to the Christian not only a revelation of the Scriptures, but it is a fundamental theme which he is appointed to exhibit and defend. To acknowledge the triune mode of existence, does not impair, diminish, or complicate the doctrine of the *one*

God, or lessen the obligation to uphold it. The Koran reflects this misconception: “Say not, *There are* three gods; forbear *this;* it will be better for you. God is but one God. … They are certainly infidels who say, God is the third of three; for there is no god besides one God. … And when God shall say *unto Jesus at the last day*, O Jesus son of Mary, hast thou said unto men, Take me and my mother for two gods besides God? He shall answer, Praise unto thee! it is not for me to say that which I ought not” (cited by Rice, *Crusaders of the Twentieth Century*, pp. 212–13). The Jew resists this doctrine, since to acknowledge the Trinity in the Godhead is, on his part, to recognize the Deity of the One whom he identifies as *Jesus of Nazareth*. The Unitarian resists this doctrine, since otherwise he must acknowledge the need and way of redemption through Christ. The Mohammedan resists this doctrine, since to acknowledge it is to ignore the warning of the Koran and, to his mind, depart from the foundation of his faith, namely, *there is one God*. The Christian missionary to Islam faces this resistance as does the missionary to the Jew, and the inexplicable mystery which the triune mode of existence presents is an added problem in his work. W. A. Rice, M.A., writes in *The Crusaders of the Twentieth Century*, “Nothing would be easier than to win proselytes among Hindus and Mohammedans if only this doctrine of the Trinity were given up” (p. 230). None of these various peoples are wholly open to the Scriptures. The Jew rejects the New Testament; the Unitarian rejects the trustworthiness of all Scripture; and the Mohammedan rejects the Bible itself. Mohammed evidently gained what impression he had of Christianity from the Roman Catholic Church, and it is evident his acquaintance with the true testimony of the Scriptures was meager.

In approaching the theme of the Trinity, the student may well be prepared to confront a deep mystery which, of necessity, is not explained to finite minds. The fact that the doctrine is enshrouded with mystery tends to restrict its consideration to those who are by spiritual illumination minded to believe the testimony of God relative to things unknowable. To others the doctrine of the Trinity presents no problem, since it is by them rejected completely. Failure to respect the silence of God here, as always, leads to confusion. Such, indeed, has been the character of much theological controversy over the Trinitarian contention. With some native acumen, Dr. Robert South (1634–1716) has said of this doctrine: “As he that denies it

may lose his soul; so he that too much strives to understand it may lose his wits" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 184, cited by Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 295). Similarly, John C. Doederlein (1780) has said: "We have reached a field which we have long been dreading, ample for crops, yet sown and tangled with briers the seeds of which have been sown broadcast by the fruitful ingenuity of theologians and nourished by the heats of councils and synods mingled with the tempests of anathemas; crops which many good men seem to think ought to be cut down, or, if the sacred thicket must be spared, abandoned to theologians to cultivate it" (*Institutio Theologiæ Christianæ*, Vol. II, p. 333, 332, cited by Harris, *loc. sit*).

Chapter XVIII

Proof of the Trinitarian Doctrine

Proofs of the essential doctrine of the Trinity may be drawn from both reason and revelation, though the usefulness and validity of the former has often been challenged. The fact that men of equal sincerity disagree relative to the possibility of reason serving in the field of this doctrine is evidence that unaided human minds fail in their attempts to search the deep things of God. But more objectionable than the attempts of reason, are the efforts to illustrate that which has no counterpart in human life or in nature. The triune existence of God is vastly more than the exercise of three primary functions such as power, intellect, and will; or correspondence to three divisions of a human being into body, soul, and spirit; or any suggestion created by motion, light, and heat as related to the sun; or three tones blending into one chord effect; or (as suggested by Sir D. Brewster) that a single ray of light may be decomposed by a prism into three primary colors —red, yellow, and blue—with their varying intensity of chemical powers. Because of their irrelevance, such illustrations may be said to "darken counsel" with words which are void of import. Richard Baxter (1615–1691) states: "But for my own part, as I unfeignedly account the doctrine of the trinity the very sum and kernel of the Christian religion, (as exprest in our baptism,) and Athanasius his creed, the best explication of it that ever I read; so I think it very unmeet in these tremendous mysteries to go farther than we have God's own light to guide us" (*Christian Religion*, cited by Watson, *Institutes* I, 449). Not so much as a fraction of relevance can be established between such incidental occurrences within finite realms and the infinitude of reality which the triune mode of the existence of the one God presents. An illustration which fails to illustrate is somewhat worse than nothing.

I. Reason

This approach to the doctrine of the triune mode of the existence of God is properly a continuance of that already presented under the rationalistic arguments for the reality which God is, and such qualification as were there advanced and imposed respecting the scope and value of reason in the pursuance of things divine apply at this point as well. As before asserted,

reason cannot give intelligent assent to all that revelation discloses, which fact is due to the limitations of reason. Nevertheless, there can be no final contradiction set up between reason and revelation, since revelation is, above all else, the disclosure of infinite reason. God is the ultimate perfection of reason and whatever He discloses is none other than the manifestation of infinite reason. Owen Feltham (d. 1668) has testified: "I believe there is nothing in religion contrary to reason, if we knew it rightly" (cited by Cooke, *The Deity*, p. 470). It is equally true that, if it were really understood, there is no word of revelation to which reason would not give an affirmative response. Belief in the doctrine of the Trinity—one God subsisting in three modes of existence—should not be founded upon reason. It is a revelation. It is, however, quite legitimate to observe, as one may do with some attention, that reason, so far as it is able to go, acquiesces in that which revelation discloses. The Bible, being infinitely true, seeks no support from finite reason. Of this Hermann Venema maintains: "But although reason affords us no assistance by making any express affirmation on the subject, neither does it deny nor oppose. It teaches the unity of the divine essence; but, although it cannot prove that that essence subsists in several persons, it can advance nothing in refutation of such a doctrine. It leaves it in its own proper place" (*System of Theology*, p. 197).

A restatement is in order, to the end that it may not be understood that reason is called upon to assent to the impossible notion that one is three and three are one. The doctrine of the triune existence of God bears no semblance to such abstract contradictions, the assertion being that in the Godhead there are distinctions in personal consciousness which are combined with identity of nature and of attributes. Previously it has been proved that there is no absurdity involved when it is contended that plurality does coexist with unity. The element of mystery, which is present is normal. The problem is not the how of the mystery, but the *fact*. Any experienced logician will distinguish between these so widely different propositions.

In moving forward along lines of rationalistic contemplation of this great doctrine, no claim is made to originality. The arguments advanced are those employed by various writers—too many, indeed, for any identification as to human authorship. The line of reasoning will be in a series of independent propositions, namely:

1. The Divine Attributes are Eternal. Since God exists eternally, His attributes, which exist necessarily, exist eternally. No attribute of God is derived, since this would make Him dependent to that degree. Likewise, no attribute of God is acquired, since that would imply that God has existed at some time as an imperfect Being. His attributes coexist with His existence. Since all-sufficiency, immutability, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, goodness, love, holiness, and a disposition for communion are attributes of God now, they have been His attributes in precisely the same manner from all eternity.

2. Eternal Activity of the Attributes. The attributes of God are eternally active. This truth led some of the ancients to conclude that God, to satisfy His attributes, was eternally creating material things. Aristotle contends: "God, who is an immovable (immutable) nature, whose essence is energy, cannot be supposed to have rested or slept from eternity, doing nothing at all, and then, after infinite ages, to have begun to move the matter, or make the world" (*Met. Lib*., xiv., c. 6, cited by Cooke, *The Deity*, p. 476). This line of reasoning fails, in that it is based on the fallacy that God's activity is confined to the creation of material things. Though the attributes of God have been eternally active, creation had its beginning. To assert of God that His omniscience has not been eternally active is to claim that there was a time when He knew nothing. There is no time when, in the exercise of omnipotence, He did nothing. Thus, and with specific meaning at this juncture, there was never a time when His disposition for communion was not active. No thought can be entertained that implies that there was ever a time when divine holiness, justice, and goodness were not active. It is equally evident that as God lives in the realization of His attributes, they have been active from all eternity, and thus He will be related to His attributes for all eternity to come. It is to be observed, however, that God is not, as an automaton, governed by His attributes, but is ever acting in intelligence and reason which may involve some variety in the emphasis given to some attributes over others under extenuating circumstances.

3. The Attributes Require Both Agent and Object. The exercise of the divine attributes implies that there is required both an agent and an

object. Power, love, and disposition to communion, like all other attributes, necessitate both agent and object. Similarly, generally speaking, the agent cannot be numerically, identically, and individually the same. Requiring reciprocal relations, they cannot arise and be exercised within one absolute unity. If any exception exists, it is in the realm of omniscience wherein self-knowledge is recognized. The familiar illustration is that of a spirit wholly isolated from all other beings with no knowledge that any other exists. Could such a spirit under such circumstances exercise objective power, love, or disposition for communion? Thus it would be with God. He is a perfect Agent in the exercise of infinite perfections and attributes; but who, it may be inquired, is the object? Creation presents a vast array of objects and these are all benefited by His agency; but the question is more demanding in that it inquires who served as object in the exercise of the eternal attributes in that situation which existed before aught was created. The attributes of God were active prior to creation and, if so, there must have been both agent and object then as now. To restrict the divine object to creation is to deprive God of the exercise of His qualities and characteristics during that period preceding creation. It also follows that, since creation was a matter of divine choice and thus contingent, it is to restrict the exercise of God's attributes to that which is contingent. In such a case the divine attributes might as easily have never been exercised at all. All this suggests the absurdity that the divine attributes were not exercised in eternity past, that they might not under certain circumstances be exercised now, and that they might never be exercised at all. Such reasoning must be rejected. Cicero represents Velleius as proposing to his opponents the strange inquiry, "What was it that induced God to adorn the heavens with stars and bright luminaries? whether he was previously like one who lived in a dark and comfortless habitation, and desired a better residence? If so, why was he so long a period without the gratification of his desire?" (*De Natura Deorum,* Lib. i., c. 9, cited by Cooke, *ibid.,* p. 493). While this reference is more or less irrelevant to the point, it is true that the exercise of the divine attributes did not begin with creation. God was as tranquil and complete in Himself before creation as after. It is equally imperative to recognize that a finite universe has never been, nor can it ever be, the full satisfaction objectively of the infinite Being. A man may enjoy his faithful dog, but all the activities and capacities of a man are not satisfied with a dog

as object. It may be noted here that even man who is made in the image of God is not finally satisfied with creation as his object. He finds no rest or complete satisfaction until he draws largely on the infinite One. The Psalmist utters this truth when he says: “As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God” (Ps. 42:1). The destiny of man is of eternal duration. He will observe the creation of new heavens and a new earth and, if redeemed, will enjoy them forever. Having received the gift of eternal life, he is little encouraged to set his affections on things of time and sense. He is rather enjoined to set his affections on things above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God (Col. 3:1–3).

God is not dependent upon creation as an object for the exercise of His qualities. He depends on nothing beyond Himself; hence

4. God is Sufficient in Himself. Reason thus asserts that there is within God that which corresponds both to agent and object. All attempts to discover an adequate divine object outside of God must fail. Something must be discovered, for it certainly exists, which is anterior and infinitely superior to all that creation affords. At this point it may be noted that the anticipation of creation could not serve as an adequate object; for, if creation, when realized, is insufficient to serve as an infinite object, it could not so serve when it existed as a mere archetypal idea. It is in harmony with the independence and infinite excellence of the Godhead to assert that His resources are in Himself, and it is equally true that He is also the answer to every desire of His own Being. In His relation to creation, He gives but receives nothing. He is the source of all blessing and He finds in Himself His own felicity. He is the only sphere in which He may exercise His own infinite nature. The exercise of His attributes is as essential as their existence. Thus, if there is no other sphere which corresponds to His infinity, these attributes must be exercised within Himself and within Himself He has found satisfaction throughout eternity. It is therefore necessary to conclude that the very mode of the divine Being answers all these demands. The agent and the object are embraced within Himself. A plurality is thus predicated of the Divine nature.

5. The Agent and Object are Persons. Since the divine nature includes plurality, it must be a plurality of Persons. Such a plurality cannot be

predicated of the divine Essence, for the Scriptures distinctly testify to the truth that there is but *one God*. Similarly, this plurality cannot be that of mere offices or modes of manifestations, for such could not serve in their relation to each other as agent and object. Nothing short of Persons can serve in this reciprocity. In the case of the exercise of the attributes which are moral, both the agent and the object must exhibit intelligence, consciousness, and moral agency. In the experience of communion, the necessity is as much on the object as it is on the agent, that there shall be similarity in thought, disposition, will, purpose, and affection. If the agent be a Person, the object must be a Person also; whatever pertains to Deity is of necessity eternal. Nothing in God, as has been seen, can be contingent or adventitious. Every attribute and divine quality is eternal, and, in like manner, the Person, or Persons, to whom these attributes pertain are eternal. None of these Persons within the Godhead could be lacking in the essential features and attributes of Deity and maintain any place in the communion which comprises the Godhead. By the most empirical necessity these Persons are coequal. No gradations belong to infinity. There is no sphere of existence intermediate between infinite Deity and finite creaturehood. Whatever is within the Essence of Deity is lacking nothing which belongs to infinite completeness. All must be equal in power, glory, wisdom, benevolence, dignity, and disposition to communion. These attributes ever have been and ever will be exercised by each Person within the Godhead. In all the fullness of infinity, these attributes, have been eternally active in each Person. Therefore, as each Person has ever exercised these attributes to infinity and eternally, it becomes evident that each has been and ever will be infinitely active as agent and object. It is impossible for a finite mind to comprehend the intimate and enduring affection which infinite love has generated within the Godhead. Each loving and each receiving in return. Each with infinite understanding appreciating the perfections of the others. The holy will of One in absolute agreement with the holy will of the Others. There need be no surprise that the Father said of the Son, “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.”

6. Plurality in God is a Trinity. Thus far in this argument, only a plurality within the Godhead has been asserted, but some proof may be advanced as evidence that this plurality is a trinity—no less, and no more.

This is the clear testimony of revelation, but it is the purpose of this argument first to demonstrate whatever may be discovered through reason before turning to revelation. It has been seen that there must be a plurality of Persons in order that the divine attributes may be exercised within the Godhead and apart from creation, and that each Person must serve both as agent and object in the communion and reciprocity which belongs to the relationship; but if all the forms of activity of Persons are to be experienced, there must be conjoint action as well as that which is individual. The united fellowship and agreement which has especial significance among men on earth (Matt. 18:19) doubtless has its counterpart in the fellowship within the Godhead. To no small extent, such conjoint action is implied in communion and agreement between the Persons of the Godhead, which agreement has been recognized. It therefore follows that as the element of conjoint action as agent is experienced by two, there must be a third Person who serves as object. There is no need for more than three Persons in the Godhead and there could not be less. *Three* is the number of divine completeness, not only on the testimony of the Bible, which is sufficient and final, but on the ground of the fact that within a triad of Persons every demand which reciprocity might present is satisfied. Two infinite Persons agreeing as agents for the conjoint function of Beings must have as object a third Person equally as qualified as themselves. Thus Father and Son being conjoint agents, say, in the exercise of infinite love, have the Holy Spirit as their object; the Son and Spirit being conjoint agents, have the Father as their object; and the Father and the Spirit being conjoint agents, have the Son as the object of their love. Thus it is seen that there is a large measure of agreement between revelation and reason concerning the Godhead three.

The individual objector to the Trinitarian dogma will do well to give heed to the teachings of the Bible on this subject; but if he, through unbelief, is not amenable to the Word of God, he should attend upon the less exact, yet nevertheless empirical, dictates of reason. The starting point of the Christian witness, whether he be dealing with Jew, Unitarian, Mohammedan, or agnostic, is a defense of the unity of God. The Christian yields first place to none in his insistence that there is but *one God*. The Christian is in full possession of all that to which the Jew or Mohammedan lays claim, and infinitely more.

7. The Bible Sustains Reason. Yet, again, and continuing under the general theme of *reason*, it will be seen that the Bible sustains and justifies every rational conclusion as to the triune mode of the existence of God. Truth existed before any revelation in written form was made. It therefore does not depend on revelation for its truthfulness. To the same end, it may be said that some truths, though recorded and in no way opposed to reason, are not demonstrable by reason. If, as has been proved, revelation is infinitely true, it follows that, should reason advance a contradiction to revelation, reason is at fault. The doctrine of the Trinity is one of the most unequivocal teachings of the Bible. Though reason has no occasion to aid revelation in regard to this doctrine, revelation may assist reason. Attention is now drawn to this field of investigation. The available Scriptures will be only such as assert the eternal existence of the Godhead. Some things, the Scriptures aver, have existed *from* the foundation of the world, or within the boundaries of time, while other Scriptures affirm that some things existed *before* the foundation of the world, or from all eternity. Christ is said to have been slain *from* the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8), but to have been foreordained *before* the foundation of the world (1 Pet. 1:20).

a. The Eternal Exercise of Love. In His High Priestly prayer Christ said to His Father: "for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24). Love is a divine attribute which, like all attributes, as has been demonstrated, is not only eternal and therefore exercised before the creation of the universe and apart from the universe, but requires that it, as agent, shall have an object in every way coequal and reciprocal. This declaration on the part of Christ refers to that eternal exercise of love. By these words of Christ the reader is carried back to that awesome eternity which preceded creation, when there was no agent nor object other than the Persons within the Godhead. God did not, as an individual Person, merely love Himself, but He loved other Persons than Himself, who comprise the one Essence which God is.

b. The Exercise of Mutual Glory. In the same prayer and when speaking directly to His Father of things perfectly understood between themselves, Christ said: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5). The phrase παρὰ σεαυτῳ ("with thine own self") is definite, indicating a glory with the

Person of the Father apart from external dignities or honors. The same is expressed again by the words, παρὰ σοί ("with thee"). From everlasting the Son has participated in the essential glory which belongs to Deity. The glory is that of dignity, perfection, and infinite blessedness. God being immutable, His glory can never change. The dating of this glory should not be unobserved. It is before creation of worlds and doubtless prior to the existence of any angelic beings who were present to gaze upon that glory. Some intimation of this glory may be gained from Revelation 21:23, where that same unchangeable glory is said to be manifest in eternal ages to come.

c. The Exercise of Knowing. A plurality of Persons in the Godhead provides for a mutual communion in knowledge between agent and object. Such is the case now and such it has ever been. The words of Christ on this aspect of eternal reciprocity are of great import: "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father" (John 10:15); "… no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son" (Matt. 11:27). In like manner it is disclosed that the Spirit knows. It is written: "And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. 8:27); "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2:10). Thus not only the reciprocity of agent and object in the sphere of knowledge is assured, but the eternity of both the Son and the Spirit is declared.

d. The Exercise of Divine Disposition to Communion. Had the triune existence been that of wholly distinct Beings without mutual relations to bind them, it would be easy, under such circumstances, for these Beings to have become separated from each other and disturbed by rival interests; but, being of one Essence, there could be no separation prompted by self-interests. The significant word *with* is employed to denote this eternal communion. As noted above, Christ speaks to the Father of the glory which He had *with* Him in past ages, and John opens his Gospel with the sublime declaration: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God" (John 1:1, 2). The same relationship is presented in 1 John 1:2. It is written of the Christ that He was "that eternal life, which was with the Father." The phrase *in the beginning*, as used here by John, could hardly be a reference to aught else than the

eternity past which was prior to the event mentioned in the next verse, namely, “All things were made by him.” At such a time and under such circumstances, it is asserted that the Son, or Logos, was *with* God, and also that then, as now, and as He ever will be, the Son, or Logos, was and is God. There never was, nor could there ever be, anything but mutual communion, all-satisfying to both agent and object, between these Persons of the Godhead. This communion, being apart from all that is created, was as perfect and complete before creation as after. It is within the sphere of the Godhead three that there is an incomprehensible depth of meaning to the word: “The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father,” and, “As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee,” and “I am in the Father, and the Father [is] in me,” and yet again, “All things that the Father hath are mine.”

Thus it is seen that the deductions which finite reason affirms are sustained by the Word of God, which is infinitely true. There is a plurality in the Godhead from all eternity and these in the reciprocity of agent and object have maintained mutual love, glory, knowledge, and communion from everlasting—a relationship so sufficient that infinite demands have been satisfied. To this, creation, coming later in time, could add nothing.

II. Revelation

As the Scriptures assume the existence of God on the ground of the fact that He never began to be, in like manner and for the same reason, the Scriptures assume the triune mode of the existence of Deity. The three Persons concur as the Authors of revelation and are, on that account, not to be magnified alone as the subjects of revelation. The existence of the author of any book is assumed, and, true to these realities, the doctrine of the triune existence is not based upon direct Biblical assertion, or any use of the word *trinity*, which word is not found in the Sacred Text. The word *trinity* came into use in the second century. It is of great import that the names of God are self-revealed and that, in the Old Testament, the name *Elohim* is plural, and that, in the New Testament, the name Θεός, though singular, is represented in triune plurality as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is noted, also, that the primary Old Testament message respecting Deity is of His unity, but there are many indications that there is a plurality of Persons. So, and to the same purpose, it is to be noted in connection with the New

Testament, as having to do with the various aspects of redemption, which parts are assumed by the different Persons of the Godhead, that its primary message relative to God is of the three Persons with definite indications that, back of this representation, there is but one God.

1. The Doctrine of the Trinity as Set Forth in the Old Testament. Attention has been called earlier in this treatise to the importance of the truth that the word *Elohim* is plural and hence that it is used properly with plural forms of speech; but this, like much Old Testament doctrine, is incomplete apart from the progress of doctrine which is consummated in the New Testament, where the distinctions between Father, Son, and Spirit appear. Why should the declaration that the Old Testament name *Elohim* is a veiled reference to the trinity of Persons in the Godhead be resisted, when the New Testament states that the trinity of Persons exists and has always existed? If there were no further development of the Trinitarian doctrine than the intimation advanced by the plural form of *Elohim*, the case would be different, for the plural of *Elohim* is not sufficient and final proof of the triune mode of existence; but does not the singular form of Θεός, when by authoritative Scripture it is seen to represent three distinct Persons, guide unerringly in the right solution of the problem which the plural of *Elohim* generates? The case is even stronger when it is discovered that the objector offers no argument against this interpretation, but would merely substitute another notion.

By no means is the Old Testament witness to the plurality of Persons in the Godhead restricted to that which may be derived from the plural form of Elohim and its associated forms of speech. Definite distinction is made in the second Psalm between Jehovah and His Messiah (vs. 2). In this Psalm Jehovah states, “Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion” (vs. 6), and the Son, who is the King, declares, “Jehovah said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.” Similarly, a distinction is drawn in many passages between Jehovah and Jehovah’s Servant, or the Angel of Jehovah. Quite in keeping with the truth that God is one Essence in which three Persons subsist, is the fact that the Angel of Jehovah is at times One other than Jehovah, and at other times He is Jehovah Himself. Again, in the twenty-second Psalm, which records the prayer of Christ addressed to His Father when Christ was on the cross, it is recorded that He said, “My God,

my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (vs. 1); so, also, in verse 15, "and thou hast brought me into the dust of death." Thus, likewise, the name *Immanuel* is interpreted by inspiration to mean "God with us," which indicates no less a fact than that God has entered the human sphere in the incarnation of the Son, who became flesh and dwelt among us. Nor is it of small importance that the three primary names of Deity in the Old Testament are directly ascribed to each of the three Persons. That the First Person is *Jehovah, Elohim,* and *Adonai* need not be pointed out. Yet it is equally true that these names are applied to the Second Person. He is called *El* (Isa. 9:6), *Jehovah* (Ps. 68:18; Isa. 6:1–3; 45:21). So, also, the Spirit is called *Jehovah* (Isa. 11:2, literally *Spirit of Jehovah;* cf. Judg. 15:14), and the Spirit is *Elohim* (Ex. 31:3, literally *Spirit of Elohim*). Thought should be given, also, to the benediction which the high priest used in invoking a blessing upon the people of Israel, and by divine authority: "The LORD bless thee, and keep thee: the LORD make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel; and I will bless them" (Num. 6:24–27). The three parts of this benediction comport with the ministries of the three Persons in the Godhead. The following from J. Pye Smith's *Person of Christ* presents this feature of truth well: "The first member of the formula expresses the benevolent 'love of God;' the father of mercies and fountain of all good: the second well comports with the redeeming and reconciling 'grace of our Lord Jesus Christ;' and the last is appropriate to the purity, consolation, and joy, which are received from the 'communion of the Holy Spirit' " (cited by Watson, *Institutes,* I, 470). There is a striking correspondence here with the benedictions recorded in the epistles of the New Testament, which so clearly name the Persons of the Godhead and assign to them their respective ministries (cf. 2 Cor. 13:14).

Because of its great meaning, attention is directed to the threefold ascription of Isaiah 6:3. On this passage Richard Watson has written:

> The inner part of the Jewish sanctuary was called the *holy of holies*, that is, the holy place of the *Holy Ones;* and the number of these is indicated, and limited to *three,* in the celebrated vision of Isaiah, and that with great explicitness. The scene of that vision is the holy place of the temple, and lies therefore in the very abode and residence of the *Holy Ones,* here celebrated by the seraphs who veiled their faces before them. And one cried unto another, and

said, "*Holy, holy, holy* is the LORD of hosts." This passage, if it stood alone, might be eluded by saying that this act of *Divine* adoration here mentioned, is merely *emphatic*, or in the Hebrew mode of expressing a *superlative;* though that is assumed, and by no means proved. It is however worthy of serious notice, that this distinct *trine* act of adoration, which has been so often supposed to mark a plurality of persons as the objects of it, is answered by a voice from that excellent glory which overwhelmed the mind of the prophet when he was favoured with the vision, responding in the same language of plurality in which the doxology of the seraphs is expressed. "Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for *us*?" But this is not the only evidence that in this passage the *Holy Ones*, who were addressed each by his appropriate and equal designation of *holy*, were the *three* Divine subsistences in the Godhead. The being addressed is the "LORD of hosts." This all acknowledge to include the *Father;* but the Evangelist John. 12:41, in manifest reference to this transaction, observes, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his (Christ's) glory and spake of him." In this vision, therefore, we have the *Son* also, whose glory on this occasion the prophet is said to have beheld. Acts 28:25, determines that there was also the presence of the Holy Ghost. "Well spake the *Holy Ghost* by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear and not understand; and seeing ye shall see and not perceive," &c. These words, quoted from Isaiah, the Apostle Paul declares to have been spoken by the Holy Ghost, and Isaiah declares them to have been spoken on this very occasion by the "LORD of hosts." "And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed but understand not, and see ye indeed but perceive not," &c.

Now let all these circumstances be placed together—THE PLACE, the holy place of the Holy Ones; the repetition of the homage, THREE times, Holy, holy, holy—the ONE Jehovah of hosts, to whom it was addressed,—the plural pronoun used by this ONE Jehovah, US; the declaration of an evangelist, that on this occasion Isaiah saw the glory of CHRIST; the declaration of St. Paul, that the Lord of hosts who spoke on that occasion was the HOLY GHOST; and the conclusion will not appear to be without most powerful authority, both circumstantial and declaratory, that the adoration, Holy, holy, holy, referred to the Divine three, in the one essence of the Lord of hosts. Accordingly, in the book of Revelation, where "*the lamb*" is so constantly represented as sitting upon the Divine throne, and where he by name is associated with the Father, as the object of the *equal* homage and praise of saints and angels; this scene from Isaiah is transferred into the fourth chapter, and the "living creatures," the seraphim of the prophet, are heard in the same strain, and with the same *trine* repetition, saying, "*Holy, holy, holy*, Lord God Almighty, which *was*, and *is*, and *is to come*."—*Ibid*., I, 470–71

Similarly, the threefold benediction which Jacob implored on the sons of Joseph is well described by Hermann Venema:

"God, before whom my fathers … did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Gen. 48:15, 16. If the doctrine of the Trinity be not revealed in this passage, it will be difficult to account for so long a preface. But let us examine it a little more closely. We have mention made in the words of Jacob of three distinct persons—"God before whom my fathers did walk," and "the Angel who redeemed me"—here we have at least *two* persons; but it is further said, "the God which fed me." The last of these is unquestionably distinguished from the Angel, and also from God before whom his fathers walked. There are thus three distinct persons, under three

personal names and performing distinct works. “The God which fed me” and “the Angel who redeemed me” are each represented as possessed of what is peculiar to a divine person, and as standing on the same footing with the true God. Divine works are ascribed to each. They are mentioned as the object of divine worship and as the source of blessing. Jacob invokes a blessing from the three. But the true God is the only object of worship—the only being to whom prayer may be addressed. We nowhere read of the Old Testament saints praying to or invoking blessings from any except God. As if Jacob had said, Let him who is the fountain of blessing bless the lads. No creature can effectually bless them. The other two, therefore, whom Jacob mentions are really divine persons. This is confirmed by Scripture which describes God the Father as the leader, the teacher, or him before whom our fathers walked—the Son of God as the Göel, the Angel who redeemed,—and God who is the author of all illumination, sanctification, and comfort, as the Holy Spirit who furnishes us with spiritual food and feeds us therewith. —*System of Theology*, pp. 210–11

Three distinct Persons are indicated in 2 Samuel 23:2, 3; Isaiah 48:16; 63:7–10. Likewise, in view of the fact that creation is predicated of each Person of the Godhead separately as well as of *Elohim* by the words, “And God [*Elohim*] said, Let us make man in our image” (Gen. 1:26), it is a strong confirmation of the same truth that Ecclesiastes 12:1 has the plural, reading, as it does, “Remember now thy Creator [‘creators’] in the days of thy youth,” and Isaiah 54:5, which reads, “Thy Maker [‘makers’] is thy husband.”

As a summarization of the doctrine of the Trinity as found in the Old Testament, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas states in his *Principles of Theology* (pp. 25, 26), and under the heading “The Doctrine Anticipated”:

At this stage, and only here, we may seek another support for the doctrine In the light of the facts of the New Testament we cannot refrain from asking whether there may not have been some adumbrations of it in the Old Testament. As the doctrine arises directly out of the facts of the New Testament, we do not look for any full discovery of it in the Old Testament. We must not expect too much, because, as Israel’s function was to emphasize the unity of God (Deut. 6:4), any premature revelation might have been disastrous. But if the doctrine be true, we might expect that Christian Jews, at any rate, would seek for some anticipation of it in the Old Testament. We believe we find it there. (*a*) The use of the plural *“Elohim,”* with the singular verb, *“bara,”* is at least noteworthy, and seems to call for some recognition, especially as the same grammatical solecism is found used by St. Paul (1 Thess. 3:11, Greek). Then, too, the use of the plurals “our” (Gen. 1:26), “us” (3:22), “us” (11:7), seems to indicate some self-converse in God. It is not satisfactory to refer this to angels because they were not associated with God in creation. Whatever may be the meaning of this usage, it seems, at any rate, to imply that Hebrew Monotheism was an intensely living reality. (*b*) The references to the “Angel of Jehovah” prepare the way for the Christian doctrine of a distinction in the Godhead (Gen. 18:2, 17; 18:22 with 19:1; Josh. 5:13–15 with 6:2; Jud. 13:8–21; Zech. 13:7). (*c*) Allusions to the “Spirit of Jehovah" form another line of Old Testament teaching. In Genesis 1:2 the Spirit is an energy only, but in subsequent books an agent (Isa. 40:13; 48:16;

59:19; 63:10 f.). (*d*) The personification of Divine Wisdom is also to be observed, for the connection between the personification of Wisdom in Prov. 8, the Logos of John 1:1–18, and the "wisdom" of I Cor. 1:24 can hardly be accidental. (*e*) There are also other hints, such as the Triplicity of the Divine Names (Numb. 6:24–27; Psa. 29:3–5; Isa. 6:1–3), which, while they may not be pressed, cannot be overlooked. Hints are all that were to be expected until the fulness of time should have come. The special work of Israel was to guard God's transcendence and omnipresence; it was for Christianity to develop the doctrine of the Godhead into the fulness, depth, and richness that we find in the revelation of the Incarnate Son of God.

2. The Doctrine of the Trinity as Set Forth in the New Testament. Within the New Testament, the field of testimony and investigation relative to the doctrine of the Trinity is greatly enlarged. There are those, and not a few, who declare that no certain proof of the triune mode of existence can be established from the Old Testament, that is, apart from the retroactive influence of the New Testament revelation. Certain godly Jews did, it is evident, sense the plural aspect of the divine existence. Such men as served as translators of the LXX did search the Scriptures, but little is on record as assurance that they came to any clear understanding of a triune mode of existence of the one God whom they worshiped. The instruction was vigorously given to them to defend the monotheistic conception of Deity. As is true of all saints of all the ages, their belief concealed in itself vast realities to which they did not attain. Even if the plural aspect of Deity were divinely apprehended by some, more than by others, the full-orbed disclosure awaited the fullness of the time.

The New Testament revelation is all but limitless. The mention of a name of Deity or its related pronoun is at once the declaration of a trinitarian distinction. Like the element of moral virtue in the Christian's prescribed conduct, the triune mode of existence of Deity is everywhere present and assumed throughout the New Testament. It is so completely the sphere of all relationships that it defies analysis. Nonetheless, some of the most glorious features of this truth may be considered separately with profit. Four general lines of investigation follow, namely, (a) the names of God, (b) the attributes of God, (c) the works of God, and (d) the worship of God.

a. The Trinity and the Names of God. Direct application is made of the names of God to each of the three Persons. There is no question raised as to the divine titles belonging properly to the Father. Yet the Son and Spirit bear the

same designations. The Son is called *God* (John 1:10), *the true God* (1 John 5:20), *the blessed God* (Rom. 9:5), *the great God* (Titus 2:13). So, also, the Holy Spirit is called *God* (Acts 5:3–9) and *Lord* (2 Cor. 3:17).

While the different names of the Persons in the Godhead are everywhere fully employed throughout the New Testament, the complete designation for God as revealed in the New Covenant is declared in, and as a part of, the Great Commission, to wit: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19). As baptism stands as the initial act of a believer in a public witness for Christ, so, on that threshold, the full title is proclaimed of the God into whose fellowship the candidate enters. In this connection, it is significant that the first public appearance of Christ was that of His baptism, and that, though no formula is recorded as having been pronounced over Christ by John on that occasion, the three Persons of the Godhead were present and identified. The Father owned the Son—"This is my beloved Son"—; the Son was visibly present; and the Spirit was seen to descend upon Christ in the form of a dove. Direction is given in the Great Commission that baptism should be administered in the *name*, not *names*—the one name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. The phrase, *the name*, is a strong declaration of the divine unity which subsists as Father, Son, and Spirit. The ordinance in view is to be performed by the authority of that incomparable name, but that name is threefold.

b. The Trinity and the Attributes of God. It is a challenging fact that the attributes of Deity are ascribed to each of the Blessed Three. (a) Of the Father it is said, "From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God" (Ps. 90:2); of the Son it is said that He is the "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last," that He "was in the beginning with God," and that His goings forth have been from the days of eternity (Rev. 1:8, 17; John 1:2; Micah 5:2); of the Spirit it is written, "Christ through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. 9:14). (b) Infinite power is exercised by each Person. Of the Father it is said: "Who are kept by the power of God" (1 Pet. 1:5); of the Son—"Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me" (2 Cor. 12:9); of the Spirit—signs and wonders were wrought "by the power of the Spirit of God" (Rom. 15:19). (c) Omniscience is ascribed to each of the

triune Persons: The Father “searcheth the heart” (Jer. 17:10); the Son—“All the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts” (Rev. 2:23); the Spirit —“Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God” (1 Cor. 2:11). (d) So, omnipresence belongs to each Person: God has said, “Do not I fill heaven and earth?” (Jer. 23:24); Christ said, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matt. 18:20); the Psalmist wrote of the Spirit, “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?” (Ps. 139:7). (e) Holiness is the character of each of the Trinity: Of the First Person it is inquired, “Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy” (Rev. 15:4); Christ is the Holy One—“But ye denied the Holy One” (Acts 3:14); and the Spirit is everywhere said to be the *Holy Spirit*. It is not to be wondered that angels exclaim “Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts” (Isa. 6:3, R.V.). (f) Truth is ascribed to each Person: Of the Father, Christ said, “He that sent me is true” (John 7:28); of the Christ it is written, “These things saith he that is holy, he that is true” (Rev. 3:7); and of the Spirit, “It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth” (1 John 5:6). (g) Equally, indeed, are the three Persons benevolent: Of the Father it is declared, “The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance” (Rom. 2:4); Christ loved the church (Eph. 5:25); “Thy good Spirit” (Neh. 9:20). (h) The disposition for communion is shared by each Person: The Father and Son are said to have fellowship with saints, “And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (1 John 1:3); and testimony is borne as to the *communion* of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 13:14).

The same equality might be set forth concerning every aspect of the character of God. What is true of one Person is true of each of the others and this is conclusive evidence that the Godhead is a Trinity of infinite Persons, yet *one God*.

There is no intimation that one Person of the Godhead sustains these attributes in respect to the other two Persons, or that the attributes are held in any partnership. All is predicated of each as though no others existed. Thus the peculiar relationship of One in Three, and Three in One, is upheld apart from those usual interdependent sharings which characterize all human combinations and mutual manifestations. The fact that each Person possesses all the divine characteristics and so completely that it would seem

that no other need to possess them, speaks of the distinction between the Persons as such. On the other hand, the fact that they all manifest these characteristics in identically the same ways and to the same measure, speaks of the unity from which their mode of existence springs.

c. The Trinity and the Works of God. Each distinctive work of God is not only said to be wrought by a Person of the Godhead, but the major works of God are predicated of each of the Three Persons. In no instance are these Persons said to be combined in what they do; it is rather that the same thing in one Scripture is attributed to one Person that is in another Scripture attributed to another, and so on until each of the Three is credited with the work and, in each case, it is as though no other Person was ever related to it. No outward partnership is recognized. The fact that each One is announced as wholly achieving a given undertaking, quite apart from the Others, indicates the truth that the Persons maintain a distinction the One from the Others. On the other hand, the fact that each does completely and perfectly the given task and in a way that it would imply that no other need undertake it, indicates a mysterious unity far more vitally concentrated than is known in any aspect of human experience. Some of these major works of God which are declared to be wholly wrought by each Person and quite independent of the others should be noted specifically:

(1) *Creation of the Universe.* The stupendous enterprise of calling an immeasurable universe into existence is set forth as being wrought by each Person quite apart from partnership, sharing or cooperation. Of God the First Person it is stated, “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands” (Ps. 102:25); of Christ it is stated, “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible” (Col. 1:16); and of the Spirit it is written, “The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” (Gen. 1:2), and, “By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens” (Job 26:13). All of this is combined in the one sublime statement that “in the beginning God [*Elohim*] created the heaven and the earth” (Gen. 1:1). The separate, yet complete, act of creation on the part of each Person is gathered up in the assertion that *Elohim*—which name portends the mystery of plurality in unity and unity in plurality—achieved the undertaking.

(2) *Creation of Man.* The creation of man is the creative act of God, since of no other has it been said that the thing created is made in His image and likeness. This creative act of God is also the work of the separate Persons in the Trinity: *Jehovah Elohim*, it is said, "formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7); of Christ it is written that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible" (Col. 1:16); so, to the same end, it is declared, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job 33:4). In view of this, the wise man admonishes, "Remember now thy Creator [plural word in original] in the days of thy youth" (Eccl. 12:1); and to Israel it is written, "Thy Maker [also plural] is thine husband"(Isa. 54:5).

(3) *The Incarnation.* Three Persons are present in the incarnation: the Spirit generates the Son, but in such a manner that the Son ever addresses the First Person as *Father*. Such is the nature of regeneration in the case of lost souls. While that regeneration is wrought by the Spirit, the saved one ever, from that time forth, addresses the First Person as *Father*.

(4) *The Life and Ministry of Christ.* He, the Son, did always the will of the Father and, to this end, the Spirit was given to the Son without measure.

(5) *The Death of Christ.* When on the cross and there addressing His Father, it is recorded of Christ that He said, "And thou hast brought me into the dust of death" (Ps. 22:15). Similarly, it is written of the Father, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all" (Rom. 8:32). Likewise, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son" (John 3:16); the Son spoke for Himself saying, "No man taketh it [my life] from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down" (John 10:18). Again, Paul testified concerning the sacrifice of Christ that He it was "who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). Of the Spirit's part in Christ's death it is said, "Christ … through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. 9:14).

(6) *The Resurrection of Christ.* Among many direct statements which assert that the Father raised the Son from the dead, one declares, " … whom God hath raised up" (Acts 2:24); and the Son said of His life in resurrection, "I have power to take it again" (John 10:18), and "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John 2:19). Of the Spirit, in this same

connection, it is said, “Christ [was] … put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit (1 Pet. 3:18).

(7) *The Resurrection of All Mankind.* It is recorded of both the Father and the Son, “For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will” (John 5:21), and of the Third Person it is stated: “But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom. 8:11).

(8) *The Inspiration of the Scriptures.* Here the Three Persons appear in various passages: “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. 3:16); “The prophets … searched … what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow” (1 Pet. 1:10, 11); and of the Spirit—“But holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Pet. 1:21).

(9) *The Minister’s Authority.* It is written of the Father, “Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament” (2 Cor. 3:5, 6); and of the Son, the Apostle testified, “He counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry” (1 Tim. 1:12); and the same Apostle instructs the elders of the Church in Ephesus, “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28).

(10) *The Indwelling Presence.* There is “one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all” (Eph. 4:6). The believer’s new life is declared to be “Christ in you, the hope of glory” (Col. 1:27). And, “Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?” (1 Cor. 6:19).

(11) *The Work of Sanctification.* Jude writes to believers as to those “that are sanctified by God the Father” (Jude 1:1); again, of Christ it is said, “For both he that sanctified and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren” (Heb. 2:11). Thus, also, the Apostle writes of the Holy Spirit in relation to believers, “Ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (1 Cor. 6:11).

(12) *The Believer's Safekeeping.* Various aspects of this feature of truth might be presented. Christ declared of the Father that "no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand" (John 10:29); and not only is the same thing promised by the Son Himself (John 10:28), but the Son has wrought in four effectual ways to the same end. It is written, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. 8:34). Nothing could be more assuring than that the believer is "sealed [by the Spirit] unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30).

Marvelous, indeed, are the works of God and of surpassing import is the fact that these works are, in each case, said to be wholly wrought by each of the Trinity separately, not in partnership or mutual cooperation, and sufficiently in each instance to make it appear to be unnecessary for the work to be undertaken by Another! Thus unity and plurality are demonstrated as existing in the Godhead on a plane of relationship above and beyond the range of human experience.

d. The Trinity and the Worship of God. All created intelligences are appointed to render worship to God, and their worship, such as it is, comprehends the triune Godhead.

(1) *By Angels.* As has been observed, the angels ascribe worship to three Persons when they say, "Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts" (Isa. 6:3), and the "living creatures" are saying, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come" (Rev. 4:8).

(2) *By Saints.* All prayer and worship is now directed, by divine instruction, to the Father, in the name of the Son, and in the enabling power of the Holy Spirit (John 16:23, 24; Eph. 6:18).

(3) *The Benedictions.* In Numbers 6:24–26, the blessing implored by the high priest upon the people is recorded as, "The LORD bless thee, and keep thee: the LORD make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." In 2 Corinthians 13:14 the most used benediction of the church is recorded, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen."

As a summarization of his extended discussion bearing on the doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. Horace Bushnell writes:

> To hold this grand subtonic mystery, in the ring of whose deep reverberation we receive our heaviest impressions of God, as if it were only a thing just receivable, not profitable; a dead truth, not a living; a theologic article, wholly one side of the practical life; a truth so scholastic and subtle as to have in fact no relation to Christian experience; nothing, we are sure, can be less adequate than this, or bring a loss to religion that is more deplorable, unless it be a flat denial of the mystery itself. In this view we cannot but hope that what we have been able to say may have a certain value … preparing some to find how glorious and how blessed a gift to experience, how vast an opening of God to man, how powerful, transforming, transporting, this great mystery of God may be. We can wish the reader nothing more beatific in this life than to have found and fully brought into feeling the practical significance of this eternal act or fact of God, which we call the Christian Trinity. Nowhere else do the bonds of limitation burst away as here. Nowhere else does the soul launch upon immensity as here; nowhere fill her burning censer with the eternal fires of God, as when she sings,
>
> One inexplicibly three,
> One in simplest unity.

… Neither will it do for us to suffer any impatience or be hurried into any act of presumption, because the Trinity of God costs us some struggles of thought, and because we cannot find immediately how to hold it without some feeling of disturbance and distraction. Simply because God is too great for our extempore and merely childish comprehension, he ought to be given us in forms that cost us labor and put us on a stretch of endeavor. So it is with all great themes. … Let no shallow presumption turn us away, then, from this glorious mystery till we have given it time enough and opened to it windows enough by our praises and our prayers, to let in the revelation of its glory. Let it also be a welcome commendation to our reverence, that so many friends of God and righteous men of the past ages, such as bore a greater fight than we and grew to greater ripeness in their saintly walk, bowed themselves adoringly before this holy mystery, and sang it with hallelujahs in the worship of their temples, in their desert fastings and their fires of testimony. And as their *Gloria Patri*, the sublimest of their doxologies, is in form a hymn for the ages, framed to be continuously chanted by the long procession of times till times are lapsed in eternity, what can we better do than let the wave lift us that lifted them, and bid it roll on: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen. —*New Englander*, Vol. 12, Nov., 1854, cited by Harris, *God the Creator and Lord of All*, I, 406–7

Praise God, from whom all blessings flow;
Praise Him, all creatures here below;
Praise Him above, ye heavenly host;
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. —Amen.

Chapter XIX

GOD THE FATHER

PROCEEDING TO a more comprehensive investigation into that which revelation discloses concerning the individual characteristics and relationships of each of the Blessed Three, that which is peculiar to the First Person, known as the *Father*, is foremost in order. First, it is essential to observe the difference between that notion concerning God which is advanced by the monotheists of the Unitarian class and the Biblical representation of the *Father*. It has too often been assumed that all systems which recognize God at all, agree with the Christian system to the extent that the First Person is shared by all, that is, the Christian belief is satisfied if two other Persons are added to the One God whom all are supposed to acknowledge alike. The error of this assumption is made evident when it is seen that the Christian's conception, based on the teaching of the Scriptures, is not that the *one God* of the Unitarian is the First Person plus two more who sustain doubtful titles to the honors of Deity; but that the *one God* is that whole Essence which subsists as Father, Son, and Spirit, and that if any one of these three Persons is to be designated as a representative of the Unitarian idea of God to whom the Christian would add two more, any one of the Three, they being absolutely equal in every particular, might be drafted with impartial propriety for such fancied discrimination. The monotheistic notion, as voiced by Jews, Mohammedans, and Unitarians, is of a God who is one Person; while the Christian's idea is of one God who answers every claim of Biblical monotheism, yet subsists in three equal Persons. The Father is not the one God of the Bible any more than is the Son or the Spirit. The Three are *one God*. It is recognized that, for the purposes of manifestation and redemption, the Son has voluntarily elected to do the will of the Father and to do that will in dependence upon the Spirit. To the same end, the Holy Spirit has voluntarily chosen not to speak from Himself as the Author of what He says, but to speak whatsoever He hears. It is unscriptural, shallow, and a dishonor to both the Son and the Spirit to assume that these voluntary subjections are due to inherent inferiority. Such a claim robs these two Persons of one of their great glories

—that of voluntary subjection to the end that worthy objectives may be realized. Unitarianism, so far as it concerns itself with the Scriptures at all, lays hold of those passages wherein this voluntary subjection is asserted and by these passages seeks to prove that the Scriptures declare an inherent inferiority of the Son and of the Spirit. To reach these conclusions, they must either discredit or wholly reject that larger body of Scripture (to be attended later) which declares the absolute Deity of the Son and Spirit. It may be concluded, then, that, outside of these more or less temporary relationships which the voluntary subjections engender, the Father is in no inherent respect superior to either the Son or the Spirit. The Fatherhood of God has several manifestations. In Ephesians 3:15 the phrase, "the whole family" over which God is said to be Father, is better rendered *every fatherhood*, which discloses the truth that this Fatherhood includes various filiations, and is itself that norm after which all fatherhoods are patterned and from which they are named. The distinctive Fatherhoods of God are:

I. Fatherhood Over Creation

The Fatherhood of God over creation is one of measureless extent. In the Ephesian passage, referred to above, there is allusion to families in heaven and on earth. In Hebrews 12:9 God is mentioned as "the Father of spirits," and in James 1:17, He is designated "the Father of lights." Similarly, in Job 38:7 angels are called sons of God (cf. Job 1:6; 2:1; Gen. 6:4). As to the more restricted relationship of the divine Fatherhood over humanity, it is written of Adam—after having traced the genealogy of Christ backward to Adam—that he is a "son of God." Thus, also, in Malachi 2:10 it is stated: "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?" Yet, again, in Acts 17:29, it is recorded that the Apostle said in his sermon to the men of Athens on Mars' Hill: "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God." These passages, with 1 Corinthians 8:6 where it is declared, "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things," teach that it is within the latitude of the Biblical use of the word *Father*, as applied to God, to comprehend all created beings as belonging to that Fatherhood. Thus it is revealed that there is a form of universal Fatherhood and universal brotherhood which, within its proper bounds, should be recognized; but this, as important as it may be, is in no way to be confused with that

Fatherhood and brotherhood which is secured by the regenerating work of the Spirit. It should be added as a qualifying fact that this general form of kinship between Deity and creation is not usually predicated of the Father, but is declared to be between God and His creation. His love for all humanity is expressed in the words, “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.”

II. Fatherhood by Intimate Relationship

The intimate relationship between Jehovah and Israel, which owed all its reality to the gracious working of God, is divinely expressed by the figure of father and son. In Exodus 4:22 record is given that Jehovah instructed Moses to say to Pharaoh: “Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my firstborn.” There is no record that they were children of God by regeneration. Nor were they at that time a redeemed people, as they were later when departing from Egypt. In anticipating God’s precious nearness to Solomon for his father’s sake, God said to David: “I will be his father, and he shall be my son” (2 Sam. 7:14). In like manner, in an effort to bring God near to the hearts of His people, the Psalmist says: “Like as a father pitieth his children, so the LORD pitieth them that fear him” (Ps. 103:13).

III. The Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ

The phrase “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” is the full title of the First Person of the blessed Trinity, and it incorporates, also, the full title of the Second Person. True, God the Father is also the Father of all who believe, but for all eternity to come He must first be recognized by that surpassing distinction which, in part, has been His throughout the eternity past, namely, the *God* and *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ. The relation of the Second Person to the First Person has from all eternity been that of a Son, and, like all else relate Θ to the Godhead, is not only eternal but is unchangeable. He did not become a Son of the Father, as some say that He did, by His incarnation, or by His resurrection, nor is He a Son by mere title, nor is He temporarily assuming such a relationship that He may execute His part in the Covenant of Redemption. Of these claims, that of sonship by the incarnation has had many exponents and none more effective

than Ralph Wardlaw, who made certain distinctions which others of that school of interpretation failed to note, namely, that the title *Son of God* is not, according to this specific belief, to signify that He is a Son through the channel of His humanity alone—which idea borders on the Unitarian opinion—nor is it true that the title belongs to His Deity alone. Dr. Wardlaw claims that it belongs to the Person of Christ including His Deity and His humanity as they both resided in Him following the incarnation. This incarnation theory of sonship does not question the preexistence of the Second Person as the Logos of God, but it does assert that the specific title *Son of God* does not apply to the Logos until the hypostatic union of the divine and human natures is formed by the incarnation. It becomes, then, a question as to *when* the title began to have a proper use. Theologians generally have been emphatic in their insistence that the divine sonship is from all eternity. Their belief in this matter is based upon clear Scripture evidence. He was the *Only Begotten* of the Father from all eternity, having no other relation to time and creation than that He is the Creator of them. It is evident that the Father and Son relationship sets forth only the features of *emanation* and *manifestation* and does not include the usual conception of derivation, inferiority, or distinction as to the time of beginning. The Son, being very God, is eternally on an absolute equality with the Father. On the other hand, the First Person became the *God* of the Second Person by the incarnation. Only from His humanity could Christ address the First Person as "My God." This He did in that moment of supreme manifestation of His humanity when on the cross He said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And again, after His resurrection, He said, "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20:17). On this point of His eternal Sonship, Dr. Van Oosterzee says:

> This relation between Father and Son had not a beginning, but existed from all *eternity*. Clearly enough is this assured to us by the Lord Himself (John 8:58; 17:5, 24), and by His first witnesses (John 1:1; Rev. 22:13; Col. 1:17, and many other places). For there is as little ground here for accepting a purely ideal pre-existence, as for speaking of a period of time before the Creation, at which the Son—previously not existing—was called into existence by the Father. Arianism, which asserts this last, is properly regarded exegetically absolutely unsupported. A sound exposition of Colossians 1:15, 16 shows, not that the Son is here placed on a level with the creature as opposed to the Father, but on a level with the invisible God as opposed to the creature. … As a legitimate consequence of all that has been said, it may be deduced that the Father gives the most perfect *revelation of Himself* in and through the Son. If the Father dwells in a light unapproachable, in the Son the Unseen has become

visible (John 1:18). In the Father we adore in like manner the Hidden One, in the Son we contemplate the God who reveals Himself (Heb. 1:3). “As the human figure reflects itself in the mirror, and all that is in the seal is found also in the impression thereof, so in Him, as the outbeaming of His invisible being, the Unseen has become visible. God finds Himself again, and reflects Himself in the Logos, as in His other I” (Tholuck). Thus is the Son one with the Father, in the communion of the Holy Ghost.—*Christian Dogmatics*, I, 278–79

Dr. Van Oosterzee, in the course of his argument, confuses the issue by drafting passages which teach the eternity of the Logos or Second Person, but do not involve any reference to the eternal Son. It will be found that but few passages give direct support to the eternity of the sonship relation; but enough of these are in evidence, it is believed, to sustain the doctrine. None of these is more conclusive than Colossians 1:15, 16, which Dr. Van Oosterzee employs in the above quotation. God is said to give His Son to be a Savior. This does not mean that God gave the Eternal Logos or Second Person who, in turn, became a Son by being given. Dr. Wardlaw, along with others, is in error, it seems, in attempting to prove the theory of sonship by incarnation from Hebrews 1:2–4. In this context the Son is said to be “appointed heir of all things.” As the appointment antedates the incarnation, so the appointment was given to the Son before the incarnation. Dr. Wardlaw makes an important comment on the scope of the meaning to be assigned to the two titles—*Son of God*, and *Son of Man*.

If, therefore, it be alleged that the same thing which we have been saying of the title Son of God might equally well be affirmed of the title Son of Man, we at once grant it. The one and the other are alike titles of His person. Neither does the one represent Him as only God, nor the other as only man; but both distinguishing Him as Emmanuel, “God manifest in the flesh.” “The name ‘Son of God’ imports that He is really God; and ‘Son of Man’ that He is really man. But as ‘Son of Man’ does not mean that He is only a man, so neither does Son of God imply that He is only God. Under the appellation Son of Man, He speaks of Himself as having come down from heaven, and being in heaven while on earth (John 3:13), as having power to forgive sins (Matt. 9), to raise the dead, and to judge the world (Matt. 25:31, 32; John 5:27). Therefore this name must include more than His human nature. Speaking of Himself under the appellation Son of God, he declares He can do nothing of Himself (John 5:19), and that the Father is greater than He (John 14:28), therefore the name Son of God must include more than His divine nature. The truth is, these names are used indifferently to denote the one person of Emmanuel, and not to give us a separate or abstract view of His natures and their peculiar actions, this being easily known from the natures of the actions themselves. In His person we find God performing the actions of man, and a man performing the actions and exercising and displaying the perfections of God; for though He was possessed of two distinct natures, yet such is their union in Him that they make but one self; so that if we abstract or separate them, we lose the person of the Son; it is no more Himself” (M’Lean’s Works, vol. iii, pp. 308, 309).—*Systematic Theology*, II, 52, 53

Various passages imply the generation of the Son,—"the only begotten of the Father"; "the only begotten Son"; "the only begotten Son of God." On the basis of these and other terms the theological distinction is set forth to the effect that the Son is eternally generated. As "the firstborn of every creature" Christ is wholly unrelated to created beings, being, as He is, begotten *before* all created beings. This distinction between Christ and creation is profound, a mystery, since its realities are outside the range of human cognition. Christ is by generation and not by creation. He is the Creator of all things. Generation is not predicated of the Father or the Spirit. This feature is peculiar to the Son. It is not the result of any divine act, but has ever been from all eternity. The words of the Nicene Creed are: "The only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father"; of the Athanasian: "The Son is from the Father alone; neither made, nor created, but begotten … generated from eternity from the substance of the Father" (cited by A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, pp. 116, 118).

It is probable that the terms *Father* and *Son*, as applied to the First and Second Persons in the Godhead, are somewhat anthropomorphic in character. That sublime and eternal relationship which existed between these two Persons is best expressed to human understanding in the terms of *father* and *son*, but wholly without implication that the two Persons, on the divine side, are not equal in every particular. On the doctrine of the subordination of the Son, Dr. John Miley has well said: "In the divine economies of religion, particularly in the work of redemption, there is a subordination of the Son to the Father. There is, indeed, this same idea of subordination in the creative and providential works of the Son. However, the fullness of this idea is in the work of redemption. The Father gives the Son, sends the Son, delivers up the Son, prepares a body for his incarnation, and in filial obedience the Son fulfills the pleasure of the Father, even unto his crucifixion (John 3:16, 17; Rom. 8:32; Psa. 40, 6-8; Heb. 10:5–7; Phil. 2:8). The ground of this subordination is purely in his filiation, not in any distinction of essential divinity" (*Systematic Theology*, I, 239).

IV. Fatherhood Over All Who Believe

Under this the fourth aspect of the divine Fatherhood, a most intimate relationship and abiding reality is in view. Generation and regeneration are closely akin. The former is the begetting of life which is the starting point of physical existence, while the latter is the begetting of life which is the starting point of spiritual existence. With the authority of God the Scriptures testify that men in their natural estate of generation are spiritually dead until born anew, or from above. This birth, with its impartation of the divine nature, is a great mystery. It, like the blowing of the wind, is discernible as to its effects, but not disclosed to man as to its operation. As to their relation to God, men are either perfectly lost, being unregenerate, or perfectly saved, being regenerate. This discriminating transformation is wholly wrought of God—He alone is able—, and, like all divine undertakings, can be aided in no way by human cooperation or virtue. The one and only relation man can sustain to this work of God is that of *faith*, belief, or confidence in God to do what He alone is able to do. Having promised this blessing in answer to faith, He never fails to do even as He has promised. The faith attitude is itself of necessity wrought of God, since the unregenerate have no such capacity of themselves. Those who believe and are saved, are the elect of God. Among many features of divine undertaking in salvation, regeneration is one. This new birth is wrought by God the Holy Spirit and results in legitimate Fatherhood on the part of God, and legitimate sonship on the part of the one who believes. Regeneration is God's own plan by which the lost may enter into that relation to Himself which is infinitely near and real, and it is no small commendation of the plan that it is wholly satisfying to infinite love. The extended soteriological aspects of regeneration need not be introduced here. Enough is said at this point if it is made clear that each individual who is born of God has thus become a son of God in the most vital and immutable meaning of sonship and has been received into the household and family of God. The regenerate one may say, and he does say, *Abba*, *Father*—a term of filial relation. This sonship, though it brings the believer into the position of an heir of God and a joint-heir with Christ, is not on the same plane with the Sonship of Christ which is from all eternity. Christ never used the phrase *our Father*. The so-called "Lord's prayer" is no exception to this since that is a prayer He taught His disciples to pray but did not and could not pray Himself. He spoke of "my Father, and your Father; my God, and your God." Nevertheless the Fatherhood and Sonship

relations between God and believers are wonderful and glorious beyond expression.

Chapter XX

God the Son: His Preexistence

The unity of God, as has been indicated, is an essential fundamental of revelation. It is presented in the Scriptures with great solemnity and is there guarded with the utmost care. Direct precepts, promises, threatenings, and examples of punishment for idolatry all tend to emphasize this basic truth. Yet added to this so vital truth and without qualification or diminution of it, the further revelation is presented, namely, that this one God subsists in three Persons. This plurality is so clearly proclaimed even in the Old Testament that the devout Jew could not have failed to observe it; nor had he any reason for rejecting it until his prejudices were aroused against the claims of One who appeared with all the credentials of his long-expected Messiah. In the exercise of that blind detriment, he departed from whatever truth he had held respecting the Deity of his Messiah and of the Spirit. He became the defender of a form of monotheism which his cherished Scriptures do not sustain. As before asserted, it is not now a matter of adding two persons to the one whom the Jew is pleased to acknowledge as his God or of designating that One to be One of Three; it is rather a recognition of the added revelation that the one God, whom all acknowledge alike, subsists in a threefold plurality. Advantaged by that disclosure, the illuminated mind becomes aware of the great truth that the Three Persons are equal in every respect and that the same honor and adoration are alike due to each. To that spiritual mind which is guided by the Scriptures, each Person of the Godhead, because of specific and individual functions, occupies a distinct place. Reference has been made already to these features which are peculiar to the Father, and reference will yet be made to those features which are peculiar to the Spirit. The present objective is the examination of those features which are peculiar to the Son, and by so much is introduced the greatest theme of Systematic Theology. Because of its surpassing, determining import, the doctrinal conflicts—and there have been many—of the Christian era have been waged over this subject. In some instances strife has been between those who believed and those who did not; but more often it has been between men of equal

sincerity who sought to determine what is true respecting the God-man, the Lord Jesus Christ. His complete humanity is clearly set forth, yet of Him it is as clearly disclosed that He is equal with the Father and the Spirit. To Him are given the titles of Jehovah, Redeemer, and Savior, and He is invested with every attribute belonging to Deity. He is the greatest theme of prophecy; about Him things are written which could not be true of any angel or man. Because of His claim to be what He is, He died under the charge of blasphemy. He bore the sins of the world in a sacrificial death, and, because of that accomplishment, He forgave sin and for His sake alone sin is forgiven to the end of the world. He arose from the dead, thus sealing His every claim to Deity. He is now seated on the Father's throne and all power is given unto Him both in heaven and on earth. He is declared to be the Creator of all things visible and invisible, the source of eternal life, the object of worship both by angels and men. He will yet raise the dead and, as Judge, determine the future estate of all created beings. On the Godward side, He is the manifestation of God to men and the Bestower of every element in human life which is acceptable to God. Such contrasts as are set up between His humanity and His Deity could not but draw out the fire of fierce and prolonged controversy—a controversy too often waged in the interests of mere metaphysical and ontological considerations without due respect to the simplicity of that reality concerning Him which the Word of God asserts. The church has learned much from these dissensions, and no truth more empirical than that the "things of Christ" are revealed only to spiritual minds and only by revelation.

As the true starting point for all worthy thinking regarding the Christ, the theologian will do well to fix in mind the essential fact that the Second Person is intrinsically equal in every respect to the other Persons in the Godhead and that He remains what He ever has been regardless of misconceptions arising either from His eternal generation, or His Sonship, or from any natural deductions arising from the fact of His incarnation or His humiliation. No approach to a Biblical Christology is possible which does not ground itself on, and proceed from, the all-determining truth that the incarnate Second Person, though He be a "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," is the eternal God. The Socinian distinction between the words *Deity* and *Divinity* and their claim that Christ was not Deity but was Divinity in the sense only that He partook of divine elements, must be

rejected. He is divine in the sense that He is absolute Deity—else the language of the Bible wholly misleads. A candid mind must acknowledge the array of evidence as to Christ's Deity, or else show equally valid reason for not doing so. The trifling attempt of Unitarians to dispose of the vast body of truth which asserts the Deity of Christ is unworthy of consideration. No more vital question has ever been propounded than this: "What think ye of Christ?" and, similarly, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" Outwardly religious men have ever said in reply: "John the Baptist, Elias, Jeremias, or one of the prophets." Others who stood nearer to Him have ever said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:13–16). No ground is left for argument with the Jew, the Mohammedan, or the atheist who repudiates the whole doctrine of Christ's supernatural being. The Arians professed great adoration for Christ, even acknowledging His preexistence; but they, believing Him to be a creation of God, rejected the truth of His *eternal* preexistence. In more recent times, the controversy has been with the Socinians and their successors, the Unitarians, all of whom with patent inconsistency have sought to retain the worthy name *Christian* while they dishonor the One whose name they espouse. This immeasurable insult to Christ would be serious enough were it confined to those who bear the Unitarian name, but these heretical teachings are again, as they have done before, penetrating the whole Christian profession under the gloss of scholarship which, being motivated by unbelief and being as dark as the natural heart of man, tends ever to promote its cherished liberalism. So-called *modernism* is not to be accounted for on the basis of a supposed weakness in the Biblical testimony. The greatest scholars of the Christian era have bowed with full submission to the authority of the Scriptures and have hailed its message as perfect and final. Unitarianism and its other self —modernism—reflect the downward pull of that unbelief which characterizes the unregenerate. The same truth abides which has sustained saints in life and filled the martyr with glory in death. The Unitarian has seldom been a martyr. Dr. Joseph Priestley was highly indignant when told by the Jew, David Levi, that when looking into the New Testament he (Levi) saw that Jesus of Nazareth was there represented as God, and for that reason he did not consider Dr. Priestley, with all his claims to the contrary, to be a Christian. The identical proofs which demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Unitarian (of whatever name) that God the Father is Deity, go on to a

demonstration of equal extent and force that the Lord Jesus Christ is Deity. Basing all upon the Word of God which alone bears dependable witness, some aspects of the vast field of Christology will now be attended.

The importance of this theme may be gathered from the fact that, directly or indirectly, about all that enters into Systematic Theology might be incorporated into Christology. Since in this work a whole volume is devoted to Christology, only such phases of this discipline will be taken up under trinitarianism as may be required in preparation for the study of Anthropology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology, and Eschatology. Likewise, since it is in the scope of Theology Proper to restrict the contemplation of the Christ to His Person apart from His works, this present treatment will conform to that dictum. The larger disquisition on Christology (Vol. V) is subject to these seven major divisions: (a) His preexistence, (b) His incarnation, (c) His death, (d) His resurrection, (e) His ascension and session, (f) His return and reign, and (g) His eternal authority and relationships. The present, more restricted discussion is divided thus: (a) His preexistence, (b) His names, (c) His Deity, (d) His incarnation, (e) His humanity, (f) the kenosis, and (g) the hypostatic union.

May the Spirit, whose work it is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto His own, illuminate the mind of the one who writes and the mind of all those who in patience pursue these pages!

The first step in the proof that the Lord Jesus Christ has His equal and rightful place in the Godhead is taken, when the truth is substantiated that He existed before He came into the world in human form. Of necessity, evidence bearing on such a stupendous theme as the preexistence of Christ will be drawn only from the Bible. No other source of information exists. The demonstration that Christ preexisted is not, however, a complete proof that He is very God. Such proof does refute the Socinian contention, namely, that He is only a man, for no man has ever existed before his birth; but it does not refute the Arian hypothesis, which is that Christ is a created being who existed as such before entering this human sphere. Decisive evidence as to the Deity of Christ will appear under another division of this general theme. Space may not be claimed here for investigation of secondary passages which only *imply* that Christ preexisted. There are various phrases in which this implication resides. He said of Himself that He was sent into the world (John 17:18); likewise it is written that He came

in the flesh (John 1:14); He took part of flesh and blood (Heb. 2:14); He was found in fashion as a man (Phil. 2:8). He said, “I am from above” (John 8:23); and “I am not of the world” (John 17:14); He spoke also of descending out of heaven (John 3:13). Here it is indicated that He preexisted and no utterances such as these could have any place in the experience of human beings. Attention is rather to be directed: (a) to major passages of indisputable import and (b) to the Person of the Angel of Jehovah.

I. Major Passages on Preexistence

John 1:15, 30. Twice in these passages John the Baptist asserts of Christ that “he was before me.” A time relationship is indicated, and, though John was older in years than Christ, he declares that Christ was *before* him. The Unitarian notion that John was stating that by divine appointment Christ is higher in rank and dignity than John, is impossible and cannot be sustained by unprejudiced exegesis. Had John made reference only to matters of appointment and dignity he would have said, “He *is* before me,” and not, “He *was* before me.” The text declares that, in point of time, Christ preceded John.

John 6:33, 38, 41, 50, 51, 58, 62. In this context is written a sevenfold declaration made by Christ that He “came down from heaven.” To this may be added Christ’s words to Nicodemus: “And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven” (John 3:13). Similarly, the assurance is made emphatic by repetition as presented in John 3:31, “He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all.” As a disposition of this body of truth, and as a pure invention which has not a vestige of support either Biblical or traditional, the Socinians offered the hypothesis that some time after His birth Christ was transported to heaven, that He might receive the Word of Truth which was committed to Him, and from thence He came down from heaven. Later promoters of this form of doctrine have assumed that these passages assert that Christ had been “admitted to an intimate knowledge of heavenly things.” Were this the case, Christ would be in no way superior to Moses or any of the prophets. In John 3:13 it is pointed out that no man

hath ascended into heaven and that Christ is the only One who has been in heaven—as one translation gives it, “No man, excepting myself, ever was in heaven.” To the same end, John 6:62 not only anticipates the literal ascension recorded in Acts 1:10, but states that, when He ascended, He returned “where he was before.” On this controversy an early writer, Dr. Edwards Nares, may be quoted with profit: “We have nothing but the positive contradictions of the Unitarian party, to prove to us that Christ did not come from heaven, though he says of himself, he did come from heaven; that though he declares he had seen the Father, he had not seen the Father; that though he assures us that he, in a most *peculiar* and *singular* manner came forth from God, he came from him no otherwise than like the prophets of old, and his own immediate forerunner” (*Remarks on the Imp*. [Unitarian] *Version*, cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 481).

John 8:58. Most emphatic, indeed, is this claim on the part of the Savior to preexistence. He said, “Before Abraham was, I am.” That the phrase *I am* sets forth the meaning of the ineffable name, *Jehovah*, and that it asserts no less than eternal existence, has been demonstrated under the general theme of *Biblical theism*. It is evident, too, that the Jews recognized that by this statement Christ declared Himself to be Jehovah. This is seen in their bitter resentment. How could He, being not yet fifty years old, have existed before Abraham? In answer to this query Christ replied that He not only existed *before* Abraham, but that He had always existed prior to the time when He was speaking. Such is the claim embodied in the application of the eternal *I am* to Himself. For the last degree of blasphemy, which the Jews believed this to be, they were by their law obligated to stone Him to death. This they proceeded to do, but Christ displayed the very supernatural power which He had professed by disappearing from their midst. The Unitarian theories that Christ was asserting that His existence at that time was prior to the time when Abraham would become the father of many nations through the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, or that Christ merely preexisted in the foreknowledge of God, are not worthy of consideration. Faustus Socinus interpreted this passage thus: “Before Abraham became Abraham, *i.e*. the father of many nations, I am or have become the Messiah” (cited by Alexander, *Theology*, I, 369). This statement was later included in the Socinian confession of faith. This momentous event is better described by John Whitaker after this manner:

> "Your Father Abraham," says our Saviour to the Jews, "rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." Our Saviour thus proposes himself to his countrymen, as their Messiah; that grand object of hope and desire to their fathers, and particularly to this first father of the faithful, Abraham. But his countrymen, not acknowledging his claim to the character of Messiah, and therefore not allowing his supernatural priority of existence to Abraham, chose to consider his words in a signification merely human. "Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" But what does our Saviour reply to this low and gross comment upon his intimation? Does he retract it, by warping his language to their poor perverseness, and so waiving his pretensions to the assumed dignity? No! to have so acted, would have been derogatory to *his* dignity, and injurious to *their* interests. He actually repeats his claim to the character. He actually enforces his pretensions to a supernatural priority of existence. He even heightens both. He mounts up far beyond Abraham. He ascends beyond all the orders of creation. And he places himself with God at the head of the universe. He thus arrogates to himself all that high pitch of dignity, which the Jews expected their Messiah to assume. This he does too in the most energetic manner, that his simplicity of language, so natural to inherent greatness, would possibly admit. He also introduces what he says, with much solemnity in the form, and with more in the repetition. "Verily, verily, I say unto you," he cries, "BEFORE ABRAHAM WAS, I AM." He says not of himself, as he says of Abraham, "Before he was, I was." This indeed would have been sufficient, to affirm his existence previous to Abraham. But it would not have been sufficient, to declare what he *now* meant to assert, his full claim to the majesty of the Messiah. He therefore drops all forms of language, that could be accommodated to the mere creatures of God. He arrests one, that was appropriate to the Godhead itself. "Before Abraham *was*," or still more properly, "Before Abraham was MADE," he says, "I AM." He thus gives himself the signature of *untreated* and *continual* existence, in direct opposition to *contingent* and *created*. … He attaches to himself that very stamp of *eternity*, which God appropriates to his Godhead in the Old Testament; and from which an apostle afterward describes "Jesus Christ" expressly, to be "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." Nor did the Jews pretend to misunderstand him now. They could not. They heard him directly and decisively vindicating the noblest rights of their Messiah, and the highest honours of their God, to himself. They considered him as a mere pretender to *those*. They therefore looked upon him, as a blasphemous arrogator of *these*. "Then took they up stones, to cast at him" as a blasphemer; as what indeed he was in his pretensions to be God, if he had not been in reality their Messiah and their God in one. But he instantly proved himself to their very senses, to be both; by exerting the energetic powers of his Godhead, upon them. For he "*hid* himself; and went out of the temple, *going through the midst of them*; and so passed by."—Cited by Watson, *op. cit*., I, 482–83

John 1:1–4, 14. This familiar portion reads: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. … And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." No Scripture is more conclusive as to the preexistence of

Christ than this. Like the preceding passage (John 8:58), the attempt is made to express the thought of eternal existence by the use of the imperfect tense with the thought implied that it is an eternal present. He *is*, not merely *was*, in existence at a time of beginning which was before He had created all things by the Word of His power (cf. vs. 3). He was not only *with* God, but He *was* God. He who ever *is*, never began to be. With fullest assurance the inspired text goes on to recount that this eternal One "was made flesh, and dwelt among us." To the order of these events, the truth they disclose, and the majesty here described, Dr. B. B. Warfield has made an illuminating comment:

> John here calls the person who became incarnate by a name peculiar to himself in the New Testament—the "Logos" or "Word." According to the predicates which he here applies to Him, he can mean by the "Word" nothing else but God Himself, "considered in His creative, operative, self-revealing, and communicating character," the sum total of what is Divine (C. F. Schmid). In three crisp sentences he declares at the outset His eternal subsistence, His eternal intercommunion with God, His eternal identity with God: "In the beginning the Word was; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God" (Jn. 1:1). "In the beginning," at that point of time when things first began to be (Gen. 1:1), the Word already "was." He antedates the beginning of all things. And He not merely antedates them, but it is immediately added that He is Himself the creator of all that is: "All things were made by him, and apart from him was not made one thing that hath been made" (1:3). Thus He is taken out of the category of creatures altogether. Accordingly, what is said of Him is not that He was the first of existences to come into being—that "in the beginning He already had come into being"—but that "in the beginning, when things began to come into being, He already *was*." It is express eternity of being that is asserted: "the imperfect tense of the original suggests in this relation, as far as human language can do so, the notion of absolute, supra-temporal existence" (Westcott). This, His eternal subsistence, was not, however, in isolation: "And the Word was with God." The language is pregnant. It is not merely coexistence with God that is asserted, as of two beings standing side by side, united in a local relation, or even in a common conception. What is suggested is an active relation of intercourse. The distinct personality of the Word is therefore not obscurely intimated. From all eternity the Word has been with God as a fellow: He who in the very beginning already "was," "was" also in communion with God. Though He was thus in some sense a second along with God, He was nevertheless not a separate being from God: "And the Word was"—still the eternal "was"—"God." In some sense distinguishable from God, He was in an equally true sense identical with God. There is but one eternal God; this eternal God, the Word is; in whatever sense we may distinguish Him from the God whom He is "with," He is yet not another than this God, but Himself is this God. The predicate "God" occupies the position of emphasis in this great declaration, and is so placed in the sentence as to be thrown up in sharp contrast with the phrase "with God," as if to prevent inadequate inferences as to the nature of the Word being drawn even momentarily from that phrase. John would have us realize that what the Word was in eternity was not merely God's coeternal fellow, but the eternal God's self.—*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, IV, 2342–43

John 17:5. In His prayer to His Father the Savior said: “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” This unqualified declaration that He had shared personally and rightfully in the glory which belonged only to Deity before the world was, is another proclamation of the truth that Christ existed before His incarnation and, being, as it is, a part of His prayer to the Father, is not subject to those restrictions which are required when men are addressed. He is speaking to the Father concerning things which belong to the eternal relationship within the Godhead. The Unitarian gloss proposes that Christ shared in the glory only in the sense that He was anticipated in the eternal counsels of God. If that were true, consistency would require that His petition to be restored to that glory was no more than a request to be returned to that nonexistent anticipation, with no expectation that He would ever attain to an actual glory.

Philippians 2:6. Here it is written: “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” This decisive passage—yet to be examined under the kenotic implications, is adduced here for but the one reason of its clear affirmation that Christ, before the incarnation, existed in the form of God. The kenotic question is one of His human form—the preincarnate, divine form being hardly subject to question, except by those who must subvert or invalidate every Scripture which opposes their preconceived ideas born of unbelief. Of the important foundation on which this passage is based, namely, the essential Deity and preexistence of Christ, Dr. B. B. Warfield has written at length, a part of which is here quoted:

> The statement is thrown into historical form; it tells the story of Christ’s life on earth. But it presents His life on earth as a life in all its elements alien to His intrinsic nature, and assumed only in the performance of an unselfish purpose. On earth He lived as a man, and subjected Himself to the common lot of men. But He was not by nature a man, nor was He in His own nature subject to the fortunes of human life. By nature He was God; and He would have naturally lived as became God—“on an equality with God.” He became man by a voluntary act, “taking no account of Himself,” and, having become man, He voluntarily lived out His human life under the conditions which the fulfilment of His unselfish purpose imposed on Him. The terms in which these great affirmations are made deserve the most careful attention. The language in which Our Lord’s intrinsic Deity is expressed, for example, is probably as strong as any that could be devised. Paul does not say simply, “He was God.” He says, “He was in the form of God,” employing a turn of speech which throws emphasis upon Our Lord’s possession of the specific quality of God. “Form” is a term which expresses the sum of those characterizing qualities which make a thing the precise thing that it is. Thus, the “form” of a sword (in this case mostly matters of external configuration) is all that makes

a given piece of metal specifically a sword, rather than, say, a spade. And "the form of God" is the sum of the characteristics which make the being we call "God," specifically God, rather than some other being—an angel, say, or a man. When Our Lord is said to be in "the form of God," therefore, He is declared, in the most express manner possible, to be all that God is, to possess the whole fulness of attributes which make God God. Paul chooses this manner of expressing himself here instinctively, because, in adducing Our Lord as our example of self-abnegation, his mind is naturally resting, not on the bare fact that He is God, but on the richness and fulness of His being as God. He was all this, yet He did not look on His own things but on those of others. It should be carefully observed also that in making this great affirmation concerning Our Lord, Paul does not throw it distinctively into the past, as if he were describing a mode of being formerly Our Lord's, indeed, but no longer His because of the action by which He became our example of unselfishness. Our Lord, he says, "being," "existing," "subsisting" "in the form of God"—as it is variously rendered … Paul is not telling us here, then, what Our Lord was once, but rather what He already was, or, better, what in His intrinsic nature He is; he is not describing a past mode of existence of Our Lord, before the action he is adducing as an example took place—although the mode of existence he describes was our Lord's mode of existence before this action—so much as painting in the background upon which the action adduced may be thrown up into prominence. He is telling us who and what He is who did these things for us, that we may appreciate how great the things He did for us are.—*Ibid*., pp. 2338–39

II. The Angel of Jehovah

The unanimity of belief on the part of all devout scholars that the Angel of Jehovah is the preincarnate second Person of the Trinity, is most significant. The entire scope of this theme cannot be introduced here. Two lines of evidence should be pursued: (a) that this Angel is a divine Person and not merely one of the created heavenly hosts; and (b) that this Angel is none other than the Christ of God, the second Person of the Blessed Three.

1. A Divine Person. The fact of appearances of a divine Person will not be questioned by any who accept the testimony of the Bible. It is recorded that He appeared once in the consummation of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (Heb. 9:26), that He now "appears in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24), and that He will yet "appear the second time without [apart from] sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28). But as Angel of Jehovah He appeared over and over again in the outworking of Jehovah's purposes and dealings with the Old Testament saints This mighty One is sometimes designated *the Angel of Jehovah*, and sometimes *the Angel of the countenance*—meaning that He was ever before the face of God. Far removed, indeed, is this Being from those angels who are created. He is an

angel only by *office*. This means that He is one of the Godhead who serves as messenger or revealer. He is ever the manifestation of God (John 1:18). The first proof to be advanced is that this Angel is Deity, regardless of appearances or service rendered.

The primary evidence that this Angel is of the Godhead is in the fact that, among various appellations, He bears the titles belonging to Deity alone—*Jehovah* and *Elohim*. As such He dwelt among Israel as the supreme and final object of their worship. To the people it was said "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Thus, whom they worshiped under divine favor was, of necessity, Deity. Concern at this point has only to do with the one designation, *Jehovah*. This title above all others is peculiar to Deity, since it is at no time applied to any other. Emphasizing this truth the Scriptures declare: "Seek him that maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night; that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth (Jehovah is his name)" (Amos 5:8, R.V.); "That they may know that thou alone, whose name is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth" (Ps. 83:18, R.V.); "I am Jehovah, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise unto graven images" (Isa. 42:8, R.V.). When this ineffable name is thus freely ascribed to the second Person, the Lord Jesus Christ, the evidence is complete that the Savior is not only Deity, but that He existed as such from all eternity. When this highest of all titles in heaven or in earth is given to One who bears the name *Angel*, as the cognomen *Angel of Jehovah* specifies, it is not that the name has been employed contrary to the Scriptures, but it indicates a Person of Deity, who, because of His peculiar service and relationships, though uncreated, is termed *Angel*. Certain passages (cf. Ex. 17:15; Num. 10:35, 36; Ezek. 48:35) wherein Jehovah is associated with material objects, provide no exception, nor should confusion arise because of the fact that this Angel is sometimes called *Jehovah* and at other times *Jehovah's Messenger*. It is recorded that Jehovah said, "I will send my angel [or, messenger]," but that Angel is as clearly said to be Jehovah Himself. The same Person is evidently in view whether Jehovah says, "I will send my angel," or "I will go." If an insoluble mystery arises at this point, it is none other than that which permeates the entire doctrine of the Trinity with its one Essence. All passages bearing on the Angel of Jehovah are evidence and should be

considered (Gen. 16:7; 18:1; 22:11, 12; 31:11–13; 32:24–32; 48:15, 16; Ex. 3:2, 14; Josh. 5:13, 14; Judg. 3:19–22; 2 Kings 19:35; 1 Chron. 21:15, 16; Ps. 34:7; Zech: 14:1–4). From these Scriptures the demonstration is conclusive that the Angel of Jehovah is part of the eternal Godhead.

2. Part of the Trinity. In like manner, the Scriptures are equally clear in presenting the truth that the Angel of Jehovah of the Old Testament is the Christ of the New Testament. To a considerable degree, the understanding of all that is set forth must depend upon the recognition of the fact that the words *messenger* and *servant*, as used of Jehovah, are equivalent to the name *Angel of Jehovah*. The appearances of Deity as recorded in the Old Testament are very rarely of the First Person as such. It is rather the Manifester, the Messenger, of Jehovah—His Angel, or the Angel of Jehovah, who appears and who undertakes. It is none other than the One by whom all things were created, who is designated in the New Testament as the Christ of God (Col. 1:16; Heb. 1:2). As the Messenger of the covenant He appeared to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and Hagar. He led Israel out of Egypt. He administered the law at Sinai, and He will be the Executor as well as the Sustainer of the covenant yet to be made with Israel (Jer. 31:31–33). There could be no doubt but that the tabernacle, and later the temple, were to be the place where Jehovah was pleased to dwell and to meet His people. Malachi declares that the Messenger of the covenant will suddenly come to His temple. That it is styled *His temple* implies that the Messenger is Jehovah who abode in the temple and for whom it existed. The passage, which evidently refers to the second advent of Christ, reads: “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts” (Mal. 3:1). However, He had come as suddenly to the tabernacle which Moses built in the wilderness, and as suddenly to the temple which Solomon built and dedicated to Jehovah. Thus He will come, as Malachi predicts, to the temple which will be in Jerusalem and from thence enter into those long-anticipated judgments which are yet to fall upon Israel. But, when Christ was here on earth and when in Jerusalem, He was ever in the temple. It was to Him the house of His abode. The crucial event which had the greatest significance concerning His relation to the temple in the time of

His first advent was His formal entrance into the temple, as the consummation of His so-called "triumphal" entry into Jerusalem—which event all Evangelists are careful to report. This occurrence, it will be seen, is a conspicuous advent of Jehovah to His temple. When approaching Jerusalem from Galilee, Christ stopped at the foot of the Mount of Olives and sent two disciples on to a village to procure the colt of an ass which He might ride into the city. The remaining distance was less than a mile. The securing of this conveyance was not for personal distinction of a self-centered kind, nor was it due to weariness. It had been predicted that He would so enter the city in the days of His lowly guise. The act was specified in the program for the Messiah as definitely as was His birth of a virgin in Bethlehem. Every instructed Jew was aware of this. The prophecy reads: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass" (Zech. 9:9; cf. Matt. 21:1–10; Mark 11:1–10; Luke 19:29–40; John 12:12–15). Thus Christ fulfilled the expectation concerning the Messiah and was none other than Jehovah's Messenger of the Old Testament. The reaction of the people can be explained in no other way than that they unwittingly, or otherwise, cooperated in the fulfillment of this so-important prediction. They said, "Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord [Jehovah]; Hosanna in the highest" (Matt. 21:9). It was Passover and the city was filled with Jews from many foreign places. Up to this time Christ had avoided display lest His enemies should precipitate His death before His ministry was completed. It was at its end and now, by this act, He asserts His Messianic claim. Were the hosannas of the multitude to be suppressed, the stones would cry out—so great, indeed, was the imperative demand that prophecy be fulfilled. Speaking with the authority of Jehovah, He said as He entered the temple: "My house is the house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves."

Regarding the ministry of John the Baptist, it is said that he fulfilled the prophecy by Isaiah—"the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD [Jehovah], make straight in the desert a highway for our God" (Isa. 40:3). Thus Christ, whom John announced, *was* and *is* Jehovah and, if He is Jehovah, He preexisted from all eternity. After the same manner, the Angel who appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, to Moses at

the bush, and as the voice which shook the earth, is as clearly identified as the Christ of the New Testament. He is the Angel of Jehovah. On this conclusion which is sustained by the Scriptures, upheld by the early Fathers, and by all interpreters who seek the honor of Christ, Richard Watson writes: "It has now therefore been established that the Angel Jehovah, and Jesus Christ our Lord, are the same person; and this is the first great argument by which his Divinity is established. … We trace the manifestations of the same person from Adam to Abraham; from Abraham to Moses; from Moses to the prophets; from the prophets to Jesus. Under every manifestation he has appeared in the form of God, never thinking it robbery to be equal with God. 'Dressed in the appropriate robes of God's state, wearing God's crown, and wielding God's sceptre,' he has ever received Divine homage and honour. No name is given to the Angel Jehovah, which is not given to Jehovah Jesus; no attribute is ascribed to the one, which is not ascribed to the other; the worship which was paid to the one by patriarchs and prophets, was paid to the other by evangelists and apostles; and the Scriptures declare them to be the same august person,—the image of the Invisible, whom no man can see and live;—*the Redeeming Angel, the Redeeming Kinsman, and the Redeeming God"* (*Theological Institutes*, I, 504).

In view of the testimony of so extended a body of Old Testament Scripture, none can reasonably doubt but that Jehovah is coming to establish a reign of righteousness in all the earth. Thus it is written in Psalm 96:11–13 (R.V.) and repeated in substance in Psalm 98:7–9, which emphasis should not be unnoticed: "Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein; let the floods clap their hands; let the hills sing for joy together before Jehovah; for he cometh to judge the earth: he will judge the world with righteousness, and the peoples with equity" (R.V.). This is a description of the second advent of Messiah and the response of the enlightened heart is prepared in the closing phrase of the Bible—"Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Chapter XXI

GOD THE SON: HIS NAMES

THE MESSIANIC character of Psalm 45 cannot be questioned. Its closing verse is a promise and a prophecy, "I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations: therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever." Because of all that is disclosed in the name of the Messiah, He shall be praised in all generations. Large indeed is the sum total of all His names, His titles, and His descriptive designations. Because of His incarnation, His work in redemption, and His multiplied relationships, the number of His appellations exceeds those of the Father, the Spirit, and all the angels so far as these are revealed. As is true of each Person of the Godhead, the names of the Second Person are a distinct revelation. It is probable that almost every essential truth resident in the Second Person is expressed in some specific name, e.g., *Emmanuel* speaks of His incarnation relationships, *Jesus* of His salvation, the *Son of man* of His humanity, the *Son of God of* His Deity, *Lord* of His authority, the *Son of David* of His throne rights, *Faithful and True* of His manifestations, and *Jesus Christ the Righteous* of the equity with which He meets the condemnation due the Christian because of sin. Some of the major titles are to be considered more specifically.

I. Jehovah, Lord

Some truth relative to the Jehovah character of the Second Person has been set forth in the previous discussion. Without restating what has gone before, added evidence may well be advanced to the end that the glory may be unto Him to whom it belongs. He is properly styled *Jehovah*. This is because of the fact that He is *Jehovah*; yet it will be remembered this designation is applicable to none but Deity. It is the ineffable name which represents that eternal exaltation which cannot be communicated to any creature. In Psalm 83:18 it is written: "That men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth." Similarly, in Isaiah 42:8, "I am Jehovah, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise unto graven images" (R.V.). No greater proof of Deity could be presented concerning Christ than that He

should rightfully be called *Jehovah*. Only a little attention need be exercised to discover how constantly the Jehovah title is ascribed to Christ. In Zechariah 12:10 Jehovah predicts concerning Himself: “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.” Of none other of the Godhead than Christ could it be said that He was “pierced” and one for whom the people would “mourn,” yet this is Jehovah who speaks. What other application could be given of Revelation 1:7, which reads, “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him”? To the same end, the prophecy presented in Jeremiah 23:5, 6 declares that the Righteous Branch, a son of David, who is Himself a King, shall be called *Jehovah our Righteousness*. It is Christ and not another who is made unto believers *righteousness* (1 Cor. 1:30), and it is only *in Christ* that they are *made the righteousness of God* (Rom. 3:22; 2 Cor. 5:21). Again, Jehovah who ascended up on high and led captivity captive, according to Psalm 68:18, is, in Ephesians 4:8–10, none other than Christ. And in Psalm 102 where the name *Jehovah* appears many times and in verse 12 with special significance, that enduring Person is declared in Hebrews 1:10 ff. to be the Lord Jesus Christ. Isaiah’s testimony, “Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD [Jehovah] of hosts,” is interpreted by the Apostle John to be a reference to Christ. He states: “These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him” (Christ—John 12:41). It may yet be added that as Jehovah of the Old Testament declares Himself to be the First and the Last (Isa. 41:4; 44:6; 48:12), so Christ, according to Revelation 1:8, 17, 18; 22:13, 16 is the same First and Last. The hosts of heaven have no thought of withholding from Christ the honor due unto Jehovah. Of their song it is written, “And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made

manifest" (Rev. 15:3, 4). As has been observed, Christ is Jehovah of the temple (cf. Matt. 12:6; Mal. 3:1; Matt. 21:12, 13), and He is Jehovah of the Sabbath (Matt. 12:8).

A distinct and extensive proof that Christ is Jehovah is to be seen in the New Testament title of *Lord* which is applied to Him upwards of a thousand times. *Jehovah* is a Hebrew term which is not brought forward into the New Testament. Its equivalent is κύριος, which title is also applied to the Father and the Spirit. It is a justifiable procedure to treat the name *Jehovah* of the Old Testament as continued in its specific meaning into the New Testament by the name *Lord*. Such would be the natural meaning of many exalted declarations: "Lord of all" (Acts 10:36), "Lord over all" (Rom. 10:12), "Lord of glory" (1 Cor. 2:8), and "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Rev. 17:14; 19:16).

II. Elohim, God

The body of Scripture in which this title is assigned to the Second Person is manifold indeed. In two notable passages in Isaiah the advent of Christ is anticipated and there in each He is styled *Elohim*. Predicting the ministry of the forerunner and his message, the prophet writes: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God" (Isa. 40:3). In the fulfillment of this anticipation, Luke declares that Christ is in view. He states: "As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (3:4). It is evident that the word *our* as used in this prophetic passage includes the saints of all the ages and affirms the truth that the one who bears this title is Creator, Benefactor, and Judge, and that to Him supreme adoration is ever due. None from among men could ever answer the claims of this exalted name. After the same manner in a passage none will misinterpret, Isaiah, in the midst of other equally significant appellations, states that Christ is *the mighty El*. The passage reads, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God [El], The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne

of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (9:6, 7). The accompanying ascriptions in this passage are as exalting as the title, *mighty God*. He is Wonderful, Counsellor, Father of eternity, and a King who will establish a kingdom of perfect peace. This mighty God is born as a child. The Ancient of days becomes an infant in a woman's arms; the Father of eternity is a Son given to the world. Each appellation breathes out the character of Deity and together they without question belong to the Second Person alone.

The New Testament bears even a greater witness. Of John the Baptist it was said that he would turn many to "the Lord their God." The Apostle John certifies that "the Word was God." Emmanuel, Matthew says, is "God with us"—not as a mere spiritual presence, but a complete identification with the human family forever. The Apostle Paul enjoins the elders at Ephesus to "feed the church of God, which he [God] hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). The writer to the Hebrews says of Christ: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Thomas, in spite of his incredulity, declares, "My Lord and my God," and the Apostle Paul in another Scripture anticipates the return of Christ as "the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:13). It may be accepted as true that in the combined titles such as *God and Father, Christ and God, God and our Saviour, the great God and our Saviour*, but one Person is in view. Thus Christ is specifically called *God* (cf. Rom. 15:6; Eph. 1:3; 5:5, 20; 2 Pet. 1:1). In 1 John 5:20, 21, Christ is designated, "the true God, and eternal life." So He is "the blessed God" and "God over all" (Rom. 9:5).

III. Son of God, Son of Man

An interesting and fruitful study is presented in these two titles. Christ did not often designate Himself as *Son of God*, though He accepted that address whenever it was offered to Him by others. That He asserted that He is the *Son of God* led to the charge of blasphemy in His trial (Luke 22:67–71). In this instance He was asked two direct questions, namely, "Art thou the Christ?" and, "Art thou the Son of God?" It is possible that, in the estimation of the Jews, to claim to be Messiah was not as great an evil as to

claim to be the Son of God. He was condemned for blasphemy because of His unqualified assertion that He is the Son of God. John adds in John 5:18, "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God," and, again, in 10:33, "The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." It is evident also that Christ spoke repeatedly of God as His Father, and though He reminded His followers that God is their Father, His own Sonship is a reality which He never classed with others. This is true regarding every form of sonship which the Bible recognizes and especially is it true of the sonship which believers sustain to God through regeneration. He taught His disciples to pray "Our Father which art in heaven," but He did not, and could not, pray that prayer with them (cf. Matt. 11:27). John's Gospel makes much of the *Son of God* title and properly, since it is the Gospel of His Deity. In that Gospel, *the Son*—which evidently is an abbreviation of the full title *the Son of God*—executes judgment (5:22); He has life in Himself and quickeneth whom He will (5:26, 21). He gives eternal life (10:10); it is the will of the Father that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father (5:23); the Son does only what He sees the Father do (5:19), and only that which He hears from the Father does He speak (14:10); and the Son confesses that, on the divine side, He has a Father and, on the human side, He has a God (20:17). A conclusive and arresting Scripture in this connection is Matthew 28:18–20, which reads: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Here it is seen that not only all authority is given to the Son, but He is named in the Trinity on an equality with the other Persons of the Godhead. The Apostle Paul began His incomparable ministry with no uncertain word as to the Son of God. It is written of him: "And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God," and his continued emphasis upon the Deity of the Son is well set forth in Romans 1:1–4: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, (which he had promised afore by his prophets in the

holy scriptures,) concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection, from the dead."

Concerning the name *Son of man*, the fact is to be recognized for all that it connotes, that Christ almost universally referred to Himself by this title. He so represents Himself thirty times in Matthew, fifteen times in Mark, twenty-five times in Luke, and twelve times in John. The designation, as belonging to Christ, appears once in Acts (7:56) and twice in Revelation (1:13; 14:14). This cognomen appears in certain parts of the Old Testament, notably, Psalms, Ezekiel, and Daniel. In later years much consideration has been given to the problem why Christ chose this designation rather than the more exalting name—*Son of God*. The impression generally held in earlier years was that the term *Son of God* emphasizes the Deity of the Savior, while the term *Son of man* emphasizes His humanity. It is highly probable that in the majority of cases this difference obtains. However, such is not always the case. The *Son of man* title covers a wide range of reality. In Mark 2:28 it is declared that "the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." while in Matthew 8:20 Christ appears under the same name in lowly guise, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." Some have sought to account for Christ's continued use of this name on the ground that it appears in the Old Testament. Such a connection can hardly be established, though there is clear anticipation of the Messiah under this designation in Daniel 7:13, 14. The choice of this appellation on the part of Christ does not seem to be restricted to Messianic aspects of His ministry. The people inquired, "Who is this Son of man?" (John 12:34), and Christ inquired, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" (Matt. 16:13). The varied reply, like the question on the part of the people, hardly indicated that this specific title was associated generally with the Messianic hope. It would seem rather from His own viewpoint, with the background of His Deity from all eternity in mind, the natural feature of His Person to be stressed while here on the earth was that which was new—His humanity. In this He was drawing near to those to whom He spoke and to whom He was ministering. Doubtless a contact was established under the relationship which the humanity title suggested, that could not have been secured under the divine title. The use

of the *Son of man* title by the Savior did not preclude Him from presenting Himself in any exalted position which occasion might demand. An important disclosure is made in Mark 10:45 concerning the Son of man: “For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.”

IV. Lord Jesus Christ

Essential truth relative to the Person of the Redeemer is revealed in this, His complete and official title. The name *Lord*, being none other than Jehovah, declares His Deity. The name *Jesus* belongs to His humanity and the way of salvation through His redeeming Sacrifice—“A body hast thou prepared me.” The title *Christ*, though used as a general identification of the Second Person, in its technical implication means all that is anticipated in the Old Testament—Prophet, Priest, and King. Since these offices as represented by these titles occupy so large a place in Christology and must be yet considered at length in other divisions of Systematic Theology, they will not be pursued further here.

The first sentence of the first preserved writing of the Apostle Paul employs a designation of Deity, which seems to be that commonly used by him, “God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess. 1:1. Cf. 2 Thess. 1:1; Gal. 1:1; 1 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:2; Rom. 1:7; Eph. 1:2; 6:23; Col. 1:2; Philemon 1:3; Phil. 1:2; 1 Tim. 1:2; Titus 1:4; 2 Tim. 1:2). From this, the exalted character of this name and of the One who bears it may be seen. The designation, *Lord Jesus Christ*, is as elevated as the term *God*, with which it is coupled.

Chapter XXII

God the Son: His Deity

As there is no question among professing Christians about the Deity of either the Father or the Spirit, it is reasonable to suppose that there would have been no question raised about the Deity of the Son had He not become incarnate in human form. The Deity of the Son is asserted in the Bible as fully and as clearly in every particular as is the Deity of the Father or the Spirit. On the other hand, the humanity of the Savior is as dogmatically set forth. To those who in their thinking keep these two natures of Christ separate both with respect to substance and manifestation, there is less perplexity about Christ's Deity. Difficulty arises with those who, assuming that they must blend these natures, attempt to strike an average in which His Deity is lowered and His humanity is exalted to a point of equivalence. To such persons, the resulting error is twofold: the Deity of the Lord is submerged in doubt and the humanity of the Lord is deprived of all its naturalness. Under those conditions, the Scriptures which so clearly present each of these two natures must either be disputed or qualified beyond effectiveness. The hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ is to be considered in another section of this general theme. However, it should be observed at this place, that the true scientific method would be first to establish the fact of the two natures of Christ before undertaking to enter upon the mystery involved. The truth of the two natures is fully demonstrated; the mystery resides in their coexistence in one person. Of this scientific method Dr. A. B. Winchester has written:

> The bush burning and unconsumed was a great mystery. Moses might have turned from it to consider something "practical"—as men of affairs say. If he had done so what a vision, an experience, a life-work, a character, and a glory he would have missed! All progress of knowledge in *any* kind is made possible only by the recognition at once of fact and of mystery. Every fact has its mystery, and each mystery has its fact. The scientific procedure is to make the known, the stepping stone to the unknown; to advance from the simple to the complex; from the fact to the mystery. To invert that order, ignore the fact and begin with the mystery is unscientific and an effective barrier to any possible advance in knowledge. Remember this is the inexorable law of advance in knowledge of any kind, secular or religious. "Great is the mystery of godliness: *God* was *manifest* in the *flesh*." … (1 Tim. 3:16.) In studying this "great mystery" we must follow the same order, *i.e.*, first the fact, then the mystery. This is precisely what rationalistic theologians and skeptics have not done.

> Moses was scientific. His attention was arrested by the fact of the bush and the fact of the flame. He would investigate the facts reverently and carefully, waiting patiently for the unfolding of the mystery. Beloved, do not miss that important lesson. That lowly bush burning unconsumed is a type radiant with the glory of the angel of the Covenant, our gracious and glorious Lord Jesus Christ. It foreshadows Him in the mysterious constitution of His complex Person and in the great redeeming work which necessitated for its accomplishment the union (not blending) of the divine and human natures in one mysterious and glorious Person. The flame in the unconsumed bush typified the presence of Jehovah-Jesus, anticipating, as in other types, the future appearing in "flesh" of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ.—*God Hath Spoken,* pp. 179–80

The Second Person has ever been the manifestation of Deity and never more so than in and through the incarnation. So vital is this truth that He could say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14:9), and "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. 11:27). The manifestation of the Godhead is not dependent alone upon the humanity of the Son secured through the incarnation, for He was the perfect Revealer for all eternity. Because of this, He only served as the Angel of Jehovah. There is abundant reason to believe that finite humanity, of itself, could never serve as a medium through which infinity might be expressed. It follows from Christ's words recorded in John 5:23 (R.V.) and 1 John 2:22, 23, that he who fails to see God in Christ does not see God at all. It follows, also, that the first step to be taken in an approach to the understanding of the Person of Christ is an unprejudiced recognition of His Deity. Certain lines of evidence establish this reality:

I. Divine Attributes Belong to Christ

There is no attribute of Deity which is not declared to be in Christ and to the full measure of infinity. Of these note may be made of:

1. Eternity. This attribute can be applied to none but God. It is possible that angels have lived to observe uncounted ages come and go, but multiplied ages do not make an eternity. It is a specific and peculiar assertion to claim for any being the attribute of *eternity*. In Isaiah 9:6, Christ is styled "The everlasting Father," or *Father of eternity*, and Micah declares that this same Jesus who on the human side was to be born in Bethlehem,

was, on the divine side, He "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (Mic. 5:2). Thus, also, John announces that this Logos of God *was* in the beginning and is none other than the eternal God (John 1:1, 2). Of Himself He said, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58). By this declaration Christ proclaimed His Deity and His enemies so understood Him, for they took up stones to kill Him on the charge of blasphemy. He is *eternal life* and the bestower of it. A creature by generation may beget after its kind, but none but an eternal Being could beget eternal life. The new birth is "from above."

2. IMMUTABILITY. No created thing can be said to be immutable. Jehovah can say of Himself, "I am the LORD ['Jehovah'], I change not" (Mal. 3:6). Psalm 102:25–27 is a message concerning Jehovah which is quoted in Hebrews 1:10–12, and there applied to Christ, and after this manner, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." The Lord Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever" (Heb. 13:8).

3. OMNIPOTENCE. As before indicated, the title *Almighty God* is used as a designation of Christ (Rev. 1:8). It is written that He shall reign until all enemies are destroyed (1 Cor. 15:25), and that "He is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:21).

4. OMNISCIENCE. It is as definitely maintained that Christ knew all things. John states that He knew from the beginning those who would not believe, and the one that would betray Him (John 6:64), and that He knew "what was in man" (John 2:25). Peter said, "Lord, thou knowest all things" (John 21:17). The Lord said of Himself, "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father" (John 10:15). Of Mark 13:32 where it is recorded that Christ declared that He did not know the day or the hour of His return, it may be observed that the passage is not unlike 1 Corinthians 2:2, where the Apostle wrote, "For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified," the thought being *not to make known*, or

not to cause another to know. The truth mentioned was not then, as to its time, committed either to the Son or to the angels to publish.

5. Omnipresence. No attribute is more distinctive in the realms of that which is peculiar to Deity than omnipresence, and none more foreign to the creature; yet of Christ it is said that He "filleth all in all" (Eph. 1:23). Christ promised that He whose residence was to be in heaven would, with the Father and as Jehovah walked with Israel (Lev. 26:12), come and make His abode with the believers (John 14:23). He also promised that, where two or three are gathered together unto His name, He would be in the midst of them (Matt. 18:20). So, also, He has declared to His messengers in all lands and throughout the age, "Lo, I am with you always" (Matt. 28:20, R.V.).

6. Other Major Attributes. To these divine attributes already named as belonging to the Savior, may be added all others, notably, *life* (John 1:4; 5:26; 10:10; 14:6; Heb. 7:16); *truth* (John 14:6; Rev. 3:7); *holiness* (Luke 1:35; John 6:69; Heb. 7:26); and *love* (John 13:1, 34; 1 John 3:16).

Thus it is effectively reasoned that, if attributes represent the elements of being and the divine attributes are the distinguishing features of Deity and every divine attribute is fully ascribed to Christ, He is Deity in the most absolute sense.

II. The Prerogatives of Deity are Ascribed to Christ

It is predicated of the Savior that He is Creator of all things and their Preserver, and that He has authority over His creation. He forgives sin, He will raise the dead, and He will judge the world. True worship is offered to Him and is received by Him. He is honored as Deity by inspired writers, and those who know Him best love and serve Him most. Some of these patent truths may well be considered more at length:

1. He is Creator of All Things. But three major passages need be introduced in support of this declaration. With what seems to be some consideration of the Mosaic account concerning creation, John declares, *positively*, that "all things were made by him" (the Logos); and, *negatively*, "without him was not any thing made"; and, *universally*, "the world was made by him" (John 1:3, 10). A more conclusive, dogmatic assertion could

not be framed. The very material world in which He lived and moved was the work of His own hands. With the same positive and universal signification the Apostle, by the Spirit, states, “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist” (Col. 1:16); and with the added truth that all elements in His universe are held together by Him. Lastly, in Hebrews 1:10 it is written, “And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands.” Therefore, if to create all things as *Originator* of them and to be the object of them as *Proprietor*, is a mark of Deity, the Lord Jesus Christ is, in the absolute sense, God.

2. He is Preserver of All Things. The Lord of glory, the Savior of the world, upholds all things by the word of His power (Heb. 1:3), and, as noted above, is that One by whom all things are sustained (Col. 1:17). As vast as the universe may be, it is one organic whole which is bound and held by one omnipotent Person—the Christ of God.

3. He Pardons Sin. The right and authority to pardon sin, since sin is evil because of its offense against God, could be exercised only by God Himself. Hence when, as in various instances, Christ acted directly in the pardon of sin He, by so much, asserted that He is God. On one occasion He wrought a notable miracle to convince the scribes that “the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins” (Luke 5:24). Thus, also, it is disclosed that Christ forgives the sins of believers. The Apostle writes: “Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye” (Col. 3:13).

4. Christ Will Raise the Dead. This He did while here on earth. When identifying that which is peculiar to Deity, the Apostle writes: “that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead” (2 Cor. 1:9). To the same purpose Christ said, “For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will” (John 5:21). John 5:28, 29 presents a clear prediction: “Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his

voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." So emphatically, indeed, has Christ the power to raise the dead that He is styled "the resurrection, and the life" (John 11:25).

5. Christ Apportions the Rewards of Saints. Though delivered from all judgment due to sin and because of the fact that Christ has borne their sins, the redeemed of this age do, nevertheless, all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, there to receive His approval or disapproval concerning their service for Him (2 Cor. 5:10).

6. The Judgment of the World is Committed to Christ. The Lord Himself said, "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (John 5:22). With this in view, it is to be noted that the dead, small and great, shall stand before *God* and be judged by Him (Rev. 20:12). Thus Christ is identified as God and declared to be God.

7. That Worship Which Belongs Only to God is Freely Rendered to Christ. Worship of God is primarily on the ground of the fact that God is the Creator. The Psalmist says, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the LORD our maker" (Ps. 95:6). In the same manner Christ declared: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). No man—not even an apostle—would suffer himself to be worshiped (cf. Acts 10:25, 26; 14:8–15); nor will any unfallen angel accept the worship which belongs to God alone (Rev. 22:8, 9). Yet Christ stated: "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him" (John 5:23). The sense in which Christ is to be honored may be determined by the way in which the inspired writers honor Him. On His ascension to heaven, they worshiped Him (Luke 24:52), and the early Christians were designated as those who call upon the name of Christ (Acts 9:14; cf. 22:16; Rom. 10:13; 1 Cor. 1:2). To those at all familiar with the New Testament text, it need not be pointed out that, as He was worshiped in His preincarnate glory (Isa. 6:3), so Christ is even more presented as the object of worship after His incarnation. It is no small feature of this consequence that all prayer is now to be made in Christ's name (John 14:13, 14), and that those who knew Him best were by so much the more impelled

to adore Him. He has always proved Himself to be the satisfying portion of all the saints of this and past ages.

How complete, then, is the evidence which establishes Christ's actual Divinity! It has been demonstrated that He existed from all eternity in the form of God, that He bears the titles of Deity, that the attributes of Deity are predicated of Him, and that He functions in all the prerogatives of Deity—He is Creator and Preserver of the universe, the Pardoner of sin, the One who raises the dead, who bestows eternal life and eternal rewards, who judges the world, and who receives the worship of angels and of men. No more is declared of the Father or the Spirit than is declared of the Son. To question this body of evidence is to reject proof altogether, which path leads logically to the rejection of God and to atheism. Either the Lord Jesus Christ is God in the fullest sense or there is no God at all.

No better summarization in brief form of the evidence that Christ is God has been found than that by Samuel Greene:

> In the Holy Scriptures we learn of Christ, that his *name* is Jehovah; the Lord of Hosts; the Lord God; the Lord of Glory; the Lord of all; he is the true God; the Great God; and God over all; the First and the Last; the self-existent I AM. We see that all the *attributes* and incommunicable perfections of Jehovah belong to Christ. He is Eternal, Immutable, Omnipresent, Omniscient, Omnipotent! We see that the *works* which can be done by none but Jehovah himself, are done by Christ. He created all worlds; upholdeth all things by the word of his power; governs the whole universe, and provides for all creation; the power of his voice will call forth all the millions of the dead at the resurrection; he will judge them all in the great day. Although the company before his awful tribunal will be innumerable as the sand upon the seashore, yet will he perfectly recollect all their actions, words, and thoughts, from the birth of creation to the end of time: too much for man, but easy to Christ! He is also *to his Church* what none but God can be. He hath chosen his people before the world was; the Church is his own property; he redeemed a lost world; he is the source of all grace and eternal salvation to his people; and it is he that sends the Holy Ghost down to prepare the Church for glory, which he presents unto himself at last, and gives her the kingdom. And we are *to act towards Christ* exactly in the same manner as we are to act towards God the Father; to believe in him; to be baptized in his name; to pray unto him; and to serve and worship him, even as we serve and worship the Father. These are the things which irresistibly prove the Godhead of Immanuel. What stronger proofs than these have we of the existence of Jehovah? —*Present Day Tracts. Christology*. "The Divinity of Jesus Christ," p. 30

Objections

It is not the purpose of this work to dwell to any extent on the negative side of any truth; but like the foundational doctrine of the inspiration of the

Scriptures, so has the equally foundational doctrine of the Person of Christ been assailed. Objections usually disclose the inability of the objector to recognize and receive the truth set forth in the Word of God. This is especially true in the two fundamental doctrines named. In each there is a union of that which is divine with that which is human. The dual authorship of the Bible is an insolvable mystery to the unregenerate mind; so, also, is the union of two natures in Christ. Concerning the objections which are made against the truth of Christ's Deity, a fair illustration is presented by Dr. B. B. Warfield from the writings of Schmiedel:

> Proceeding after this fashion Schmiedel fixes primarily on five passages which seem to him to meet the conditions laid down; that is to say, they make statements which are in conflict with the reverence for Jesus that pervades the Gospels and therefore could not have been invented by the authors of the Gospels, but must have come to them from earlier fixed tradition; and they are preserved in their crude contradiction with the standpoint of the evangelists, accordingly, only by one or two of them, while the others, or other, of them, if they report them at all, modify them into harmony with their standpoint of reverence. These five passages are: Mk. 10:17 ff. ("Why callest thou me good? None is good save God only"); Mt. 12:31 ff. (blasphemy against the Son of Man can be forgiven); Mk. 3:21 (His relations held Him to be beside Himself); Mk. 13:32 ("Of that day and of that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son but the Father"); Mk. 15:34, Mt. 27:46 ("My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"). To these he adds four more which have reference to Jesus' power to work miracles, viz.: Mk. 8:12 (Jesus declines to work a sign); Mk. 6:5 ff. (Jesus was able to do no mighty works in Nazareth); Mk. 8:14–21 ("The leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod" refers not to bread but to teaching); Mt. 11:5; Lk. 7:22 (the signs of the Messiah are only figuratively miraculous). These nine passages he calls "the foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus." In his view, they prove, on the one hand, that "he [Jesus] really did exist, and that the Gospels contain at least some trustworthy facts concerning him,"—a matter which, he seems to suggest, would be subject to legitimate doubt in the absence of such passages; and, on the other hand, that "in the person of Jesus we have to do with a completely human being, and that the divine is to be sought in him only in the form in which it is capable of being found in a man." From them as a basis, he proposes to work out, admitting nothing to be credible which is not accordant with the non-miraculous, purely human, Jesus which these passages imply.—*Christology and Criticism*, pp. 189–90

Further comment is uncalled for beyond the statement of the truth, that if the Christ of God be set forth as both God and man, it is to be expected that His humanity will be presented along with His Deity. That this is the plan and intent of the Bible needs no defense.

Richard Watson has written a worthy declaration of Christ's essential Deity. It should be preserved and read by all:

Of Christ, it will be observed that the titles of Jehovah, Lord, God, King, King of Israel, Redeemer, Saviour, and other names of God, are ascribed to him,—that he is invested with the attributes of eternity, omnipotence, ubiquity, infinite wisdom, holiness, goodness, etc.,—that he was the Leader, the visible King, and the object of the worship of the Jews,—that he forms the great subject of prophecy, and is spoken of in the predictions of the prophets in language, which if applied to men or to angels would by the Jews have been considered not as sacred but idolatrous, and which, therefore, except that it agreed with their ancient faith, would totally have destroyed the credit of those writings,—that he is eminently known both in the Old Testament and in the New, as the Son of God, an appellative which is sufficiently proved to have been considered as implying an assumption of Divinity by the circumstance that, for asserting it, our Lord was condemned to die as a blasphemer by the Jewish sanhedrim,—that he became incarnate in our nature,—wrought miracles by his own original power, and not, as his servants, in the name of another,—that he authoritatively forgave sin, —that for the sake of his sacrifice, sin is forgiven to the end of the world, and for the sake of that alone,—that he rose from the dead to seal all these pretensions to Divinity,—that he is seated upon the throne of the universe, all power being given to him in heaven and in earth, —that his inspired apostles exhibit him as the Creator of all things visible and invisible; as the true God and the eternal life; as the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God and our Saviour,—that they offer to him the highest worship,—that they trust in him, and command all others to trust in him for eternal life,—that he is the head over all things,—that angels worship him and render him service,—that he will raise the dead at the last day,—judge the secrets of men’s hearts, and finally determine the everlasting state of the righteous and the wicked.—*Theological Institutes*, I, 473

Chapter XXIII

GOD THE SON: HIS INCARNATION

THE INCARNATION is rightfully included as one of the seven major events in the history of the universe from its recorded beginning to its recorded ending. These events in their chronological order are: (1) the creation of the angelic hosts (Col. 1:16); (2) the creation of material things, including man (Gen: 1:1–31); (3) the incarnation (John 1:14); (4) the death of Christ (John 19:30); (5) the resurrection of Christ (Matt. 28:5, 6); (6) the second advent of Christ (Rev. 19:11–16); and (7) the creation of the new heavens and the new earth (Rev. 21:1; Isa. 65:17).

These stupendous events are not only the greatest divine undertakings, each one of them, but they, in turn, indicate the beginnings of a new and measureless advancement in the mighty program of divine achievement. The incarnation is by no means least in this series, it being no less a far-reaching event than the entrance of the Second Person of the eternal Godhead into the human sphere, partaking of the human elements—body, soul, and spirit—with the distinct purpose of remaining a partaker of all that is human for all eternity to come. True, that in Him which was mortal has put on immortality (1 Tim. 6:16), and He has been, and is now, glorified with the highest glory known to infinity (Eph. 1:20, 21; Phil. 2:9–11; Heb. 1:3).

Certainly, from the divine viewpoint, such a descent, from the ineffable heights of heaven in which the Second Person dwelt in the eternity past, to the sphere inhabited by the mere creatures of His hand, in order that He might lift them to the sphere of His eternal glory, constitutes an event of boundless importance. This unprecedented and never-to-be repeated crisis-experience in the eternal existence of the Second Person is, of itself, beyond the range of human understanding, while its effect on that company of redeemed ones taken from among His creatures who, through the inherent right established by His advent into their sphere, are finally presented in eternal glory conformed to His image, constitutes an achievement of surpassing importance, whether the achievement be valued by the dwellers on earth or by the highest of angels in heaven.

The transcendent importance of this doctrine is to be seen in the truth that what the unique God-man is and what He does is altogether grounded in the reality of His incarnation—His essential Deity, His humanity, His Personality, and His virgin birth being contributing factors to His theanthropic Person. Though His Deity has been previously contemplated, it is germane to the right understanding of this theme to inquire, (a) Who became incarnate? (b) How did He become incarnate? and (c) For what purpose did He become incarnate?

I. Who Became Incarnate?

In arriving at even a semblance of an answer to this momentous question, it is requisite that a true apprehension of the Person of Christ shall be held with worthy convictions. The doctrine of *the Person of Christ* is not one of mere speculative interest; it undergirds the very structure of Christianity itself, as well as all that enters into the Messianic hope for Israel and for the world. The founders of ancient religions served only to originate ideals and systems which could as well have been fostered by any other men. The men who initiated these systems did not remain as the fountain source of all that they proposed, or the living executors of the affairs of the universe in which men and angels reside. Even within Judaism and Christianity men like Moses and Paul might have been replaced by other equally good men, but it is not so with Christ. On this theme Charles Gore writes:

> To recognize this truth is to be struck by the contrast which in this respect Christianity presents to other religions. For example, the place which Mohammed holds in Islam is not the place which Jesus Christ holds in Christianity, but that which Moses holds in Judaism. The Arabian prophet made for himself no claim other than that which Jewish prophets made, other than that which all prophets, true or false, or partly true and partly false, have always made,—to speak the word of the Lord. The substance of Mohammedanism, considered as a religion, lies simply in the message which the Koran contains. It is, as no other religion is, founded upon a book. The person of the Prophet has its significance only so far as he is supposed to have certificated the reality of the revelations which the book records.
>
> Gautama, again, the founder of Buddhism, one, I suppose, of the noblest and greatest of mankind, is only the discoverer or rediscoverer of a method or way, the way of salvation, by which is meant the way to win final emancipation from the weary chain of existence, and to attain Nirvana, or Parinirvana, the final blessed extinction. Having found this way, after many years of weary searching, he can teach it to others, but he is, all the time, only a preeminent

example of the success of his own method, one of a series of Buddhas or enlightened ones, who shed on other men the light of their superior knowledge. …

It was plainly the method of Buddha, not the person, which was to save his brethren. As for the person, he passed away, as the writer of the Buddhist scripture repeatedly declares, "with that utter passing away in which nothing whatever is left behind," living on only metaphorically in the method and teaching which he bequeathed to his followers. We are touching on no disputed point when we assert that according to the Buddhist scriptures, the personal, conscious life of the founder of that religion was extinguished in death. But this single fact points the contrast with Christianity. The teaching of Jesus differs in fact from the teaching of the Buddha not more in the ideal of salvation which he propounded than in the place held by the person who propounded the ideal. For Jesus Christ taught no method by which men might attain the end of their being, whether He Himself, personally, existed or was annihilated: but as He offered Himself to men on earth as the satisfaction of their being —their master, their example, their redeemer—so when He left the earth He promised to sustain them from the unseen world by His continued personal presence and to communicate to them His own life, and He assured them that at the last they would find themselves face to face with Him as their judge. The personal relation to Himself is from first to last of the essence of the religion which He inaugurated.—*The Incarnation of the Son of God*, pp. 7–10

Christ not only originates the universe as its Creator and formulates those ideals and principles which are the intrinsic glory of the Bible, but He continues to impart Himself to finite men and to execute and consummate the program which Infinity has devised. With these truths in mind, wonder need not be entertained that the Person of Christ has been, and is, the central point of all moral and religious controversy. The history of this contention will be pursued by the theological student in another division of his discipline. Without the reality of the God-man, there is no sufficient ground for the truths of salvation, for sanctification, or for a lost world. This theanthropic Person is the hope of men of all ages and of the universe itself.

With these considerations in view, recourse may be had to a previous discussion in this thesis, wherein the preincarnate Christ has been investigated with specific attention. There it was demonstrated from many Scriptures, and seen to be the witness of all the Scriptures, that the One who came into this world is none other than the Second Person of the Godhead —equal in every respect to the Father or the Spirit. The hypostatic union of natures which the incarnation accomplished, being as a theme assigned to a specific division of this treatise as are each of His natures separately, extended treatment of these aspects of truth is not now to be undertaken. Suffice it to point out that Christ is God in His divine nature and man in His human nature, but in His Personality as the God-man He is neither one nor

the other apart from the unity which He is. Isolation of either nature from the other is not possible, though each may be separately considered. The divine nature is eternal, but the human nature originates in time. It therefore follows that the union of the two is itself an event in time, though it is destined to continue forever. This union is a far reaching accomplishment, which is the unique reality of the theanthropic Person. The truth which this union embodies is well stated in the Athanasian Creed as follows: “Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting—Who although he be God and man, yet he is not two; but one Christ: one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh; but by taking the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person; for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.” The same truth is also presented in the second article of the Creed of the Church of England: “The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed virgin of her substance, so that the two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man” (both creeds as cited by Watson, *Institutes*, I, 617).

The Bible provides the best manner of speech, in its declaration of the truth that it was one of the Godhead Three who by incarnation became the God-man.

Isaiah 7:14. “Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.” This twofold prediction is explicit in that it avers that One is to be born of a woman, which under no circumstances could imply, as to derivation, more than that which is human; yet this One thus born is Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is “God with us”—but *with us* in the deeper sense of these words, which is, that He has become *one of us*.

Isaiah 9:6, 7. “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.” Again the complex,

twofold Person is delineated. He is a Child born and a Son given. Reference is thus made both to the human and divine natures. The Child that is born will sit on David's throne, but the Son that is given bears the titles of Deity and carries all the government and authority of the universe upon His shoulders.

Micah 5:2. "But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." In like manner, One is seen to come to a geographical location on earth—Bethlehem—, which is a human identification, yet His goings forth are from everlasting.

Luke 1:30–35. "And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." No more explicit assurance of a twofold reality could be formed within the bounds of human language than is presented in these verses. That which is so clearly human is predicated of the One who is the Son of the Highest and who was, as no human could be, "that holy thing."

John 1:1, 2, 14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. … And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." In an earlier exposition of this passage it has been pointed out that here, more positively than elsewhere, it is declared that the eternal God, the Logos, became flesh that He might tabernacle among men. As the context discloses, He it was who created all things and from Him all life proceeds—especially that eternal life which those that *believe* on His name and *receive* Him (vs. 12) do possess.

Philippians 2:6–8. "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." This great Christological portion of the Word of God places Christ in three positions, each of which is final as to the entire incarnation revelation: (a) He was in the form of God, (b) He is equal with God, and (c) He appeared on earth in the likeness of men. Beyond a few words of exposition, the more extended treatment of this passage must be reserved for the later consideration of the *kenosis*. The determining word in this context is μορφῇ, which indicates that the preincarnate Christ was in the *form* of God in the sense that He existed *in* and *with* the nature of God. He *was* God and therefore occupied the place of God and possessed all the divine perfections. Bishop Lightfoot, writing on this Scripture, *in loc*., and μορφῇ in particular, states: "Though μορφὴ is not the same as φύσις or οὐσία, yet the possession of the μορφὴ involves participation in the οὐσία also: for μορφὴ implies not the external accidents but the essential attributes." His preexistence in the *form* of God is complete evidence that He is God, but it is this same One who took upon Him the μορφὴ of a servant and ὁμοίωμα of men. In both the divine and human *form* there is complete actuality.

Colossians 1:13–17. "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." The order of notation is reversed in this sublime passage, but the direct declaration is undiminished. The One, being human and having provided a redemption through His blood, is, nevertheless, none other than the eternal Son who is Creator of all things visible and invisible.

1 Timothy 3:16. "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up

into glory." At this point the reader is confronted with a direct assertion, namely, "God was manifest in the flesh"; and all else which is here predicated of Him serves only to strengthen this well-established truth.

The Book of Hebrews. This epistle abounds with Christological revelation. Most conclusive, indeed, is the teaching that the eternal Son and Creator who is described in chapter 1, is the One who, according to chapter 2, is partaker, along with the "children," of "flesh and blood."

These passages conduct the mind that is amenable to the Word of God to one grand conclusion, namely, that the eternal Son of God has entered the human sphere. The *method* and *purpose* of this stupendous move on the part of God are yet to be considered.

II. How Did the Son Become Incarnate?

The Scriptures answer this question as explicitly as they testify to the incarnation. He was born into the human family and thus came to possess His own identified human body, soul, and spirit. In this may be seen the difference between a divine *indwelling*, which implies no more than that human beings may partake of the divine nature, and *incarnation*, which is no less than the assumption on the part of Deity of a complete humanity that is in no way the possession of another. That the Christ of God was born of a virgin is also expressly asserted and without the slightest contrary suggestion. The generating of that life in the virgin's womb is a mystery, but it is in no way impossible to God who creates and forms all things. That Christ was virgin-born asserts that He received no fallen nature from His Father; and, lest it should be thought that a fallen nature was permitted to reach Him through His human mother, it was declared to Mary by the angel who announced His birth, that the "holy thing" to be born of her would be, because of that holiness, called "the Son of God." Recognition of the Biblical emphasis upon the truth that Christ was not only free from sinning but also free from a sin nature, is most essential. And, again, there is no intimation to the contrary.

The doctrine of the *virgin birth* is in no way coextensive with the doctrine of the *incarnation*. In the one case recognition is given only of an important step in the whole incarnation undertaking, whereas, in the doctrine of the *incarnation*, consideration must be extended to the whole of

the life of the Son of God from the virgin birth on to eternity to come. Every revelation of the incarnation bears some intimation of its abiding character. It is unto conformity to the glorified God-man, that saints of the present age are to be brought and thus to be in fellowship with Him forever. Their bodies whether translated or resurrected are to be "like unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3:21). Of Christ it is declared, "He only hath immortality, dwelling in the light" (1 Tim. 6:16). Resurrection is of the body and thus it was in the case of Christ. His human body was raised, seen of many witnesses, and ascended into heaven where it appeared as the firstfruits of all the saints who will appear like Christ in glory. Christ's glorified human body has become a revelation to all angelic hosts of that reality which the saints will display in heaven when they, too, shall have received their resurrection bodies. Of Christ and in relation to His second advent it is said that "His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east" (Zech. 14:4), He will be recognized by the physical wounds which He bears (Zech. 13:6), and as David's Son He will sit on David's throne (Luke 1:32). Little specific reference is made to Christ's human soul and spirit. The same is true of the saints in their future glory. This is doubtless due to the fact that the Bible employs the term *body* to include all that is human (cf. Rom. 12:1; Heb. 10:5, 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 2:14).

In becoming an identified individual member of the human race, it was both natural and reasonable that Christ should enter that estate by the way of birth and pursue the normal process of development through childhood to manhood. Any other approach to this estate would not only be unnatural, but would have left Him open to grave suspicion that His manner of existence was foreign to the human family. Further consideration of the more intricate problems connected with the union of two natures in one Person will appear under the treatment of the hypostatic union.

III. For What Purpose Did He Become Incarnate?

The doctrine of the *incarnation* is a revelation of the purest character, and in no aspect of it is the student more dependent upon the Word of God than when seeking an answer to the present question. At least seven major reasons are disclosed, namely, (a) that He might manifest God to man, (b)

that He might manifest man to God, (c) that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, (d) that He might destroy the works of the devil, (e) that He might be Head over a new creation, (f) that He might sit on David's throne, and (g) that He might be the Kinsman Redeemer. Considering these more at length, it may be observed:

1. That He Might Manifest God to Man. The incarnate Christ is the divine answer to the question, What is God like? The God-man expresses as much of the infinite One as can be translated into human ideas and realities. Christ is God; therefore no fiction was enacted when that which is so unlike fallen man is reduced to the comprehension of those who so greatly need to be informed and whose minds are supernaturally darkened. It is true that when here on earth the Lord displayed the *power* of God. Nicodemus testified: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him" (John 3:2), but Christ did not come primarily to display the power of God. In like manner, He displayed the *wisdom* of God. They said of Him, "Never man spake like this man" (John 7:46), yet He did not come primarily to display the wisdom of God. Thus, also, He manifested the *glory* of God. This He did on the Mount of Transfiguration, and according to 2 Corinthians 4:6, "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God [is] in the face of Jesus Christ"; but He did not come primarily to exhibit the glory of God. However, He did come to unveil the *love* of God. He who is ever in the *bosom* of the Father is a declaration of that bosom. It is written, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John 1:18). God in these last days is speaking through His Son (Heb. 1:2) not of power, nor of wisdom, nor of glory, but of *love*. It is also to be noted that Christ manifested the love of God in all His earth ministry, but the supreme disclosure of that love came with His death upon the cross. To this the Scriptures bear witness: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16); "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8); "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us" (1 John 3:16); "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John

4:10). The death of Christ for “sinners” and “enemies” is the paramount expression of divine love. The death of Christ for a lost race is not the outshining of a crisis experience on the part of God. Could the divine attitude be seen as it is now, it would disclose the same sublime love and willingness, were it called for, to make the same sacrifice for those in need that was made at Calvary. The love of God knows no spasmodic experience. It is now and ever will be what in a moment of time it was exhibited to be. This revelation of God to men is made possible and tangible by the incarnation.

The incarnation is related to the prophetic office of Christ, since the prophet is the messenger from God to men. In anticipation of Christ’s prophetic ministry Moses wrote: “The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; … I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him” (Deut. 18:15, 18, 19). The surpassing importance of this prediction is seen in the fact that it is referred to four times in the New Testament (cf. John 7:16; 8:28; 12:49, 50; 14:10, 24; 17:8). It is stated that this predicted Prophet was to be “of thy brethren,” who is divinely “raised up” from “the midst of thee.” This is a clear anticipation of the humanity of the incarnate Christ.

2. THAT HE MIGHT MAIFEST MAN TO GOD. Whatever the estimation may be that a fallen race is inclined to place on the qualities and dignity of the first Adam, it is true that, in His humanity, the Last Adam is the all-satisfying ideal of the Creator, the One in whom the Father takes perfect delight. Of Him the Father said, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” This voice from heaven was heard at the baptism—His induction into the priestly office (Matt. 3:17)—; at the transfiguration—when His prophetic ministry was recognized (Matt. 17:5)—; and will yet be heard when, according to Psalm 2:7, He ascends the Davidic throne to fulfill the office of King. Whatever might have been in store for the first Adam and his race had there been no fall, is not revealed. However, a divine ideal for the Last Adam and His redeemed ones—which reaches on into

heavenly glory—fills the divine expectation to infinite perfection. It being the essential requisite of man as a creature that he do the will of the Creator, the Last Adam—the perfect Man—did always those things which His Father willed. In this He is the example to all those who are *in Him*. There is a reasonable ground for the call extended to all the redeemed, to be like Christ: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5); "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps" (1 Pet. 2:21). Thus that ethic which is the normal result of sound doctrine has not only an emphasis in the written Word, but is embodied and enacted in the Living Word.

3. That He Might Be a Merciful and Faithful High Priest. As in the theme just concluded Christ is seen before God as the representation of all that is perfect in the human sphere, so as Priest He may be seen as man's representative to God in sacrifice and in behalf of imperfection in the human sphere. No law within the kingdom of God is more arbitrary in its unyielding necessity than that a blood-sacrifice is required for human sin. Whatever may have been accepted in the realm of things typical, the final, efficacious blood could be only of one of the Godhead and without the least complicity with the human sin which it was designed to remedy. Only God can perform a sacrifice that will meet the demands of infinite holiness. There is deep significance in the Word of the eternal Son addressed to His Father and at the time of His coming into the world: "A body hast thou prepared me" (Heb. 10:5), and that in contrast to "the blood of bulls and of goats" in its incapacity to "take away sins." This Scripture implies that the sacrifice as agreed upon in the divine counsels was to be made by the Son, the Second Person in the Godhead, and that the necessary blood-shedding body had been prepared by the Father. It is, therefore, not the blood of a human victim, but the blood of Christ who is God (cf. Acts 20:28, where the blood is said to be the blood of God). It is the function of the priest to make an offering for sin. Christ, as Priest, offered *Himself* without spot to God (Heb. 9:14; cf. 1 Pet. 1:19). He served both as the Sacrifice and the Sacrificer. That "precious blood" thus shed becomes the ground upon which God may ever deal with human sin. It avails for those who are lost if they choose to be sheltered under its saving power. It is ever the cleansing of

those who are saved (1 John 1:7). As a merciful and faithful Priest, the Lord of Glory "ever liveth to make intercession for them" who "come unto God by him" (Heb. 7:25). Underlying all this is the necessity that the Second Person, who undertakes the stupendous task of representing lost men to God, shall have somewhat to offer in sacrifice—an acceptable sacrifice of purer blood than that of any man or beast. To this end the incarnation became a divine necessity.

4. That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil. As is to be contemplated later under satanology, the relation that existed between Christ and Satan extends out into spheres wholly beyond the range of human comprehension. Some things are revealed. The attentive mind may trace much in the field of comparison between the failure of the first Adam under satanic temptation and the victory of the Last Adam under similar circumstances. But all temptation or testing is within human spheres (James 1:13) and therefore, in the case of Christ, presupposes the incarnation. Again, the death of Christ is said to be the judgment of the "prince of this world" and the spoiling of principalities and powers (John 12:31; 16:11; Col. 2:15); but death is purely a human reality and if the Christ of God must die to bring the works of Satan into judgment, it follows that He must become incarnate.

5. That He Might Be Head Over the New Creation. The New Creation is a company of human beings united to Christ, and these, through redeeming grace, are individually saved and destined to appear in glory conformed to their risen Head (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2). They are *in Him* by a relationship which, in the New Testament, is likened to that of members of a human body united to, and dependent on, its head. They will have resurrection bodies conformed to His glorified body (Phil. 3:20, 21), but the humanity of Christ requires His incarnation.

The two remaining divisions of this general theme, namely, *the Davidic throne*, and *the Kinsman Redeemer*, represent the twofold divine purpose—excluding the self-revelation of God in Christ. The Davidic throne is the consummation and realization of the earthly purpose (cf. Ps. 2:6), while the Kinsman Redeemer is the means unto the sublime end that many sons may be received into glory (Heb. 2:10). Due recognition of these so widely

different and yet unchanging divine undertakings is fundamental to the right knowledge of the Bible. This twofold distinction reaches to every portion of the text of the Scriptures and characterizes it throughout all things eschatological as well as historical. This twofold division of truth is especially to be observed in the outworking of the incarnation. Since these themes occupy so large a place in the truth yet to be considered, the briefest possible treatment will be accorded them here.

6. That He Might Sit on David's Throne. Noticeable, indeed, is the fact that the two greatest passages bearing on the virgin birth of Christ assign but one purpose for that birth—that He might sit on David's throne. These passages read: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (Isaiah 9:6, 7); "And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:30–33). This same earthly purpose is in view in the resurrection of Christ. Peter, on the Day of Pentecost, with reference to the message of Psalm 16:8–11, states that Christ was raised up to sit on David's throne: "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption" (Acts 2:30, 31). Similarly that great earthly purpose is in view in the second advent of Christ: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory" (Matt. 25:31; cf. 19:28; Acts 15:16).

The highway of prophecy regarding the Davidic thone begins properly with God's covenant with David as recorded in 2 Samuel 7:16. After having

told David that he would not be permitted to build the temple but that Solomon would build it, and that David's kingdom would be established forever in spite of the evil which his sons might commit, Jehovah said to David, "And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever." David's understanding of this covenant is revealed in the verses which follow (18–29) and his interpretation of it is in Psalm 89:20–37. David accepts this sovereign covenant, recognizing its endless duration. From the Scriptures bearing on the divine covenant concerning David's throne, little ground may be discovered for the prevalent theological notion that Jehovah is anticipating in this covenant a spiritual kingdom with the Davidic throne located in heaven. Since Jehovah has directly decreed that the Davidic throne would pass to Solomon and his successors, a serious problem arises for the spiritualizer of this covenant to assign the time when, and the circumstances under which, the throne passes into heaven and when the authority of that throne changes from that which is earthly to that which is heavenly.

Jeremiah announces the same continuity in succession as that revealed to David: "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our righteousness. For thus saith the LORD; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. … Thus saith the LORD; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them" (Jer. 33:14–26). This prediction was fulfilled to the time of Christ both by the succession of kings so long as the Davidic throne continued, and then by those named in Matthew 1:12–16 who were, in their respective generations, entitled to sit on David's throne. With the birth of Christ into this kingly line—both through His mother and through His foster father—He who ever lives and ever will live, completes the eternal promise to David which Jeremiah declares. Had the anticipated

Davidic kingdom been that supposed spiritual reign from heaven, there would be no occasion for the throne rights to pass to any earthly son of David, nor would there be any occasion for an incarnation into the Davidic line. Authority over the earth had been freely exercised from heaven in previous ages and could have continued so. Apart from the earthly, Davidic throne and kingdom, there is no meaning to the title ascribed to Christ, "the son of David." Great significance is to be seen in Christ's answer to Pilate's question, "Art thou a king then?": "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (John 18:37).

It may be concluded, then, that the Second Person became incarnate that the promise to David might be fulfilled. To that end, the throne and kingdom of the incarnate One is said to abide forever, being occupied by the eternal Messiah of Israel. Such is the direct and uncomplicated witness of the Word of God. Thus the incarnation is required that the King may sit on David's throne forever.

7. That He Might Be a Kinsman Redeemer. When the major division of Systematic Theology, Soteriology, is under consideration, it will be demonstrated that at least fourteen reasons are assigned in the Bible for the death of Christ, and, since He was born to die, it follows that He was born, or became incarnate, for each and all of these reasons. However, the major portion of these reasons are but varying aspects of the general theme of the cure of sin, which, so far as the incarnation is concerned, may be attended under the one aspect of soteriological truth—the Kinsman Redeemer. As in so many instances, a doctrine is now confronted which transcends all human understanding; for none could ever fully know in this life the *occasion* for redemption which is sin, the *price* of redemption paid which is the precious blood of Christ, or the *end* of redemption which is the estate of those who are saved. The truths involved in this theme are foreshadowed in the Old Testament under what is properly designated *the Kinsman Redeemer type*. Two general lines of teaching inhere in the Old Testament type: (a) the law governing the one who would redeem (Lev. 25:25–55) and (b) the example of the redeemer (the Book of Ruth). The type of redemption is most simple; but the antitype as wrought out by Christ on the cross is complex indeed, though it follows implicitly the same lines found in the

type. The lines of the type are: (a) the redeemer must be a kinsman (Lev. 25:48, 49; Ruth 3:12, 13); (b) the redeemer must be able to redeem (Ruth 4:4–6; cf. Jer. 50:34); and (c) the redemption is accomplished by the redeemer, or *goel*, by paying the righteous demands (Lev. 25:27). Redemption was of persons and of estates, and in the typical-redemption provision was made whereby the individual might redeem himself, which amounted to no more than that a position or inheritance could not be withheld from the former and rightful owner should he become able to reclaim it. Back of this is the divine bestowal of the land to the tribes and the families which, as was intended, should remain as a permanent inheritance arrangement through succeeding generations. The feature of self-redemption has no place in the antitypical redemption; for there is no occasion for Christ to redeem Himself, nor is there any ground upon which a sinner may redeem himself from sin. The great redemptive act of the Old Testament is that wrought by Jehovah when He redeemed Israel from Egypt. In that act, which is true to the plan of redemptive truth and in which there are many types to be seen, redemption is wholly wrought by Jehovah (Ex. 3:7, 8); it is wrought through a person—Moses; it is by blood (Ex. 12:13, 23, 27); and it is by power—Israel was removed from Egypt by supernatural power. The New Testament redemption follows the same steps. It is wrought of God, through Christ, by His blood, and deliverance from the bondage of sin is by the power of the Holy Spirit. Israel's redemption was of the nation for that and all future generations. They stand before Jehovah as a redeemed nation forever. Their redemption on typical ground was verified and established in the death of Christ.

Returning to the major features of the Old Testament kinsman redeemer type, it may be seen (a) that the redeemer must be a *kinsman*. This, indeed, is the reason within the heavenly purpose for the incarnation of the eternal Son into the human family. That bondservants to sin might be redeemed whose estate before God is lost, it was necessary that the One who would redeem should be a kinsman to them. However, what is seen to be essential in the type does not create the necessity in the antitype. It is the opposite of this. The necessity which is seen in the antitype creates the necessity in the type. The type can do no more than reflect what is true in the antitype. (b) That the redeemer must be able to redeem is a truth which, when contemplated in the antitype, involves facts and forces within God which

man cannot fathom. The fact that, when acting under the guidance of infinite wisdom and when possessed of infinite resources, the blood of God (Acts 20:28) was shed in redemption indicates to the fullest degree that no other redemption would avail. Christ's death being alone the answer to man's lost estate, the Kinsman Redeemer, or *goel*, was able to pay the price; He being the God-man could shed the "precious blood" which, because of the unity of His being, was in a very actual sense the blood of God. (c) One of the most vital revelations concerning Christ was that He was Himself *willing* to redeem. The rationalistic supposition that the Father's provision of a sacrifice in the Person of His Son was an atrocious and immoral imposition—an act which even a human father would not commit—, breaks down when it is recognized that the Son was wholly agreeable and cooperating in that sacrifice. In truth, the unity within the Godhead creates an identity of action which is well expressed in the words: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19).

The entire theme of the subjection of the Son to the Father is as extensive as the earth life of the Son. Speaking of the Father, the Son said, "I do always those things that please him" (John 8:29). However, the subjection of the Son to the Father is wholly within the relationship of the humanity of the incarnate Person to His Father and is not primarily a subjection of the Deity, or Second Person, to the First Person. Between the two divine Persons there is eternal cooperation, but not subjection. It is further to be seen that subjection to the Creator on the part of man is that which is inherent in the very order of things created, and the God-man cannot be the *perfect* man which the incarnation secures should He not, as man, be wholly subject to the Father. Thus the *goel*, the Kinsman Redeemer, Christ, fulfills the type by being *willing* to redeem.

As John 18:37, with its declaration that Christ is a King, bears upon the earthly purpose of God, so John 12:27, with its reference to Christ's death, bears on the heavenly purpose of God. In both passages there is this note of finality—"For this cause came I."

Conclusion

It is thus demonstrated that the *incarnation* is of surpassing importance. Whatever momentousness belongs to the doctrine of Christ's *Deity* or to the doctrine of His *humanity*, the doctrine of the *incarnation* includes both; even later studies of the hypostatic union and the kenosis will serve only to elucidate the fuller meaning of the *incarnation*.

Chapter XXIV

GOD THE SON: HIS HUMANITY A SPECIFIC TREATMENT OF THE HUMANITY OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST IS INDICATED IN ANY CHRISTOLOGICAL THESIS. UNAVOIDABLY, THIS ASPECT OF TRUTH CONCERNING CHRIST HAS BEEN ANTICIPATED TO SOME EXTENT IN PREVIOUS SECTIONS OF THIS DISCUSSION, AND THE THEME MUST REAPPEAR IN THAT WHICH IS TO FOLLOW. A NEW REALITY IS CONSTITUTED IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST, BY THE ADDING OF HIS HUMANITY TO THAT WHICH FROM ALL ETERNITY HAS BEEN HIS UNDIMINISHED DEITY. APART FROM THIS UNION OF TWO NATURES THERE IS NO THEANTHROPIC PERSON, NO MEDIATOR, NO REDEEMER, AND NO SAVIOR. THE WHOLE TRUTH RELATIVE TO THE CHRIST HAS NOT BEEN REACHED WHEN PERCHANCE HIS ESSENTIAL DEITY HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED, NOR HAS IT BEEN REACHED WHEN A SIMILAR DEMONSTRATION OF HIS ESSENTIAL HUMANITY HAS BEEN MADE. THE CHRIST OF GOD IS THE INCOMPARABLE—AND

TO NO SMALL DEGREE, THE UNKNOWABLE—COMBINATION OF THESE TWO NATURES. THE WEIGHING OF THAT WHICH IS DIVINE, OR THAT WHICH IS HUMAN, IN THE GOD-MAN—APART FROM NATURAL LIMITATIONS ON THE PART OF THE STUDENT—IS COMPARATIVELY AN UNCOMPLICATED MATTER. ENDLESS COMPLEXITY ARISES WHEN THESE TWO NATURES COMBINE IN ONE PERSON, AS THEY DO IN CHRIST. THIS COMPLEXITY WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DIVISION OF THIS THESIS WHICH FOLLOWS. THE OBJECTIVE IN THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION IS THE DISCOVERY AND RECOGNITION OF CHRIST'S HUMANITY.

The Christian era has seen a reversal of emphasis in its Christology. The early centuries were characterized by discussions calculated to establish the *humanity* of Christ, while the present requirement seems to be the recognition of, and emphasis upon, His Deity. In his Gospel the Apostle John has presented the Deity of Christ, and in his Epistles he has as faithfully asserted His humanity. It was indicative of the time in which he wrote when he said: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (1 John 4:2, 3).

A strong incentive arises at this point to go into the historical aspects of this phase of Christology. Richard Watson has compiled an admirable condensation of the early controversy over the humanity of Christ the

quotation of which will suffice: The source of this ancient error appears to have been a philosophical one. Both in the oriental and Greek schools, it was a favourite notion, that whatever was joined to *matter* was necessarily contaminated by it, and that the highest perfection of this life was abstraction from material things, and, in another, a total and final separation from the body. This opinion was, also, the probable cause of leading some persons, in St. Paul's time, to deny the reality of a resurrection, and to explain it figuratively. But, however that may be, it was one of the chief grounds of the rejection of the proper humanity of Christ among the different branches of the Gnostics, who, indeed, erred as to both natures. The things which the Scriptures attribute to the human nature of our Lord they did not deny; but affirmed that they took place in appearance only, and they were, therefore, called *Docetae* and *Phantasiastae*. At a later period, Eutyches fell into a similar error, by teaching that the human nature of Christ was absorbed into the Divine, and that his body had no real existence. These errors have passed away, and danger now lies only on one side; not, indeed, because men are become less liable or less disposed to err, but because philosophy,—from vain pretences to which, or a proud reliance upon it, almost all great religious errors spring,—has, in later ages, taken a different character. While these errors denied the real existence of the *body* of Christ, the Apollinarian heresy rejected the existence of a human *soul* in our Lord, and taught that the Godhead supplied its place. Thus both these views denied to Christ a proper humanity, and both were, accordingly, condemned by the general Church. Among those who held the union of two natures in Christ, the Divine and human, which, in theological language is called the hypostatical, or personal union, several distinctions were also made which led to a diversity of opinion. The Nestorians acknowledged two persons in our Lord, mystically and more closely united than any human analogy can explain. The Monophysites contended for one person and one nature, the two being supposed to be, in some mysterious manner, confounded. The Monothelites acknowledged two natures and one will. Various other refinements were, at different times, propagated; but the true sense of Scripture appears to have been very accurately expressed by the council of Chalcedon in the fifth century,—that in Christ there is *one person*; in the unity of person, *two natures*, the Divine and the human; and that there is no change, or mixture, or confusion of these two natures, but

that each retains its own distinguishing properties. With this agrees the Athanasian Creed, whatever be its date.—*Theological Institutes*, I, 616–17

The Scriptures declare that Christ possessed a human body, soul, and spirit, and that He experienced those emotions which belong to human existence. Much difficulty arises when the thought is entertained of two volitions—one divine and one human—in the one Person. Though this problem is difficult, it is clearly taught in the New Testament that Christ, on the human side, possessed a will which was wholly surrendered to the will of His Father. The surrender of the will, while it obviates any possible conflict between the will of the Father and the will of the Son, does not at all serve to remove the human will from His unique Person. The human will was ever present regardless of the use He may have made of it.

The truth concerning Christ's humanity may, by the inerrant Scriptures, be proved in a manner wholly scientific. The reality of His human nature is determined by the presence of facts which are distinctly human. This principle is all that science requires in the pursuance of any investigation. The facts concerning Christ's humanity may be summarized in part as follows: **I. Christ's Humanity Was Anticipated Before the Foundation of the World** This is stated in Revelation 13:8, where Christ is declared to be the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." All references to Christ as the "Lamb" are of His humanity. They concern His human body, the perfect sacrifice for sin. The humanity of Christ, like the whole plan of redemption, was purposed by God before the foundation of the world. The cross, with its human sacrifice, is timeless in its purpose and effect.

II. The Old Testament Expectation Was of A Human Messiah This expectation was twofold: (a) as outlined in the types and (b) as foretold in prophecy: **1. The Types.** Of upwards of fifty types of Christ found in the Old Testament, the majority either directly or indirectly represent, among other features, the humanity of Christ. It is obvious that, where blood is shed, a body sacrificed, or a typical person appears, the human element is indicated.

2. Prophecy. A very few selections from the body of prophetic Scriptures must suffice: “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel” (Gen. 3:15). “Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” (Isa. 7:14). A virgin conceiving and bearing a son is human; yet this is to be Immanuel, which being interpreted is “God with us.” “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this” (Isa. 9:6, 7). The patriarch Job was conscious of an insuperable distance between himself and God. His desire was for a “daysman” who could lay his hand both upon God and upon man. This is his cry for a mediator: “For he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment. Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both” (Job 9:32, 33).

III. A Specific New Testament Prophecy Added to the Old Testament expectation concerning Christ’s humanity is the message of the angel to Mary: “And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. … The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:31–35).

IV. The Life of Christ on Earth It is written: “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren" (Heb. 2:17). He is declared to be human by 1. His Names. *Jesus* is His human name. It is related to His human life, His body, His death, and the

acquired glory bestowed because of His redeeming grace (Phil. 2:5–9). Several times He is called "The man Christ Jesus," and about eighty times He is called "The Son of man." This latter title was the name He most often gave Himself. It was as though, from the divine standpoint, the human aspect of His Person needed most to be disclosed.

2. His Human Parentage. Several unmistakable phrases are used of Christ concerning His parentage: "fruit of the loins," "her firstborn," "of this man's seed," "seed of David," "His father David," "the seed of Abraham," "made of a woman," "sprang out of Judah." His humanity is stated by each of these phrases.

3. The Fact that He Possessed a Human Body, Soul, and Spirit. Note these Scriptures: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come" (1 John 4:2, 3); "Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death" (Matt. 26:38); "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit" (John 13:21).

4. His Human Limitations. At this point we are confronted with the strongest contrasts between the Deity and the humanity of Christ. He was weary; yet He called the weary to Himself for rest. He was hungry; yet He was "the bread of life." He was thirsty; yet He was "the water of life." He was in an agony; yet He healed all manner of sicknesses and soothed every pain. He "grew, and waxed strong in spirit"; yet He was from all eternity. He was tempted; yet He, as God, could not be tempted. He was self-limited in knowledge; yet He was the wisdom of God. He said, "My Father is greater than I" (with reference to His humiliation, being made for a little season lower than the angels); yet He also said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," "I and my Father are one." He prayed, which is always human; yet He Himself answered prayer. He said, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness"; yet all power is given unto Him in heaven and in earth. He slept on a pillow in the boat; yet He arose and rebuked the storm.

He was baptized, which was only a human act; yet at that time God declared Him to be His Son. He walked two long days' journey to Bethany; yet He knew the moment that Lazarus died. He wept at the tomb; yet He called the dead to arise. He confessed that He would be put to death; yet He had but a moment before received Peter's inspired declaration that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God. He said, 'Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?"; yet John tells us, "He needed not that any should testify of man: for He knew what was in man." He was hungry; yet He could turn stones into bread. This He did not do; for had He done so, He would not have suffered as men suffer. He said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"; yet it was that very God to whom He cried who was "in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." He dies; yet He is eternal life. He freely functioned in His earthlife within that which was perfectly human, and He as freely functioned in His earth-life within that which was perfectly divine. His earth-life, therefore, testifies as much to His humanity as to His Deity, and both of these revelations are equally true.

The all-characterizing offices of Christ—Prophet, Priest, and King—, seen in the Old Testament as well as the New, are each in their turn dependent to a large degree upon the humanity He possessed.

V. The Death and Resurrection of Christ **Apart from His humanity no blood could be shed; yet that blood is rendered exceedingly "precious" by the fact that it was the blood of one of the Godhead Three. God did not merely *use* the human Jesus as a sacrifice; God was *in* Christ as a reconciling agent. "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, … neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. … By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:4–10).**

VI. The Humanity of Christ is Seen in His Ascension And Session

While they steadfastly looked they saw Him go into heaven with His resurrection, human body. He sat down "at the right hand of the throne of God." He is also spoken of as "the Son of man which is in heaven." Stephen, when he saw Him after His ascension, said "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Through His humanity, Christ has been made "a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God." He is now in heaven as our High Priest. His humanity is declared by His ascension and present ministry in heaven.

VII. The Humanity of Christ is Evident in His Second Advent And Kingdom Reign

The angel messengers said, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." He said of Himself, "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven." He will then "sit upon the throne of his glory," He shall sit "on the throne of his father David." The humanity of Christ is seen, then, in His return to the earth and in His kingdom reign.

Conclusion

So apparent and everywhere present are the facts which connote Christ's humanity, that to dwell upon them is similar to an effort to prove His existence. The danger is, and ever has been, that, in the light of these patent realities, the mind may tend to release its proper apprehension of His Deity. It is not, on the other hand, an impossibility so to magnify His Deity as to exclude a right conception of His humanity. The controversies of the church which have crystallized into creeds have wrought much in stabilizing thought regarding the theanthropic Person. Nevertheless, even though by these creeds a highway has been paved on which to tread, each mind must be instructed personally and by its own contemplation arrive at right conclusions.

As an important discrimination in the general doctrine of Christ's *humanity*, Dr. John Dick writes: "A distinction has been made between the condescension and the humiliation of Christ; the former consisting in the assumption of our nature, and the latter in his subsequent abasement and sufferings. The reason why the assumption of our nature is not accounted a part of his humiliation, is, that he retains it in his state of exaltation. The distinction seems to be favoured by Paul, who represents him as first 'being made in the likeness of men,' and then 'when he was found in fashion as a man, humbling himself, and becoming obedient to the death of the cross'

(Phil. 2:7, 8). Perhaps this is a more accurate view of the subject; but it has not been always attended to by Theological writers, some of whom have considered the incarnation as a part of his humiliation" (*Lectures on Theology*, p. 323). According to the Hebrews Epistle, He who was the effulgence of the divine glory and the express image of the divine Being *condescended* to the level whereon He took part in flesh and blood with men. However, this same exalted One entered the sphere of *humiliation* by His death and the manner of it. The humiliation was in view when He came into the world, since He was born to die. He said, "For this cause came I unto this hour" (John 12:27). On this major purpose of Christ in assuming the human form, Dr. B. B. Warfield writes: The proximate end of Our Lord's assumption of humanity is declared to be that He might die; He was "made a little lower than the angels … because of the suffering of death" (Heb. 2:9); He took part in blood and flesh in order "that through death … " (2:14). The Son of God as such could not die; to Him belongs by nature an "indissoluble life" (7:16 m.). If He was to die, therefore, He must take to Himself another nature to which the experience of death were not impossible (2:17). Of course it is not meant that death was desired by Him for its own sake. The purpose of our passage is to save its Jewish readers from the offence of the death of Christ. What they are bidden to observe is, therefore, Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels because of the suffering of death, "crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God the bitterness of death which he tasted might redound to the benefit of every man" (2:9), and the argument is immediately pressed home that it was eminently suitable for God Almighty, in bringing many sons into glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect (as a Saviour) by means of suffering. The meaning is that it was only through suffering that these men, being sinners, could be brought into glory. And therefore in the plainer statement of verse 14 we read that Our Lord took part in flesh and blood in order "that through death he might bring to nought him that has the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage"; and in the still plainer statement of verse 17 that the ultimate object of His assimilation to men was that He might "make propitiation for the sins of the people." It is for the salvation of sinners that Our Lord has come into the world; but, as that salvation can be wrought only by suffering and death, the proximate end of

His assumption of humanity remains that He might die; whatever is more than this gathers around this.—*Biblical Doctrines*, pp. 186–87

Chapter XXV

God the Son: The Kenosis

In this division of this treatment of Christology, consideration must be given to one passage of Scripture which, due to the fact that unbelief has misinterpreted and magnified it out of all proportion, is more fully treated exegetically by scholars of past generations than almost any other in the Word of God. Reference is made to Philippians 2:5–8, which reads: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

The problem centers upon the verb ἐκένωσεν which, with reference to Christ, declares that He *emptied* Himself. The immediate context is clear about what it was that He released. This specific truth will be attended more fully. From this verb the word *kenosis* has entered theological terminology, being the corresponding noun. The *Kenosis Theory* is usually an extreme view of Christ's self-emptying, which self-emptying took place at the incarnation when He exchanged what may be termed His eternal mode of existence for that related to time, from the form of God to the form of a servant or bondslave. Certain penalties or forfeitures were involved in this exchange, which by the unbelieving have been enlarged beyond the warrant of the Scriptures. The theological discussion which has been engendered is far removed from the simplicity of the faith of the early church, which faith this passage reflects, and equally as far removed from the intent of the great Apostle who wrote these words. Naturally, the phrase *emptied Himself* may suggest, to those whose minds so demand, the notion that He divested Himself of all divine attributes. Devout scholars cannot accept this conception and they evidently have not only the support of the context but that of all Scripture. The one group have made much of the human limitations of Christ, while, on the other hand, the other group—quite mindful of these limitations—see also the emphasis which the Word of God assigns to the manifestations of His Deity. The controversy is between those

who with natural limitations of their own see little of the realities of the theanthropic Person, and those opposed who, being illuminated by the Spirit, recognize the uncomplicated and undiminished presence in Christ of both the divine and human natures. A portion of the great volume of literature which this discussion has produced should be read by every theological student.

Both the *condescension* of Christ—from His native heavenly sphere to the position of man—and the *humiliation* of Christ—from His position as a man to the death of the cross—are indicated in this passage. The kenosis question is not so much concerned with the humiliation of Christ as it is with the condescension. The question inquires. How much did He release? The answer, naturally, is to be found in the discovery of that which enters into His theanthropic Person. If in His incarnation God the Son abrogated the estate of Deity, the surrender is beyond all computation. If, on the other hand, He retained His Deity, suffering certain manifestations of that Deity to be veiled for a moment of time, the surrender may more easily be comprehended. The fundamental truth that the eternal God cannot cease to be what He is has been demonstrated earlier in this work, and any theory which supposes that God the Son could cease to be what He ever has been and ever will be, is error of the first magnitude. But, it is inquired again. Do not the avowed human limitations (cf. Matt. 8:10; Mark 13:32; Luke 2:52; Heb. 4:15; 5:8) imply the absence of divine perfections? Is it not this double reality of the functioning of two natures in one Person which constitutes His uniqueness? He is the God-man, mysterious, indeed, to finite minds, but none the less actual according to the testimony of the Scriptures. If He is to serve as the Mediator between God and man, it is to be expected that He will be complex beyond all human comprehension.

In approaching this notable passage, the purpose in the Apostle's mind should be in view. This is stated in verse 4: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." To do this is to have the mind of Christ, since that is precisely what He did when He, without grasping selfishly the estate which was His own by right, released it in behalf of others, or in similar words which express the same truth concerning Christ: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich" (2 Cor. 8:9). Evidently there is no occasion to

convince the Philippian Christians that the One who appeared in the form of a servant had already existed in the form of God, and that He, before He became in fashion as a man, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. All this is accepted truth with them. The Apostle's message is practical rather than theological in its purpose: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (vs. 5). This incidental and more or less familiar manner of referring to the preexistence of Christ argues strongly that the doctrine was received by the Philippian believers.

This context, so far as it is claimed by kenoticists, may be given a threefold divisional treatment, namely (a) "the form of God," (b) the condescension, and (c) "the form of a servant … the likeness of men."

I. "The Form of God"

The first revelation concerning this great movement on the part of Christ from that eternal glory which pertains alone to Deity to a felon's death on a cross is that He subsisted (*being*, or *existing*, as variously rendered) in the form of God. The verb does not convey the thought of an estate which once was, but no longer is. "It contains no intimation, however, of the cessation of these circumstances or disposition, or mode of subsistence; and that, the less in a case like the present, where it is cast in a tense (the imperfect) which in no way suggests that the mode of subsistence intimated came to an end in the action described by the succeeding verb (cf. the parallels, Lk. 16:14, 23; 23:50; Acts 2:30; 3:2; II Cor. 8:17; 12:16; Gal. 1:14). Paul is not telling us here, then, what Our Lord was once, but rather what He already was, or, better, what in His intrinsic nature He is; he is not describing a past mode of existence of Our Lord, before the action he is adducing as an example took place—although the mode of existence he describes was Our Lord's mode of existence before this action—so much as painting in the background upon which the action adduced may be thrown up into prominence. He is telling us who and what He is who did these things for us, that we may appreciate how great the things He did for us are" (B. B. Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines*, p. 178).

The phrase, "the form—μορφῇ—of God," has not the meaning of a mere outward appearance; it avers that Christ was essentially and naturally *God*. Though He was this, He looked not greedily upon that estate. If μορφῇ

means here only outward appearance, then Christ left but little to come into this sphere. Similarly, the word μορφῇ is used in this context as a contrast to describe His servanthood and this, too, was not a mere outward appearance, else His condescension is diminished to naught. The measure of the "grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" is being exhibited by two extremes. To minimize either one, or both, is to falsify that which God solemnly declares to be true. Fortunately, this passage does not stand alone. All Scriptures which present the truth of the preincarnate existence of Christ as Deity, seal the force of this declaration that He subsisted on an equality with God, and was God. Thus, also, all passages which affirm His Deity after the incarnation—and there are many—establish the fact that Deity was not surrendered or any attribute thereof when He became flesh. A change of position or relationship is implied, but no surrender of essential Being is indicated, nor is such a surrender possible (cf. Rom. 1:3, 4; 8:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 4:4). All fulness dwells in Him (Col. 1:19), and even more emphatically, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9). It was none other than God Himself who was "manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16). The same God is manifest by the appearing of the Savior Jesus Christ (2 Tim. 1:10); and He who is to come, the glorified theanthropic Person, is declared to be "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:13). Even if Philippians 2:6 were obscure, it would in no way be subject to a "private interpretation," but would require conformity to this overwhelming testimony of the Scriptures that the Deity of the Son of God in no way ceased because of the incarnation.

It is too often assumed that the coming of Christ into the world was an unprepared and abrupt visitation. This simulation has rendered the whole divine revelation more difficult of apprehension for many. Looking backward through the medium of the Word of God, it may be seen that there has been continuous progression in the revelation of God to men and that the first advent of Christ, though related to the problem of sin, is now being unfolded by the Holy Spirit and is a preparatory step toward the finality of disclosure when the presence and power of God will be seen at the second advent. The extent of Christ's estate which was His before He came into the world is well described by Dr. Samuel Harris: "Thus in the knowledge of Christ we are lifted above the 'provincialism of this planet' and brought into fellowship with angels and archangels, with finite spirits of all orders and

all worlds. God, in that eternal mode of his being called the Logos, the Word, the Son, existed and was working out the great ends of eternal wisdom and love before his advent in Christ on earth. In the mystery of his eternal being, he was uttering himself, bringing himself forth in action as the eternal personal Spirit, the eternal archetype and original of all finite rational persons. In ways unknown to us, he may have revealed himself to the rational inhabitants of other worlds in his likeness to them as personal Spirit. He may have been trusted and adored by innumerable myriads of finite persons from other worlds before he revealed himself on earth in the son of Mary. So he himself says in prayer to his Father in heaven, 'The glory which I had with thee before the world was.' And he describes himself as the Son of man who came down from heaven, and who, even while on earth, was in heaven" (*God the Creator and Lord of All*, I, 413). Another has suggested that this earth might be "the Bethlehem of the universe," and the thought is reasonable in the light of revealed truth concerning all that exists. There are those, Dr. I. A. Dorner in particular, who hold, and with much reason and some Scripture, that the first advent was not alone a mission related to the cure of sin, but that it was required in the progress of divine self-revelation. He maintains that to see God revealed in Christ Jesus is an essential experience for any and all who will reach the realms of glory, whether they have sinned or not. What deep and hidden meaning is contained in the words that Christ while here on earth was "seen of angels"? At any rate, the narrowing of that eternal mode of existence and the veiling of the effulgence of His glory to the end that God might be manifest to men and redemption for the lost might be secured, is the story of the incarnation.

II. The Condescension

The extent of the transition from heaven's highest glory to the sphere of men could not be estimated. "When he cometh into the world, he saith, … Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5–7). This text records a word spoken by Christ before He reached the age of maturity—perhaps it was spoken before He was born of the virgin; for it is written in Psalm 22:10 that, while on the cross, He said to His Father, "I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly." In unknown past ages He was appointed to be the

Lamb slain (Rev. 13:8). Added to all this the Spirit of God has caused many predictions to be written which anticipate Christ's coming—one, indeed, in the Garden of Eden. Thus the condescension is previewed and recorded. It represents a divine arrangement, being designed and wrought by God. Christ was the Father's gift to the world; yet He chose to come and to be subject to the will of Another. He *delighted* to do His Father's will, both out of joyous obedience and because of His infinite understanding and vital participation in all that was proposed in the eternal counsels of God. What other meaning can be placed on the phrase, "when the fulness of the time was come"? Is it not that the moment in time had been reached when "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law" (Gal. 4:4)? Of all marvels of the universe none is greater than this, that He who was in the beginning with God, and was God, has become flesh. John testifies that He was seen and handled by men (John 1:1; 1 John 1:1). The fire in the bush—typifying His Deity—did not consume the bush which typified His humanity. Though lowly in its origin, that which the bush represents abides unconsumed forever.

III. "The Form of a Servant…The Likeness of Men"

As for God, no one hath ever seen Him; God's only begotten who is in the bosom of the Father [ever abiding], He hath declared Him (John 1:18). This is the Messenger of all messengers, the Servant more effective than all servants. To this end He became all that He was required to be that He might thus serve as the Revelation and the Redeemer. He thus served both God and man as the Revelation, and He thus served both God and man as the Redeemer. He said, "I am among you as he that serveth," and, in actual experience of humble service, He washed the disciples' feet. The phrase, "the form of a servant," is identical as to actuality with the phrase "the form of God." By the latter it is declared that originally He was all and everything that makes God God; by the former it is declared that He is all and everything that makes a servant a servant. His servant-title, *Faithful and True* (Rev. 19:11), is revealing. It implies both perfect obedience and perfect achievement. This was pursued by Him to the point of death—even the death of the cross. With prophetic vision He said, even before His death, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" (John 17:4), and when

He reached the moment of death He said, “It is finished” (John 19:30). How great is the Revelation! How perfect the Redemption!

He who subsisted immutably as the precise form or reality which God is, assumed that which is human, not in place of the divine, but in conjunction with it. He added to Himself the precise form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men. He was *man*, but that term was not sufficient to define Him. Because of His theanthropic Person, His manhood, though fully present, was better styled, “the likeness of men.”

Since it is recorded that He “emptied himself,” the kenosis inquiry is, of what did He empty Himself? That His Deity was dimished, or that He surrendered any divine attribute, is equally impossible because of the immutability of Deity, nor are such notions sustained by any word of Scripture. It may be observed again that all the doctrinal revelation which the kenosis passage presents was drawn out as an illustration of the human virtue, then being enjoined, of not looking on the things of self, but rather on the things of others. The subordination of self in behalf of others does not require the discarding of self. Christ emptied Himself of self-interest, not clutching His exalted estate, however rightfully His own, as a prize too dear to release in behalf of others. To do this, He condescended to a lowly position, His glory was veiled, and He was despised and rejected of men. They saw no beauty in Him that they should desire Him. He was a root out of dry ground without form or comeliness (Isa. 53:2). On the cross He said of Himself, “I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people. All they that see me laugh me to scorn” (Ps. 22:6, 7). The very essential glory of this condescension is not that Deity had forsaken Him, but that God thus wrought. It was God that was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself (2 Cor. 5:19).

With reference to the kenosis passage and the general forms of interpretation of it, no better statement has been found than that of Dr. Charles Lee Feinberg in *Bibliotheca Sacra* (XCII, 415–18), which is here quoted:

> Any scriptural explanation of the doctrine of the Person of Christ must give this passage a prominent, if not a central, place. But in the expounding of it men’s minds have been wont to ask: Of what did Christ empty Himself? In what did the kenosis consist? This whole question was pushed prominently to the fore in the early decades of the last century when the Reformed and Lutheran branches of the German Protestant Church attempted to effect a

feasible basis of union. Such passages as John 14:28 and Mark 13:32 where it is written: “my Father is greater than I” and “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,” formed the starting point, apart from Philippians 2:5–11, for much of the thinking and discussion on the subject. On the very face of it, consideration of this subject is inevitable: if Christ was God in His preexistent state and then became man, what did He give up in the transaction? There have been four general kenotic theories, all aiming at the same end. According to Bruce, “The dominant idea of the kenotic Christology is, that in becoming incarnate, and in order to make the Incarnation in its actual historical form possible, the eternal preëxistent Logos reduced Himself to the rank and measures of humanity” (*The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 136). The four types of kenotic speculation are: (1) the absolute dualistic type; (2) the absolute metamorphic type; (3) the absolute semi-metamorphic type; (4) the real but relative.

The first view, which is set forth by Thomasius and others, maintains that the attributes of God can be divided into two sharply distinct groups: the ethical or immanent and the relative or physical. The former are really those that are essential to Godhead. The attributes of the immanent trinity cannot be parted with; those of the economical trinity can. The divine attributes of omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence are merely expressive of God’s free relation to the world and need not be considered indispensable. The essential attributes of deity are supposed to be absolute power, absolute love, absolute truth, and absolute holiness. This theory cannot stand, because it sets up too sharp a distinction between the attributes of God and deduces therefrom conclusions that are untenable. Could Christ be truly God, though He maintained absolute holiness, if He lost omniscience or omnipresence? This theory depotentiates the Logos to an unwarrantable degree. Besides the denial of the omnipresence of the incarnate Logos appears quite weak in the face of a statement like that made in John 3:13 where the Lord Jesus said: “And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.”

The second view, upheld by such men as Gess, Godet, and Newton Clarke, really holds to an absolute metamorphism by “divine suicide.” According to this position the preincarnate Logos so humbled Himself and emptied Himself of all divine attributes, that He became purely a human soul. In order to relieve themselves of the stigma of Apollinarianism they make it clear that they assert, not that the Logos took the place of the human soul in Christ, but that He became the human soul. His eternal consciousness ceased, to be regained gradually until He attained once more in the plerosis to the completeness of divine life. This theory is so untrue to the scriptural representation of the hypostatic union in history, which must ever be the measuring rod for any and all views of Christ’s Person, that it needs no minute refutation.

The third theory, advanced by Ebrard, contends that the Eternal Son in becoming man underwent not a loss but a disguise of His deity, in such a sense that “the divine properties, while retained, were possessed by the Theanthropos only in the time-form appropriate to a human mode of existence. The Logos, in assuming flesh, exchanged the form of God, that is, the eternal manner of being, for the form of a man, that is, the temporal manner of being” (*The Humiliation of Christ*, A. B. Bruce, p. 153). This exchange is both perpetual and absolute. This view fares no better than the former two when judged on the basis of the Word; if this theory is true then Christ was not fully God and fully man at one time as the Scriptures portray Him to be.

There remains now to note the fourth theory of the kenosis Christology which declares that the incarnate Logos still possesses His Godhead in a real and true sense, but He does so within the restricted confines of human consciousness. True deity is never in existence

outside of the true humanity. The properties of the divine nature are not present in their infinitude, but are changed into properties of human nature. The objection to this theory is that the attributes of God are not as elastic as this view would have us believe,—to be enlarged or contracted at will. Omniscience is just that always; omnipresence is always such; omnipotence connotes the same thing always. There is not a limited omnipresence, because although the Logos was in the body of Christ, He was also in heaven (Jn. 3:13).

What, then, is a true theory of the kenosis or self-emptying of Christ? First of all, the principle must be laid down that "the Logos … ceases not for a single moment (in spite of His voluntary humiliation) to be that which He was in His eternal nature and essence" (*Christian Dogmatics*, J. J. Van Oosterzee, Vol. II, p. 515). When the preëxistent and eternal Logos took on humanity, He gave up the visibility of His glory. Men could not have looked upon unveiled deity. The kenosis, furthermore, implies that Christ gave up, as Strong aptly suggests, the "independent exercise of the divine attributes" (*Systematic Theology*, p. 382). Christ was possessed of all the essential attributes and properties of deity, but He did not use them except at the pleasure of the Father. We believe just this is meant when Christ declares: "The Son can do nothing of himself" (Jn. 5:19). A proper explanation and understanding of Philippians 2:5–11, then, as well as the issues involved in a scriptural view of the kenosis, are indispensable bases for any Christological discussion.

Conclusion

A simple illustration—that of Christ's self-denial—employed by the Apostle to enforce the Christian grace of self-denial, has, largely because of the immeasurable truth involved in that which Christ accomplished and somewhat because of the misunderstanding of terminology, developed into a major controversy among theologians; yet the declaration is clearly that of the truth of the incarnation and all that is involved in it. The supreme act of God would hardly be altogether within the range of finite understanding, though finite beings, who are amenable to the Word of God, need not be misled in regard even to the most exalted of realities.

Chapter XXVI

God the Son: The Hypostatic Union

The term *hypostatic* is derived from *hypostasis*, which word, according to the New Standard Dictionary, means "the mode of being by which any substantial existence is given an independent and distinct individuality." Thus it follows that a union of hypostasis character is a union of natures that are within themselves independent and distinct. The expression *hypostatic union* is distinctly theological and is applicable only to Christ in whom, as in no other, two distinct and dissimilar natures are united. History records no instance of any other being like Christ in this respect, nor will any other ever appear. He is the incomparable theanthropic Person, the God-man, the Mediator and Daysman (cf. Job 9:32, 33). There need be no other, for every demand, whether it be for divine satisfaction or for human necessity, is perfectly answered in Christ. This unique Person with two natures, being at once the revelation of God to men and the manifestation of ideal and perfect humanity, properly holds the central place in all reverent human thinking, as His complex, glorious Person has engaged the disputation of past centuries. He is not only of surpassing interest to men, but in Him and in Him only is there any hope for humanity in time or eternity. He is God's gift, God's one and only solution for a lapsed race. Within man, there are no resources whereby he might provide a daysman whose right and authority are both perfectly divine and perfectly human. Nothing that man could produce could redeem a soul from sin or could provide the essential sacrificial blood which alone can satisfy outraged holiness. The pity is that the trend of theological discussion regarding the unique Person of Christ has been metaphysical, theoretical, and abstract, while so little attention has been directed toward the truth that His wonderful Person is mediatorial, saving, and satisfying forever. The study of the controversies of past centuries over the Person of Christ is a discipline in itself and is not to be included in the plan of this work on Systematic Theology, other than from this line of historical truth certain warnings about disproportionate emphasis may be drawn. The specific theme, the hypostatic union, is to be approached under

two main divisions, namely, (a) the structure of the doctrine and (b) the relationships of the theanthropic Person.

I. The Structure of the Doctrine

Four vital factors constitute the structure of this specific doctrine: (a) His Deity, (b) His humanity, (c) the complete preservation of each of these two natures without confusion or alteration of them and their unity.

1. His Deity. The proofs already adduced in a previous section of this thesis are depended upon at this point as a declaration of the Deity of Christ. That evidence demonstrated the truth that Christ is not only an equal member in the Godhead before His incarnation, but that He retained that reality in "the days of His flesh." It remains, however, to be seen that this experience of the incarnation by which two natures are united in one Person belongs only to the Son. The Father and the Spirit are seen to be associated and active in all that concerns the Son; but it was the Son alone who took upon Him the human form and who is, therefore, though glorified, a Kinsman in the human family. As complex and difficult as it may be to human minds, the original Trinitarian unity abides as perfectly after the incarnation as before (cf. John 10:30; 14:9, 11).

2. His Humanity. Similarly, a former section of this thesis has demonstrated that by the incarnation Christ assumed a complete and perfect humanity. This He did not possess before, and its addition to His eternal Deity has resulted in the God-man which Christ is. Though His Deity is eternal, the humanity was gained in time. Therefore, the theanthropic Person—destined to be such forever—began with the incarnation. It is also revealed that though the assumption of His humanity was first a condescension and afterwards a humiliation, through His death, resurrection, and ascension He acquired a surpassing glory. There was a joy which was "set before him" (Heb. 12:2), and, because of the obedience manifested in the cross, God "hath highly exalted him" (Phil. 2:9). Reference is thus made to a glory and joy exceeding every glory and joy that had been His before. His condescension and humiliation were not relieved by a dismissal of His humanity, but by its glorification. A glorified man whose humanity has not been renounced is in heaven. As such He

ministers in behalf of His own who are in the world, and as such He is seated upon the Father's throne expecting until, by the authority and power of the Father committed unto Him, His enemies shall be made the footstool of His feet (Heb. 10:12, 13) and the kingdoms of this world are become "the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ" (Rev. 11:15).

Therefore, it is to be recognized that the theanthropic Person is *very God* and *very man*, and that His humanity, perfect and complete, is as enduring as is His Deity.

3. The Complete Preservation of Each of His Two Natures Without Confusion or Alternation of Them and Their Unity. The present effort is not one of defending either the Deity or the humanity of Christ, separately considered, that endeavor having been made on previous pages. It is rather one of defending the truth so evidently taught in the New Testament, that undiminished Deity—none other than the Second Person, whom He eternally is—incorporated into His Being that perfect humanity which He acquired and ever will retain. Of these two natures it may be affirmed from the evidence which Scripture provides, that they united in one Person, and not two; that in this union, that which is divine is in no way degraded by its amalgamation with that which is human; and, in the same manner and completeness, that which is human is in no way exalted or aggrandized above that which is unfallen humanity.

The reality in which undiminished Deity and unfallen humanity united in one theanthropic Person has no parallel in the universe. It need not be a matter of surprise if from the contemplation of such a Being problems arise which human competency cannot solve; nor should it be a matter of wonder that, since the Bible presents no systematized Christology but rather offers a simple narrative with its attending issues, that the momentous challenge to human thought and investigation which the Christ is, has been the major issue in theological controversy from the beginning to the present time. On the supernatural verities the greatest and most devout minds have pondered, the greatest theologians have written, and the most worthy of God's prophets have proclaimed. The ordering and systematizing of truth relative to the theanthropic Person not only could not be avoided, but became at once the greatest burden resting upon those who exercised leadership in the church of Christ. The creeds of the church are easily read and professed, but

it is well to remember the white heat of controversy out of which these priceless heritages have been forged. The Word of God counsels men to give heed to doctrine (1 Tim. 4:13, 16), and here, concerning Christ, is a limitless field in which priceless treasures are hid and truths are discovered which not only determine the destiny of men, but awaken every human capacity for meditation, worship, and praise. The greatest divine objective and the supply of the greatest human need are dependent for their realization upon the theanthropic character of the Christ of God. If the hypostatic union of two diverse natures in Christ is subject to superficial gloss, it is rendered ineffectual at every point, the purpose of God is thwarted, men are still in their sins and doom, Christianity becomes only a refined paganism, and the world is without hope. To repeat: it is not a matter at this point of a correct view as to the Deity or the humanity of Christ separately considered; it is a matter relative to the God-man—what He is, being the incarnate theanthropic Person. With reverence it is said that the Deity which Christ is could not, unaccompanied, save the lost, nor could the humanity which Christ is, acting solitarily, redeem. The issues involved are as great as the eternal purpose of God and as imperative as the need of all lost souls combined. So delicate is the adjustment of these two natures in Christ that to emphasize one at the expense of the other is to sacrifice the efficacy of all. It is natural to estimate that divine nature in Christ as so far transcending the human nature in dignity, eternal Being, and intrinsic glory, that the importance of the human nature all but disappears. Whatever may be the rightful disparagement between Deity and humanity when severed and standing each as a representation of its own sphere, it must be observed that manifestation, redemption, and much future glory resides to a large degree in the humanity of Christ.

It is equally natural to suppose that the divine nature would be injured to some extent if combined with that which is human, and the human nature would be exalted out of its precise limitations if combined with the divine. The teaching of the Scriptures serves to save the reader from such natural conclusions. The Deity of Christ is unimpaired by its union in one Person with that which is unfallen human nature, and the unfallen humanity retains its normal limitations. The confusion and uncertainty that would follow if these natures were subject to problematical alterations is beyond estimation.

It is natural, also, to conclude that the presence of two natures must result in two personalities. This could not be true, for Christ is ever represented as one Person, though He be the coalition of two so widely diverse qualities. On this deeply important phase of this theme, Dr. B. B. Warfield has written with his accustomed clarity:

> There underlies, thus, the entire literature of the New Testament a single, unvarying conception of the constitution of Our Lord's person. From Matthew where He is presented as one of the persons of the Holy Trinity (28:19)— or if we prefer the chronological order of books, from the Epistle of James where He is spoken of as the Glory of God, the Shekinah (2:1)—to the Apocalypse where He is represented as declaring that He is the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End (1:8, 17; 22:13), He is consistently thought of as in His fundamental being just God. At the same time from the Synoptic Gospels, in which He is dramatized as a man walking among men, His human descent carefully recorded, and His sense of dependence on God so emphasized that prayer becomes almost His most characteristic action, to the Epistles of John in which it is made the note of a Christian that He confesses that Jesus Christ has come in flesh (I Jn. 4:2) and the Apocalypse in which His birth in the tribe of Judah and the house of David (5:5; 22:16), His exemplary life of conflict and victory (3:21), His death on the cross (11:8) are noted, He is equally consistently thought of as true man. Nevertheless, from the beginning to the end of the whole series of books, while first one and then the other of His two natures comes into repeated prominence, there is never a question of conflict between the two, never any confusion in their relations, never any schism in His unitary personal action; but He is obviously considered and presented as one, composite indeed, but undivided personality. In this state of the case not only may evidence of the constitution of Our Lord's person properly be drawn indifferently from every part of the New Testament, and passage justly be cited to support and explain passage without reference to the portion of the New Testament in which it is found, but we should be without justification if we did not employ this common presupposition of the whole body of this literature to illustrate and explain the varied representations which meet us cursorily in its pages, representations which might easily be made to appear mutually contradictory were they not brought into harmony by their relation as natural component parts of this one unitary conception which underlies and gives consistency to them all. There can scarcely be imagined a better proof of the truth of a doctrine than its power completely to harmonize a multitude of statements which without it would present to our view only a mass of confused inconsistencies. A key which perfectly fits a lock of very complicated wards can scarcely fail to be the true key.—*Biblical Doctrines*, pp. 206–7

The truth concerning the complex Person which Christ is, is set forth in the New Testament. It is the work of the theologian to discover its proper order and to discern its precise meaning. This will not be the result if human opinion is allowed to intrude. To reach a correct estimation of the Person of Christ has been the aim of the greatest scholars whose conclusions have been crystallized into creeds. The Chalcedonian symbol has been the norm

of orthodox thinking since its drafting in the fifth century. It reads: “We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in Manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul and body; consubstantial [co-essential] with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably;* the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning [have declared] concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us” (*Creeds of Christendom*, Schaff, Vol. II, pp. 62, 63, cited by Miley, *Theology*, II, 7). The declaration made in the Westminster Confession of Faith is true to this Chalcedonian creed, though stated in different language. There it is written: “The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon Him man’s nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin; being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance. So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures—the Godhead and the manhood—were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man” (Chap. viii. sec. 2, cited by Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, 3rd ed., I, 311).

There is little question on the part of devout men but that the Deity of Christ is ever present and abides. The humanity, originating in time, is subject to many suppositions, and only the infallible Word of God is to be followed. A brief quotation from Dr. W. Cunningham is full of meaning:

The distinctive constituent elements of a man, of a human being, of one who is possessed of perfect human nature, are a body and a soul united. Christ took to Himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and He retained, and still retains them in all their completeness, and with all their essential qualities. He was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, "of her substance," as is said in the Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism; these words, "of her substance," being intended as a negation of an old heresy, revived by some Anabaptists after the Reformation, to the effect that He was conceived *in* Mary, but not *of* her; and that He, as it were, passed through her body without deriving anything from her substance; and being intended to assert, in opposition to this notion, that she contributed to the formation of Christ's human nature, just what mothers ordinarily contribute to the formation of their children. Having thus taken a true body, formed of the substance of the Virgin, He continued ever after to retain it, as is manifest in the whole history of His life, of His death, and of the period succeeding His resurrection; and He has it still at the right hand of God. He took also a reasonable soul, possessed of all the ordinary faculties and capacities of the souls of other men, including a power of volition, which is asserted in opposition to the error of the Monothelites. We see this clearly manifested in the whole of His history, both before and after His death and resurrection; and the proofs of it might very easily be drawn out in detail in a survey of the whole record which God has given us concerning His Son.—WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D.D., *Historical Theology*, 3rd ed., I, 313

Dr. John Miley has done a real service in tracing the development of Christological thought through the early centuries. Though of some length, a portion is here reproduced:

In Christianity, even from the beginning, Christ was the great theme of the Gospel and the life of Christian experience and hope. Therefore he could not fail to be the subject of much thought. Nor could such thought limit itself to merely devotional meditations, but inevitably advanced to the study of his true nature or personality. For the deepest Christian consciousness Christ was the Saviour for whose sake all sin was forgiven, and in whose fellowship all the rich blessings of the new spiritual life were received. For such a consciousness he could not be a mere man. It is true that in the history of his life he appeared in the fashion of a man and in the possession of human characteristics; still, for the Christian consciousness he must have been more than man. But how much more? And wherein more? Such questions could not fail to be asked; and in the very asking there was a reaching forth of Christian thought for a doctrine of the person of Christ. In such a mental movement the many utterances of Scripture which ascribe to him a higher nature and higher perfections than the merely human would soon be reached. Here it is that a doctrine of the person of Christ would begin to take form. He is human, and yet more than human; is the Son of God incarnate in the nature of man; is human and divine. Reflective thought could not pause at this stage. If Christ is both divine and human in his natures, how are these natures related to each other? What is the influence of each upon the other on account of their conjunction or union in him? Is Christ two persons according to his two natures, or one person in the union of the two? Such questions were inevitable. Nor could they remain unanswered. The answers were given in the different theories of the person of Christ which appeared in the earlier Christian centuries. It is not to be thought strange that theories differed. The subject is one of the profoundest. It lies in the mystery of the divine incarnation. The divine Son invests himself in human nature. So far the statement of the incarnation is easily made; but the statement leaves

us on the surface of the profound reality. With a merely tactual or sympathetic union of the two natures, and consequently two distinct persons in Christ, the reality of the divine incarnation disappears. With the two distinct natures, and the two classes of divine and human facts, how can he be one person? Is the divine nature humanized, or the human nature deified in him? Or did the union of the two natures result in a third nature different from both, and so provide for the oneness of his personality? The Scriptures make no direct answer to these questions. They give us many Christological facts, but in elementary form, and leave the construction of a doctrine of the person of Christ to the resources of Christian thought. Soon various doctrines were set forth. In each case the doctrine was constructed according to what was viewed as the more vital or determining fact of Christology, as related to the person of Christ. Opposing views and errors of doctrine were the result. More or less contention was inevitable. The interest of the subject was too profound for theories to be held as mere private opinions, or with indifference to opposing views. The strife was a serious detriment to the Christian life. Hence there was need of a carefully constructed doctrine of the person of Christ; need that the construction should be the work of the best Christian thought, and that it should be done in a manner to secure the highest moral sanction of the Church.

The state of facts previously described called for some action of the Church which might correct or, at least, mitigate existing evils. Certainly there was need that errors in Christology should be corrected and contending parties reconciled. A council which should embody the truest doctrinal thought of the Church seemed the best agency for the attainment of these ends. The Council of Chalcedon was constituted accordingly, in the year of our Lord 451. The Council of Nice was specially concerned with the doctrine of the Trinity. The doctrine constructed clearly and strongly asserted the true and essential divinity of Christ, but expressed nothing definitely respecting his personality. For more than a century this great question still remained without doctrinal formulation by any assembly properly representative of the Church. The construction of such a doctrine was the special work of the Council of Chalcedon. The subject was not a new one. Much preparatory work had been done. Many minds were in possession of the true doctrine, which was already the prevalent faith of the Church. There was such preparation for the work of this Council. Indeed, the notable letter of Leo, Pope of Rome, to Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, so accurately and thoroughly outlined a doctrinal statement of the person of Christ, that little more remained for the Council than to cast the material into the mold of its own thought and send it forth under the moral sanction of the Church.—*Systematic Theology,* II, 5–7

II. The Relationships

A practical approach to the right understanding of the theanthropic Person is through the major relationships He, as God-man, sustained while here on earth. These are:

1. To the Father. On the divine side of His Being, the Christ of God always occupied the exalted place of fellowship with the Father on the ground of equality—notably His High Priestly prayer as recorded in John 17:1–26; and every reference to His Deity implies this equality and oneness. On the human side of His Being, that which is inherently the creature's

relation to the Creator is expressed to perfection, namely, perfect submission to the Father's will. The complete obedience of Christ to the Father has been made the occasion of doubt as to His equality with the Father. Strong emphasis is needed at this point, which enforces the truth that His subservient attitude is altogether the function of His humanity. There was that in His own divine nature which was first *willing* to be the obedient One. He *willingly* left the glory, and that exercise of His volition preceded His incarnation (Heb. 10:4–7). In like manner, He will exercise authority in all future ages by the appointment of the Father. He reigns forever and ever, but on the ground of the truth that all authority is committed unto Him of the Father (Matt. 28:18; John 5:27; 1 Cor. 15:24–28).

2. To the Spirit. Another difficult aspect of revelation concerning the relationships of the God-man is resident in the truth that He did His mighty works by the power of the Holy Spirit. It is written that the Spirit generated the humanity of the God-man (Luke 1:35); He descended upon Christ (Matt. 3:16); He filled Christ without measure (John 3:34; cf. Luke 4:1); Christ asserted that His works were wrought by the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:28); and He offered Himself to God by the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14). This dependence of Christ upon the Holy Spirit is a theme which must have its full treatment under Pneumatology. It may suffice to observe at this point that the humanity of Christ is again in view. Being equal to the Spirit, it was wholly within His own power to minister in every mighty work, but this would most evidently complicate the inner relationships of His own Being and remove Him from the position of One who is an example to His followers. Christians are privileged to serve in the power of the Spirit; and so the Christ of God served, but only within the sphere of His humanity. It may be observed, likewise, that the cooperation of the Persons of the Godhead may form some basis for these relationships. Over against the truth that Christ wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit, is the corresponding truth that the Spirit was subject to Christ, for Christ sends the Spirit into the world (John 16:7), which is a divine prerogative; and the Spirit originates no message of His own, but speaks only what He hears, namely, the message of Christ (John 16:13).

3. To Himself. Unceasing discussion has continued, and many and varying opinions have been expressed as to what Christ's own consciousness could have been. How could He know and sense the might and wisdom of infinity and yet preserve that which is normal human weakness and limitation? How could He know and not know? How could He be the source of all power and yet be prone and exposed to human frailty? If two personalities were predicated of Him, it is conceivable that one, being divine, might be conscious of things belonging to that realm while the other, being human, might be conscious of things which are restricted. The Word of God lends no sanction to the idea of a dual personality in Christ. Whatever His varied abilities and qualities may be, He remains an individual Person.

Consideration is naturally directed toward the problem as to when in His development from babyhood to manhood He became conscious of His Deity and thus assured of His limitless resources. This question has been before all generations and seems to appeal to those even who evince little interest in more vital features of Christological study. One writer has recently suggested, and it is not a new notion, that at the time of the incarnation Christ's Deity passed into a state of coma from which there was a gradual recovery as the years progressed. However sincere such a writer may be, such a proposal is nothing short of an insult to the Deity of Christ. No truth could be more established than that which declares that Deity, being immutable as to every feature that enters into divine existence, could never be subject to the slightest experience of unconsciousness. It is no more a problem as to how conscious Deity can combine with human babyhood, than it is as to how Deity can combine with humanity at all. On the divine side of His Being—even when He existed as a fetus in the virgin's womb—He could have spoken the word of command and dismissed all material things back to nothing from which He had once called them forth. The field of contrast between the two natures of Christ is widened, as it appears to finite minds, when the Creator of all things is contemplated as a helpless infant in a human mother's arms. The mystery is that of the incarnation itself, and is a problem of faith and not of understanding.

Christ was far from being a normal child. It must be believed of Him that He never sinned in childhood any more than He sinned in manhood. For a

child to reach the age of maturity having never sinned in that absolute sense in which Deity cannot sin, is hardly normal from the human viewpoint. Mary had many things to "ponder" and the purity of her child was one of them. The approach to this complexity is too often wholly wrong. It is assumed that Christ was first a human infant who sometime in His experience took on the consciousness of Deity. The truth is that He was God from all eternity with a divine consciousness which can never be dimmed, and, in the unchangeable experience of Deity, He took on or entered into the realms common to a human body, soul, and spirit. Evidently, in some minds, Christ was more *anthropotheistic* than *theanthropic*. In His childhood, as in the period of gestation, He awaited the hour of a fuller manifestation; but He was ever the conscious Logos of God who was present. Whatever may have been the solution of the problem of two wills —the divine and human—in the one Person, the problem of the divine and human consciousness in one Person is still more baffling. It is only one of many enigmas. How could He be tempted when God cannot be tempted? How could He die when God cannot die? These are problems the finite mind cannot solve. Certainly there is none other to compare with Him. He is "God manifest in the flesh," the only theanthropic Person the universe will ever behold. Why, indeed, should man be surprised if he cannot understand God? To be surprised thus is to be amazed at the revelation that God is greater than man.

4. To Angels Unfallen and Fallen. A very wide field of relationship is indicated in the Bible between the unfallen angels and the Lord of Glory. They evidently attended Him and observed Him from His birth to His ascension. The incarnation of their Creator and the events incident to a perfect redemption were of greatest moment to the holy angels.

In respect to the fallen angels, there arises a relationship which is more or less paradoxical. One line of testimony concerning Him is that He commanded the evil spirits with complete divine authority. They never resisted His sovereign will. They even anticipated His coming judgments upon them when they declared, "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8:29). Yet, on the other hand, He Himself was tested by Satan. This testing was wholly within the sphere of His humanity and concerned issues which

had to do with the Father's will for Him. In the one instance, His Deity is acting in ways which are divine. In the other instance, His humanity, being what it was, is subject to that peculiar form of temptation. The answer is all sealed in the truth that He is the theanthropic Person—the God—man.

5. To Humanity. Sufficient emphasis upon the truth of Christ's humanity has been given in an earlier portion of this theme. He is *Immanuel*—God became man, a member of this race. It is not one who *was* God, or who ceased to be God, who became flesh; it is God manifest in the flesh. Had He ceased to be God, or had He failed to become man, He could not have been the Kinsman Redeemer. No greater honor was ever conferred on the race as such than that disclosed in the word *Immanuel*.

6. To Sin and the Sin Nature. In this relationship all is negative so far as the Person of Christ is concerned. A very great theme, belonging to Soteriology, is introduced, quite foreign here, when it is declared that He became "sin for us" (2 Cor. 5:21). Regarding His Person, it is true that His humanity was as sinless as His Deity. As the unfallen man He is free from a sin nature, but it is equally true that He never sinned. As to the sin nature, He was announced by the angel, even before His birth, to be "that holy thing" (Luke 1:35), and in all points He was tempted as a man apart from those temptations which arise from the sphere of a sin nature (Heb. 4:15). With respect to the fruit of a fallen nature He fearlessly challenged His enemies, saying: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" (John 8:46). And none in any succeeding generation has been any more successful in laying any sin to His account. Though living among men as one of them for thirty-three years, He retained the holiness of Deity in every respect.

a. The Impeccability of Christ. A serious question, quite hypothetical, yet vital, arises whether Christ, being human, had the ability to sin. Was He peccable or impeccable? Here the fact of the *unity* of His Person is involved and becomes in a large measure the key to the solution of the problem. There are those who, desiring to accentuate the reality of Christ's humanity, have taught that He could have sinned, and, apparently, without due regard for all that is involved. Some have taken the ground that, because of His infinite wisdom and power, He *would* not sin. Others contend that, being God, He *could* not sin. In the course of the argument which this problem engenders,

it is essential to recognize that, as demonstrated in the case of the first Adam, an unfallen human being may sin; and from this it may be reasoned, were there no other factors to be considered, that the unfallen humanity of Christ could have sinned. It is at this point that error intrudes. If isolated and standing alone, it is claimed that the humanity of Christ, being unsupported, could have willed against God as Adam did. The misleading fallacy is that the humanity of Christ could ever stand alone and unsupported by His Deity. With Adam there was but one nature and it could stand in no other way than unsupported and alone. The humanity of Christ was not, and could not be, divorced from His Deity, nor could it ever be in a position of uninvolved responsibility. Dr. W. G. T. Shedd has used the illustration with good effect that a wire may be bent by human hands, but, when welded into an unbendable bar of steel, it cannot be bent. If it be argued that Christ's humanity seemed to act separately in matters of knowledge, human weakness, and limitations, this may be conceded; yet not without a reminder that, though His humanity might seem to act independently in certain ways which involved no moral issues, because of the unity of His Person His humanity could not sin without necessitating God to sin. From such a conclusion all devout persons must shrink with holy fear. In God is no darkness at all (1 John 1:5), nor is there in God so much as a shadow cast by turning (James 1:17). This vexing problem is thus reduced to the simple question whether God could sin; for Jesus Christ is God. If it be admitted that God cannot—not merely *would* not—sin, it must be conceded that Christ *could* not—not merely *would* not—sin. It remains only to observe that, since He is "the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever" (Heb. 13:8), had He been capable of sinning on earth, He is still capable of sinning now. In such a situation, the believer's position and standing *in Christ* must ever be in jeopardy. It is a question whether the one theanthropic Person could sin. When thus viewed, there could be no ground for further discussion on the part of those who honor the Son as they honor the Father (John 5:23).

The impeccable Person of Christ is well set forth by Dr. Charles Lee Feinberg:

> First of all, the hypostatic union gave the world an impeccable Person. This predicates of Christ, mark you, not only anamartesia, but impeccability. It is not just a matter of *posse non peccare*, but of *non posse peccare*. It is not enough to say Christ did not sin; it must be declared unequivocably that He could not sin. To entertain for a moment the thought that

> Christ could sin, would involve issues that call for a radical revolution in our conception of the Godhead. To say that Christ could not sin is not tantamount to maintaining He could not be tempted. Because He was man He could be tempted, but because He was God He could not sin, for there was no sin principle in Christ that could or would respond to solicitation to sin. When Satan tempted the Last Adam in the wilderness, He was tempted and tested in all points (1 Jn. 2:16) like as the first Adam, and the human race ever since, yet in His case without sin. Sin as an inherent nature or as an outward act was foreign to Christ. Luke records that the angel disclosed to Mary that of her would be born that holy thing which was to be called the Son of God (Lk. 1:35). The hereditary sin nature that Mary had received mediately from Adam through her progenitors was not transmitted to Christ because of His miraculous conception through the operation of the Holy Spirit of God. Christ could later challenge, not His friends mind you, but His enemies to convince Him of sin (Jn. 8:46). He knew that when the prince of this world was come, he would find nothing in Him (Jn. 14:30). Paul says of Him that God made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin (2 Cor. 5:21). Though tempted in all points as we are, He was nevertheless without sin (Heb. 4:15); indeed, we are told, He was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners (Heb. 7:26). In short, the combined testimony of Scripture reveals that in Him is no sin (1 Jn. 3:5).—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, XCII, 422–23.

7. To Those Who are Saved. All that Christ is to the Christian may be classified as either benefit flowing from His Deity, or as benefit flowing from His humanity. In the sphere of redemption and all that accrues to those who are saved through Christ's blood, the humanity and Deity are too closely related to be easily separated. As to the pattern, ideal, and example which Christ is, all originates in His humanity. No human being is asked to imitate God; he is asked to be Christlike, which relates to Christ's adorable and perfect human perfections. In this respect the believer should be holy since God is holy. All this is made possible in the Christian through the enabling power of the Holy Spirit.

Conclusion

It is the work of the Spirit of God to take of the things of Christ and to show them unto men. Apart from this revelation, Christ must ever be a confusing mystery. A liberal writer has said: “He was at the same time humble and proud, acute-minded and weak-minded, clear-sighted and blind, sober-minded and fanatical, with profound knowledge of men and no self-knowledge, clear in his insight of the present, and full of fantastic dreams of the future. His life was, as Lepsius strikingly said, ‘a tragedy of fanaticism.’” Far removed is this declaration from the honor which inspired apostles who lived with Christ ascribed to Him. This is not the adoration of the martyrs who died out of sheer devotion to their Savior, nor is it the voice of the worthy saints and scholars throughout the history of the Church on earth. From the days of the apostles, the theanthropic Person has been recognized and adored in His complex two natures. Dr. B. B. Warfield gathers up this theme in characteristic manner: “The doctrines of the Two Natures supplies, in a word, the only possible solution of the enigmas of the life-manifestation of the historical Jesus. It presents itself to us, not as the creator, but as the solvent of difficulties—in this, performing the same service to thought which is performed by all the Christian doctrines. If we look upon it merely as a hypothesis, it commands our attention by the multiplicity of phenomena which it reduces to order and unifies, and on this lower ground, too, commends itself to our acceptance. But it does not come to us merely as a hypothesis. It is the assertion concerning their Lord of all the primary witnesses of the Christian faith. It is, indeed, the self-testimony of our Lord Himself, disclosing to us the mystery of His being. It is, to put it briefly, the simple statement of ‘the fact of Jesus,’ as that fact is revealed to us in His whole manifestation. We may reject it if we will, but in rejecting it we reject the only real Jesus in favor of another Jesus—who is not another, but is the creature of pure fantasy. The alternatives which we are really face to face with are, Either the two-natured Christ of history, or —a strong delusion” (*Christology and Criticism*, pp. 309–10).

A further word from Dr. Feinberg is of especial value:

> To recapitulate, then, we have pursued our discussion on the hypostatic union along several lines—creedally, noting the course of Christological thinking to show its use as a basis for later theological thought; prophetically, showing the union to be a definite subject of prophecy; historically, setting forth the scriptural representation of the union as an indisputable matter of history; critically or analytically, calling attention to the implications of the doctrine; and finally, functionally, making clear the consequences or benefits that flow from this union. In conclusion, we stand amazed in the presence of this great thing which God hath brought about—the hypostatic union with all its unfathomable mystery yet superabounding benefits—and when we recall that this God-man is the center of God's two-fold eternal purpose wherein He determined "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth," we proclaim with Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! … For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen" (Eph. 1:10; Rom. 11:33, 36).—*Op. cit.*, XCII, 425–26

To all this may be added the words of the inspired Apostle: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory" (1 Tim. 3:16); "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ, which is our hope" (1 Tim. 1:1).

Chapter XXVII

God the Holy Spirit

In Approaching this great feature of Biblical doctrine, three determining considerations are immediately in view, namely, (a) though it is the design of this work to adhere closely to the prevailing custom of treating under Theology Proper only the *Person* and not the work of the members in the Godhead, the revelation concerning the Spirit—He being Administrator of divine undertakings—is almost wholly contained in Scriptures which disclose some form of His activity, and, therefore, some notice of such activity is unavoidable. (b) Since an entire volume will yet be devoted to Pneumatology, no more of this doctrine will be introduced here than is deemed essential as a preparation for that which intervenes. (c) It is not intended in this presentation of Systematic Theology to follow an established custom of slighting, and to that degree dishonoring, the Holy Spirit; yet at this juncture the reader may be reminded that in the field of evidence respecting the Deity of the Spirit, much the same arguments, based on similar Scriptures as already employed touching the Deity of the Son, are pertinent and germane here. Such discussion of this doctrine as is admitted into this thesis at this point will follow a sevenfold division: (a) the personality of the Holy Spirit, (b) the Deity of the Holy Spirit, (c) the witness of the Old Testament, (d) the witness of the New Testament, (e) His titles, (f) His relationships, and (g) His adorable character.

I. The Personality of the Holy Spirit

As the burden of the course of reasoning concerning God the Son centered about His theanthropic Person, in like manner the burden of the course of reasoning respecting the Holy Spirit centers about what may be known about His Person, but with no complexity such as arises where a union of two natures is involved. The issue is whether the Spirit is a Person at all. Naturally those who oppose themselves against the truth that God subsists in three equal Persons have always sought to degrade the Spirit to a mere influence, as they have sought to degrade the Son to a mere man. Such opposers, and many uninstructed persons have carelessly joined them, have made much of the truth that the term *spirit* signifies that which is most ethereal, being symbolized by the wind and by breath. Here it will be easily

seen that whatever argument is based on the mere fact of the incorporality of the Holy Spirit is as properly applicable to God the Father and to the angels. Abundant evidence has been adduced to demonstrate that a being is no less a person because of an incorporal mode of existence. Corporality adds but little to the three elements of personality—intellect, sensibility, and will. The following passages suggest the ethereal character of the Spirit: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job 33:4); "And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22). Obviously these texts assert that both the old creation of material things and the new creation of spiritual realities are the result of the work of the Spirit as the breath of God. Doubtless the creative acts here mentioned are the supreme works of God and these could hardly be wrought by the wind or His breath as such, nor could they be wrought by any impersonal influence proceeding from God. In like manner, the same reply may be made to those who aver that the Holy Spirit is but an attribute of God. No attribute ever functioned as Creator, nor have the divine attributes any essentials of personality. The mere citation of such a passage as John 16:13, which reads, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will skew you things to come," contradicts the notion that the Spirit is no more than a divine attribute (cf. John 14:16, 17, 26; 15:26; 16:7–15; Matt. 28:19). That *wisdom* is a title of Christ as used in the book of Proverbs is no basis upon which Christ may be deemed only the attribute of God which is *wisdom*. In the same way it is clear that, because of the fact that the Spirit exercises *power* and *influence*, it cannot be said that He is no more than the divine attributes which these words represent. Two similar passages—Romans 7:6 and 2 Corinthians 3:6—have been thought by some to imply that the Spirit is only an attribute of God. The passages read: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter" (Rom. 7:6); "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. 3:6). Here two dispensations are in view, the former being dominated by the Law which ministers death, and the present being dominated by the Spirit who ministers life.

Science reaches its conclusions on the basis of the attending facts. If this procedure be followed relative to the existing evidence bearing on the Spirit's personality, it will be seen that He, as being the divine Administrator who is ever in action displaying every element of personality, is even more entitled to be recognized as a person than any other. Citation of Scripture at this point would be superfluous, since, of the hundreds of references to the Spirit which the Bible presents, one will serve as well as another. The inclusion of the Spirit distinctly, separately, and equally in ascriptions to Deity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—, and the fact that Christ referred to Him as another Paraclete, capable of functioning in every respect as He Himself had done, serve to terminate doubt as to the personality of the Spirit.

II. The Deity of the Holy Spirit

Some specific and additional arguments as to the Deity of the Spirit—above those already presented concerning the Deity of the Son in which arguments the Spirit shares—should be considered. These may well fall into four general groups:

1. The Holy Spirit is Called God. In the Old Testament, the Spirit is spoken of as Jehovah (Isa. 61:1). In the New Testament, Peter accuses Ananias of having lied unto the Holy Spirit, which he declares is a lie against God. The passage states: "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God" (Acts 5:3, 4). Thus, also, in 2 Corinthians 3:17 the Spirit is said to be *Lord*, which is clearly the Jehovah title.

2. The Holy Spirit is Associated with God. As already observed, it is truth of no small moment that the Spirit is associated with the Father and the Son upon an equality of Being, position, and responsibility. For reasons quite unrelated to the position or ability of the Persons of the Godhead, the Son is given second place and the Spirit the third in the order in which the whole and complete title of God appears in the New Testament. Every

characteristic of Deity belongs as much to the Spirit as to the Father or the Son.

On the relationship between the Persons of the Godhead, Richard Watson writes, incorporating an extended quotation from Bishop John Pearson:

> As to the *manner* of his being, the orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal FILIATION, so the Spirit is God by *procession* from the Father and the Son. "And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who *proceedeth* from the Father and the Son, who, with the Father and Son together, is worshipped and glorified" (*Nicene Creed*). "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*" (*Athanasian Creed*). "The Holy Ghost, *proceeding* from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal GOD" (*Articles of the English Church*). The Latin Church introduced the term *spiration*, from *spiro*, to breathe, to denote the manner of this *procession*; on which Dr. Owen remarks, "as the vital breath of a man has a continual emanation from him, and yet is never separated utterly from his person, or forsaketh him, so doth the Spirit of the Father and the Son proceed from them by a continual Divine emanation, still abiding one with them." On this refined view little can be said which has obvious Scriptural authority; and yet the very term by which the third person in the trinity is designated WIND or BREATH may, as to the third person, be designed, like the term Son applied to the second, to convey, though imperfectly, *some intimation of that manner of being by which both are distinguished* from each other, and from the Father; and it was a remarkable action of our Lord, and one certainly which does not discountenance this idea, that when he imparted the Holy Ghost to his disciples, "he BREATHED on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22).
>
> But whatever we may think as to the doctrine of "*spiration*," the PROCESSION of the Holy Ghost rests on direct Scriptural authority, and is thus stated by Bishop Pearson:—
>
> "Now this procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son, and is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First, it is expressly said, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, 'When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me,' John 15:26. And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted: for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in the personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath been already shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.
>
> "Secondly, though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions, which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Father. 'It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you,' Matt. 10:20. For by the language of the apostle, the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, 'The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. And we have received not the spirit of

the world, but the Spirit which is of God,' 1 Cor. 2:11, 12. Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son; for 'because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts,' Gal. 4:6: the Spirit of Christ; 'Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his,' Rom. 8:9; 'even the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets,' 1 Peter 1:11; the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the apostle speaks, 'I know that this shall turn to my salvation, through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ,' Phil. 1:19. If then the Holy Ghost be called the Spirit of the Father, because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son.

"Again: because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who bath by the original communication, a right of mission; as 'the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send,' John 14:26. But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father is also sent by the Son, as he saith, 'When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you.' Therefore the Son bath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son, because he received not the Godhead from him; but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner, neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit; because neither of them received the Divine nature from the Spirit: but both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost, because the Divine nature, common to both the Father and the Son, was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As therefore the Scriptures declare expressly, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father; so do they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son."—*Theological Institutes*, I, 628–30

3. The Attributes of God are Predicated of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is *eternal* (Heb. 9:14). He is *omnipresent*, since He is said to dwell in every believer (1 Cor. 6:19). He is *omniscient*. He it is who searcheth all things, even the deep things of God (1 Cor. 2:10). He is one of *supreme majesty*, for to vex Him, to do despite to Him, or to blaspheme Him, is sin in its most serious form. He giveth life (John 6:63). He inspires the Scriptures (2 Tim. 3:16); He teaches (John 16:13); He regenerates (John 3:6); He is the Spirit of "truth," of "grace," and He is *holy*, being especially honored with that descriptive title.

4. The Holy Spirit May Be Blasphemed. No person other than Deity could be the object of blasphemy, and in the case of the Spirit and under the circumstances which obtained when Christ was here on earth, the Spirit could be blasphemed by ascribing to Satan the works which were wrought by the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:31).

It may be concluded, then, that the Spirit is one who shares equally in the Godhead and, though the Son and the Spirit sustain specific relations with respect to the *manner* of their position, it does not follow that either the Son or the Spirit is any less Deity than the Father. This conclusion is harmonious

with all the Word of God, which assigns to the Spirit equal honor with the Father and with the Son.

III. The Witness of the Old Testament

At this point that progress of doctrine which the Bible exhibits is again in evidence. Much concerning the Spirit of God is discovered in the Old Testament; but, as in the case of the Son, or more exactly, the doctrine of the Trinity, the direct and complete revelation of the triune mode of subsistence is reserved for the New Testament. With the earlier and more limited disclosures and with the all-important burden resting upon Old Testament saints to maintain monotheistic truth in its essential purity, sufficient reason is apparent for the fact that the full disclosure of the triune mode of subsistence should be withheld and be revealed at the time when the Second and Third Persons have their ministries more fully revealed. Nevertheless, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit suffers less change in passing from one Testament to the other than does the doctrine of the Son. Place must be made in the instance of the Son for the incarnation and earth-life and all that these connote, while the Spirit, apart from the fact that He undertakes different activities in different ages and is actually resident in the world throughout this age, is the same in His essential mode of Being in all ages. Though much added truth concerning the Spirit awaits a larger expression in the New Testament, the Old Testament leaves no vital feature unannounced.

The title by which the Third Person is most commonly known is confronted in the opening verses of the Bible and without introduction or preparation. His Person and power are assumed. But, while this is true, it will be seen that various books of the Old Testament make no reference to the Spirit; He appears in every book of the New Testament save Philemon and 2 and 3 John, and more frequently, indeed, in the writings of the Apostle Paul than in all the Old Testament together. On the identity of the Spirit as He is presented in the New Testament in harmony with the records of the Old Testament, Dr. James Denney writes: “The Apostles were all Jews,—men, as it has been said, with monotheism as a passion in their blood. They did not cease to be monotheists when they became preachers of Christ, but they instinctively conceived God in a way in which the old

revelation had not taught them to conceive him. … Distinctions were recognized in what had once been the bare simplicity of the Divine nature. The distinction of Father and Son was the most obvious, and it was enriched, on the basis of Christ's own teaching, and of the actual experience of the Church, by the further distinction of the Holy Spirit" (cited by Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines*, p. 103). Dr. B. B. Warfield as definitely asserts:

> The New Testament writers identify their "Holy Spirit" with the "Spirit of God" of the older books. All that is attributed to the Spirit of God in the Old Testament, is attributed by them to their personal Holy Ghost. It was their own Holy Ghost who was Israel's guide and director and whom Israel rejected when they resisted the leading of God (Acts 7:51). It was in Him that Christ (doubtless in the person of Noah) preached to the antediluvians (1 Pet. 3:19). It was He who was the author of faith of old as well as now (2 Cor. 4:13). It was He who gave Israel its ritual service (Heb. 9:8). It was He who spoke in and through David and Isaiah and all the prophets (Matt. 22:43, Mark 12:36, Acts 1:16, 28:25, Heb. 3:7, 10:15). If Zechariah (7:12) or Nehemiah (9:20) tells us that Jehovah of Hosts sent His word by His Spirit by the hands of the prophets, Peter tells us that these men from God were moved by the Holy Ghost to speak these words (2 Pet. 1:21), and even that it was specifically the Spirit of Christ that was in the prophets (1 Pet. 1:11). We are assured that it was in Jesus upon whom the Holy Ghost had visibly descended, that Isaiah's predictions were fulfilled that Jehovah would put His Spirit upon his righteous servant (Isa. 42:1) and that (Isa. 61:1) the Spirit of the Lord Jehovah should be upon Him (Matt. 12:18, Luke 4:18, 19). And Peter bids us look upon the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost as the accomplished promise of Joel that God would pour out His Spirit upon all flesh (Joel 2:28, 29, Acts 2:16). There can be no doubt that the New Testament writers identify the Holy Ghost of the New Testament with the Spirit of God of the Old.—*Ibid.*, pp. 103–4

Various writers have adopted a threefold division of the ministration of the Spirit as represented in the Old Testament. These ministrations, though outside the accepted range of Theology Proper, may be mentioned here in support of the contention that the Spirit is of the Godhead and proved to be by His administration of the things of God. This threefold division is:

1. The Holy Spirit in Cosmical Undertakings. From the opening verse on to the end of the Old Testament there is testimony given relative to the Spirit as the active power in God who created all things and by whom they are sustained. The impression which the text conveys is that there is one in the Godhead who is transcendent, who speaks the word of command, who may be designated *the Word of God*, and one who executes that which is determined. God said, Let things appear (or, come into being), and He who brooded over all things caused it to be done. Much light is thrown in

subsequent Scriptures on the stupendous events so briefly mentioned in the early verses of Genesis. In the opening of John's Gospel, it is declared that the Word is God and that all things were made by Him. This account confirms the truth already intimated, namely, that by the command of the Word all things were wrought, and wrought by Him who administers and executes the divine will and purpose. Thus some slight ground is offered for the apprehension of the otherwise perplexing truth that each of those who comprise the Godhead is in turn said to have functioned separately as Creator. Thus the Persons of the Godhead are said to have wrought in the incarnation, in the death, and in the resurrection of the Second Person. In like manner, they are seen working in the new creation when the soul of man is born of the Spirit to a relationship in which God is his Father, and the ground of that salvation is the redeeming work of the Son. Every divine calling-forth in creative authority and purpose is executed by Him who administers the divine will. Confirmation in later Scriptures of the Old Testament's testimony relative to the Spirit's work in creation, and in addition to the account given in Genesis 1:1, 2, is of great importance. It is written: "By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens" (Job 26:13); "Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth" (Ps. 104:30); "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job 33:4). Here, also, there is abundant evidence set forth as to the Spirit's personality which controverts the claim of pantheism, and God is seen to be both immanent and transcendent in His relation to the world He has made. The work of the Spirit in the sphere of divine government is yet a more pronounced feature of the Old Testament doctrine.

2. The Holy Spirit's Work in Things Governmental. This vitally important theme must not be restricted to the mere government of men in which the Spirit takes so great a part; it reaches out, as well, to the divine government of all things and contemplates the authority of God which is displayed not only in directing but in creating spiritual realities. At this point the contrast between pre-cross ages and the present time becomes obvious. Then the Spirit came upon individuals apparently without regard for personal qualifications; at the present time He is the abiding, indwelling Presence in all who believe. Writing of the Spirit's authority and

undertakings, Oehler states: “It rules within the theocracy (Isa. 63:11, Hag. 2:5, Neh. 9:20), but not as if all citizens of the Old Testament theocracy as such participated in this Spirit, which Moses expresses as a wish (Num. 11:29), but which is reserved for the future community of salvation (John 3:5). In the Old Testament the Spirit’s work in the divine kingdom is rather that of *endowing the organs of the theocracy with the gifts required for their calling*, and those gifts of office in the Old Testament are similar to the gifts of grace in the New Testament, 1 Cor. 12 ff” (*Old Testament Theology*, p. 141). The oft-repeated phrase, “The Spirit of Jehovah came upon,” characterized so many who discharged rule and acted directly for God. This is especially true of chosen men who wrought in the building of the tabernacle and the temple. The outstanding manifestation of the Spirit upon men of the Old Testament period is that which is termed *the Spirit of prophecy*. God raised up His prophets in all generations, but few of these were called upon to write and of those who did write not many were appointed to write Scripture. The prophet’s supreme authority was recognized by kings and rulers. Other men might enforce the law, but the prophet proclaimed the law of God which was to be enforced. The fact that the prophets of the Old Testament were especially empowered by the Spirit of God is asserted in the New Testament: “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Pet. 1:21). Two exceedingly vital passages tend to disclose the high expectation of the people and the provisions divinely made: “According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not” (Hag. 2:5); “Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the LORD of hosts” (Zech. 4:6). It was within the one sacred nation, Israel, that the divine power wrought, protecting, instructing, and leading, and all to the end that the will of God for that people should be realized.

As in the cosmical undertakings which were so evidently outside the thing wrought and to the confusion of all pantheistic notions, likewise, in governmental undertakings, the Spirit is seen as the sovereign one who uses material in ways of His own design and wholly apart from the volition of the instrument. It is from without and quite apart from such natural gifts as the instrument might possess. This approach to men from without is emphasized in the fact that the Spirit is given unto them specifically from

God (Isa. 42:1). God fills men with His Spirit (Num. 11:25; Ex. 28:3; 31:3). This is, as in the case of the filling of the Spirit enjoined in the New Testament, a coming *upon* men (Judges 14:6, 19; 1 Sam. 11:6). So, also, the Spirit "falls" upon the prophet (Ezek. 11:5), and clothes Himself with a man (Judges 6:34). Much of this is in strong contrast to the New Testament relationship wherein each believer is a temple of the Spirit and is commanded to be "filled with the Spirit," which blessing dependeth not on sovereign divine action, but on human adjustment to the will of God. Similarly, the contrast is further seen in that the presence of the Spirit in the New Testament believer is not merely for a moment, corresponding to the duration of some specific divine enterprise, but is an abiding reality to the end of the pilgrim's path. It is true that the Spirit wrought immediately in and through the instrument for each occasion or need. Concerning this feature of truth, Dr. A. B. Davidson writes: "The view that prevailed among the people—and it seems the view of the Old Testament writers themselves—appears to have been this: the prophet did not speak out of a general inspiration of Jehovah, bestowed upon him once for all, as, say, at his call; each particular word that he spoke, whether a prediction or a practical counsel, was due to a special inspiration, exerted on him for the occasion" (*The Expositor*, July, 1895, p. 1, cited by Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines*, p. 117).

No consideration of the governmental aspect of the Spirit in relation to Israel will be complete that does not contemplate one great Messianic passage in which, as nowhere else in the Word of God, it is taught that even the kingdom rule of Messiah will be exercised in the power of the Spirit: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked" (Isa. 11:1–4). In this context, the Spirit is introduced in His sevenfold fulness, which reference does not

imply that there are seven separate spirits, but rather the complete or full measure of the one Spirit.

It is equally important to note the Old Testament's expectation of the Spirit's relation to Christ during His first advent. One passage records this anticipation: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law" (Isa. 42:1–4). Yet again, the prophet Isaiah foresees both the first and the second advent of Christ and the Spirit of Jehovah is said to be upon Him as much for the one advent as for the other. The portion of this prediction which belongs specifically to the first advent is identified and indicated by Christ Himself; the record is in Luke 4:16–21. The whole prediction in which both advents appear is as follows: "The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the LORD, that he might be glorified" (Isa. 61:1–3). Yet another Old Testament passage describes the work of the Spirit in relation to the second advent and the setting up of Messiah's rule: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit" (Joel 2:28, 29).

3. The Holy Spirit in Relation to Individuals. While attention has been given above to the Spirit's work in the cosmos and the government of God over Israel both past and future, this the third division of truth relative to the Spirit as disclosed in the Old Testament is of His relation to

individuals, each in the sphere of his own life and experience. A doctrine embracing the Old Testament teaching as to the Holy Spirit cannot be formed with the same completeness as that which embraces the truth of the New Testament. The doctrine of regeneration by the Spirit came as a surprise and bewilderment to Nicodemus. The Spirit is not said to indwell all Old Testament saints who were counted as the covenant people of God. Nor is there any word in the Old Testament related to the *baptism* of the Spirit, by which ministry the New Testament believers are joined to the Body of Christ. The Israelite began by being born into a covenant relation with Jehovah and from then on was able to continue in right relation to Jehovah through the sacrifices which were, in the event of sin, the basis of forgiveness and restoration. That many Old Testament saints went on experimentally into deep fellowship with God is demonstrated in a very extended number of individuals, many of whom are named in Hebrews 11:1–40. One striking case is that of King Saul. Upon his choice to be king, Samuel declared: "And the Spirit of the LORD will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man. And it was so, that when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart: and all those signs came to pass that day" (1 Sam. 10:6, 9). It will be remembered that with all his equipment of divine enablement, Saul failed and Jehovah Himself declares when speaking to David of the reign of Solomon: "But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee" (2 Sam. 7:15). That the Spirit once given might be withdrawn is continually intimted in the Old Testament (cf. Ps. 51:11; Isa. 63:10, 11).

Since the Messianic age is so much the expectation of Old Testament prophets, those passages which bear upon the Spirit's relation to men in that age are properly introduced here. Israel's judgments will be "until the spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest" (Isa. 32:15). The kingdom promise is: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring …" "As for me, this is my covenant with them, said the LORD; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever" (Isa.

44:3; 59:21; cf. Ezek. 11:19; 18:31; 36:26; 37:14; 39:29). So, also, Zechariah prophesies of the same people and of the same kingdom-conditions that will be: “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn” (Zech. 12:10; cf. Joel 2:28, 29).

In concluding this examination of the Old Testament’s witness to the Holy Spirit, the one question remains whether the text is sufficiently explicit to justify the belief that Old Testament saints, having no other Scriptures than their own, recognized this distinct and separate Person in the Godhead. Is it within the scope of the Old Testament teaching so to introduce the Person and work of the Spirit that He would be seen in that individuality which belongs to the Persons of the Trinity? No better conclusion will be found than that by Dr. B. B. Warfield, which reads:

> Such an identification need not involve, however, the assertion that the Spirit of God was conceived in the Old Testament as the Holy Ghost is in the New, as a distinct hypostasis in the divine nature. Whether this be so, or, if so in some measure, how far it may be true, is a matter for separate investigation. The Spirit of God certainly acts as a person and is presented to us as a person, throughout the Old Testament. In no passage is He conceived otherwise than personally—as a free, willing, intelligent being. This is, however, in itself only the pervasive testimony of the Scriptures to the personality of God. For it is equally true that the Spirit of God is everywhere in the Old Testament identified with God. This is only its pervasive testimony to the divine unity. The question for examination is, how far the one personal God was conceived of as embracing in His unity hypostatical distinctions. This question is a very complicated one and needs very delicate treatment. There are, indeed, three questions included in the general one, which for the sake of clearness we ought to keep apart. We may ask, May the Christian properly see in the Spirit of God of the Old Testament the personal Holy Spirit of the New? This we may answer at once in the affirmative. We may ask again, Are there any hints in the Old Testament anticipating and adumbrating the revelation of the hypostatic Spirit of the New? This also, it seems, we ought to answer in the affirmative. We may ask again, Are these hints of such clearness as actually to reveal this doctrine, apart from the revelation of the New Testament? This should be doubtless answered in the negative. There are hints, and they serve for points of attachment for the fuller New Testament teaching. But they are only hints, and, apart from the New Testament teaching, would be readily explained as personifications or ideal objectivations of the power of God. Undoubtedly, side by side with the stress put upon the unity of God and the identity of the Spirit with the God who gives it, there is a distinction recognized between God and His Spirit—in the sense at least of a discrimination between God over all and God in all, between the Giver and the Given, between the Source and the Executor of the moral law. This distinction already emerges in Genesis 1:2; and it does not grow less observable as we advance through the Old Testament. It is prominent in the standing phrases by which, on the one hand, God is

spoken of as sending, putting, placing, pouring, emptying His Spirit upon man, and on the other the Spirit is spoken of as coming, resting, falling, springing upon man. There is a sort of objectifying of the Spirit over against God in both cases; in the former case, by sending Him from Himself God, as it were, separates Him from Himself; in the latter, He appears almost as a distinct person, acting *sua sponte*.—*Ibid*., pp. 124–26

IV. The Witness of the New Testament

Whatever may have been the force of the Old Testament revelation regarding the Holy Spirit and that under the prescribed limitations which a divinely arranged progress of doctrine imposed, it is evident that the full manifestation of His personality and Deity, the full import of His equal position in the Godhead, and the specific scope and objective in His work, are declared in the New Testament. That the truth concerning the Spirit forms a major theme in practically every book of the New Testament is a fact which must be arresting to all who are concerned. It is outside the range of the scope of this present discussion to attempt at this point any general presentation of so vast a theme except to say, that, as pointed out above, it is the same Holy Spirit who is disclosed in the New Testament who appears so fully in the Old Testament, though very much truth is added by the New Testament message. The progress of doctrine is in evidence and not any change in the Person being considered. Without an expanding prelusion the Spirit, as God Himself, is seen in the New Testament in the full ordered majesty of His own divine Person. He is presented as One who is coming into the world and that by the promise of both the Father and the Son (John 14:26; 16:7), and thus He came on the Day of Pentecost. In view of the Old Testament revelation which avers that He was already in the world, a problem arises about the meaning of these promises that He would come into the world. The answer is hidden in the distinction which obtains between an *omnipresence*, which is the mode of the Spirit's presence in the world before the Day of Pentecost, and *residence*, which is the mode of the Spirit's presence after Pentecost. It yet remains to occur that He whose residence is now in the Church, the temple of living stones (Eph. 2:18–22), will as definitely leave the world when His temple is removed; and yet, after being removed from the world as a resident, He will still be in the world as the omnipresent One. This it will be recognized is no new procedure, since the same is true of the Second Person who was first in the

world in the omnipresent sense and, after being resident here for thirty-three years, left the world, but still retained the omnipresent presence since He indwells every believer (Col. 1:27) and is attending wherever two or three are met in His name (Matt. 18:20).

V. His Titles

Strangely, indeed, no name has been revealed by which the Spirit may be designated. He is rather differentiated by descriptive titles. The following is at least a partial representation of these designations: “Spirit of your Father” (Matt. 10:20), “Spirit of God” (Matt. 12:28), “Spirit of the Lord” (Luke 4:18), “Holy Spirit” (Luke 11:13), “Spirit of Truth” (John 14:17), “Spirit of life” (Rom. 8:2; Rev. 11:11), “Spirit of adoption” (Rom. 8:15), “the Lord is that Spirit” (2 Cor. 3:17), “Spirit of his Son” (Gal. 4:6), “Spirit of Jesus Christ” (Phil. 1:19), “Spirit which he hath given us” (1 John 3:24), “eternal Spirit” (Heb. 9:14), “Holy Spirit of promise” (Eph. 1:13), “the Spirit” (John 7:39), “the Comforter” (John 15:26), “the Spirit of glory” (1 Pet. 4:14), “the seven spirits” (Rev. 1:4).

No final reason may be assigned for the fact that only descriptive titles are used for the Spirit in the Bible. He who does not speak *from* Himself as the originator of His message, but declares what is said to Him by the Son (John 16:13, 14), is, nevertheless, and in spite of all His submission in this age, none other than the glorious Person—the Third in the blessed Trinity.

VI. His Relationships

Here, again, the course of this theme leads on to the work of the Spirit and therefore must be restricted at this point to mere intimation with a larger consideration in anticipation. Certain of the Spirit’s relationships, if considered separately, may serve to amplify what should be apprehended regarding Him:

1. To the Father. Of the Spirit it is declared that He proceeds from the Father. He executes the designs of the Father. The broad titles, “the Spirit of God” and “the Spirit of your Father,” may be received as references to the One who is thus related to the Father. God who is Himself a spirit (John

4:24), bestows His Spirit upon the Son (John 3:34), and upon all who believe (John 7:39).

2. To the Son. The relationship between the Second and Third Persons of the Godhead introduces a limitless theme reaching out to all those works of the Son which were wrought by the power of the Spirit. It is believed by some that Christ accomplished all His mighty works by the power of the Spirit and thus is an example to believers who are appointed to live and serve by the Spirit. The Third Person is sometimes termed the Spirit of Christ (cf. Rom. 8:9), which title evidently relates Him to the Second Person as One whom the Second Person sends (John 16:7), and who executes the purpose and applies the values which arise in and through the Second Person.

3. To the World. Two illuminating passages relate the Spirit to the world. First, 2 Thessalonians 2:6, 7, which Scripture presents the Spirit, though the identity is not directly asserted, as the present restraining power over the world. The passage reads: "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way." And second, John 16:7–11, in which the Spirit is presented as the One who reproves, or enlightens, the world with respect to sin, righteousness, and judgment. This, it would seem, is a work of the Spirit in the heart of the individual unregenerate person, which is essential preparation of that person for an intelligent acceptance of Christ as Savior. To quote: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." Similarly, as the world is one of the three major foes which the believer encounters, the Spirit is that enabling power who delivers from the enticements of the world.

4. To the Flesh. The flesh with its inherent Adamic nature is said to be "contrary" to the Spirit, and "lusts against" the Spirit, even as the Spirit

“lusts against” the flesh. Thus two widely different walks, or manners, of life are indicated—that of the flesh and that of the Spirit. It is true that to walk in the flesh is to disannul the power of the Spirit (Rom. 8:6, 13), and to walk in the Spirit is to disannul the works of the flesh (Rom. 6:6; 8:4; Gal. 5:16).

5. To the Devil. Again the sphere of the Christian’s conflict is in view. And, as in the encounter with the world and the flesh, the victory is only through the power of the Spirit. The central passage—Ephesians 6:10–17—points to the truth that the conquest must be by being “strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might” and by putting on “the whole armour of God.” The complete provision is implied in 1 John 4:4, “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world.”

6. To Christians. Far-reaching and characterizing are the relationships between the Spirit and the Christian. The Spirit regenerates, indwells or anoints, baptizes, seals, and fills, thus not only creating the essential factors which together make the Christian what he is, but empowering him to walk worthy of that high calling.

7. To the Divine Purpose. Though somewhat of a recapitulation, the last relationship to be mentioned here comprehends the measureless undertakings of the Spirit as Administrator and Executive of the whole divine purpose from its beginning to its final consummation in glory.

VII. His Adorable Character

For specific reasons not revealed, the Third Person bears the distinctive title of *Holy* Spirit. It could not be concluded upon any basis which the Scriptures provide that He is more holy than the Father or the Son; it is rather that the emphasis thus falls on His adorable character. There is strong probability that, as He indwells sinful beings of earth, this impressive appellation is employed by way of contrast. Assurance is given that when the Second Person became incarnate—thus related to humanity—He was described by the angel as “that holy thing” (Luke 1:35). Thus the Third

Person, though resident in human hearts, is still and ever will be the *Holy* Spirit of God.

Conclusion

Though strangely slighted, neglected, and unrecognized, the Spirit is the adorable, majestic, ever glorious, equal member of the Godhead Three. That He is disregarded cannot be due to any failure on the part of the Bible to declare His Person, or to set forth the boundless character and infinite importance of His work. Naturally, human thought begins with the First Person and extends to the Second Person, and it is highly probable that, having contemplated these, the point of saturation is so nearly reached there is little ability left that might respond to the proper claims of the Third Person in the Godhead. It becomes the solemn duty of every student of God's Word to correct, so far as possible, every tendency to ignore the truth concerning the Spirit, and by prayer and meditation to come into a deeper realization of His Person and presence. Reprovable indeed is the Christian who does not know some facts concerning the One whose temple he is. It is true that it is the Spirit's ministry to glorify Christ, but there is no warrant from the Word of God for the indignity which a common disregard for the Spirit imposes on Him.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; … world without end. Amen.

Volume Two

Angelology • Anthropology

Hamartiology Table of Contents

Angelology

Chapter I. Introduction to Angelology Chapter II. General Facts about the Angels I. Angelic Spheres

II. The Reality of the Angels

III. Relative Importance of Angels and Men IV. The Personality of the Angels

V. The Creation and Mode of Existence of the Angels VI. The Abode of the Angels

VII. The Number of the Angels

VIII. The Power of the Angels

IX. The Classification of the Angels 1. Governmental Rulers 2. Elect Angels

3. Cherubim, Seraphim, and Living Creatures a. Cherubim
   b. Seraphim
   c. Living Creatures
4. Individual Angels
   a. Lucifer, Son of the Morning (Isa. 14:12) b. Michael (Dan. 12:1)
   c. Gabriel (Dan. 9:21)
5. Angels Especially Designated

X. The Ministry of the Angels XI. The Progressive Discipline of the Angels XII. The Angels as Spectators

Conclusion

Chapter III. Angelic Participation in the Moral Problem Chapter IV. Satanology: Introduction Chapter V. Satanology: The Career of Satan I. Satan's Creation, Original Estate, and Fall II. Satan's Sin

1. "I Will Ascend into Heaven"
2. "I Will Exalt My Throne above the Stars of God"
3. "I Will Sit Also upon the Mount of the Congregation, in the Sides of the North"

4. “I Will Ascend above the Heights of the Clouds”
5. “I Will Be Like the Most High”

III. Satan According to the Old Testament IV. Satan According to the New Testament V. Satan Judged in the Cross

VI. The Execution of Satan’s Judgments 1. Satan Cast out of Heaven 2. Satan’s Judgment at the Second Advent of Christ 3. Satan’s Final Judgment

Chapter VI. Satanology: Satan’s Evil Character I. Twofold Wickedness

1. Ambitious Pride 2. Untruth
a. Three Forces
(1) The Force of the Man of Sin
(2) The Force of the Restrainer
(3) The Force of the Destroyer

II. Satan’s Sinfulness Chapter VII. Satanology: The Satanic *Cosmos* I. Satan’s Authority over the *Cosmos* II. The *Cosmos* is Wholly Evil III. Satan’s Undertakings in the *Cosmos* IV. The Things of the *Cosmos* V. Though Detained here, Christians are not of the *Cosmos* VI. The Impotency of the *Cosmos* VII. The End of the *Cosmos* Chapter VIII. Satanology: Satan’s Motive Chapter IX. Satanology: Satan’s Method Conclusion to Satanology

Chapter X. Demonology

Anthropology

Chapter XI. Introduction to Anthropology Chapter XII. The Origin of Man

I. The Evolutionary Theory

II. Revelation

III. The Time of Man’s Origin

Chapter XIII. The Material Part of Man at Creation I. The Structural Character of the Human Body II. The Future of the Human Body

III. Various uses of the Word *Body* IV. The Body of Christ

Conclusion

Chapter XIV. The Immaterial Part of Man at Creation I. The Origin of the Immaterial Part of the First Man II. The Divine Image

III. The Derivation and Perpetuation of the Immaterial Part of Man 1. The Pre-Existence Theory 2. The Creation Theory

3. The Traducian Theory

IV. Elements Which Comprise the Immaterial Part of Man 1. Soul 2. Spirit

3. Heart
4. Flesh
5. Mind

V. The Capacities and Faculties of the Immaterial Part of Man 1. Intellect 2. Sensibility

3. Will
4. Conscience

Chapter XV. The State of Innocence I. The Environment of the First Man

II. The Responsibility of the First Man III. The Moral Qualities of the First Man IV. The Tempter of the First Man

V. The Temptation of the First Man

Chapter XVI. The Fall

I. Spiritual Death and Depravity

II. Physical Death

Conclusion

Chapter XVII. Introduction to Hamartiology I. The Essential Nature of Sin

II. The Derivation of Sin

III. The Divine Permission of Sin

1. The Divine Recognition of the Creature's Free Choice 2. The Specific Value of Redeemed Beings 3. The Acquisition of Divine Knowledge 4. The Instruction of Angels
5. The Demonstration of the Divine Hatred of Evil 6. The Righteous Judgments of All Evil 7. The Manifestation and Exercise of Divine Grace Preparatory Remarks Chapter XVIII. Personal Sin

I. The Origin of Sin

1. The Eternal Anticipation of Sin in the Foreknowledge of God 2. The First Concrete Enactment of Sin in Heaven by an Unfallen Angel a. The Person Who First Sinned
b. The Nature of the First Sin

3. The First Concrete Enactment of Sin by a Human Being on Earth II. The Sinful Nature of Sin III. Three Major Proofs of the Exceeding Sinfulness of Personal Sin 1. The Angelic Proof 2. The Human Proof
3. The Divine Proof

IV. General Definitions 1. Sin against God's Holy Person a. The Theory That Sin Is Selfishness 2. Sin against the Law

a. Early Communications Preserved by Tradition b. Human Conscience
c. Direct Spiritual Guidance
d. The Written Word of God with its Various Age Applications V. General Terms and Classifications VI. The Divine Remedy for Personal Sin 1. Forgiveness 2. Justification

VII. Original Sin VIII. Guilt

IX. Universality

Chapter XIX. The Transmitted Sin Nature I. The Fact of the Sin Nature

II. The Remedy for the Sin Nature

Chapter XX. Imputed Sin

I. The Scope of the Doctrine of Imputation II. Theories of Imputation

III. The Divine Remedy for Imputed Sin 1. The Death of Christ 2. The Keys of Death

3. Death and the Unsaved
4. Death and the Christian
5. Death in the Millennium

Conclusion

Chapter XXI. Man's Estate Under Sin and his Relation to Satan I. The Fact

II. The Remedy

III. The Relation of the Unsaved to Satan Chapter XXII. The Christian's Sin and its Remedy I. The World

II. The Flesh

III. The Devil

IV. The Threefold Provision

1. The Word of God 2. The Interceding Christ
3. The Indwelling Spirit

V. The Twofold Effect of the Christian's Sin 1. The Effect of the Christian's Sin upon Himself 2. The Effect of the Christian's Sin upon God VI. The Christian's Sin Nature 1. "Flesh"

2. "Old Man"
3. "Sin"
   a. The Divine Provision
   b. The Believer's Responsibility

VII. The Christian's Relation to Imputed Sin VIII. The Christian's Relation to Man's Estate Under Sin Chapter XXIII. Punishment

I. Chastisement

II. Scourging

III. Retribution

Chapter XXIV. The Final Triumph over All Sin Angelology

Chapter I

Introduction to Angelology The truth that there is an order of celestial beings quite distinct from humanity and from the Godhead who occupy an exalted estate above the present position of fallen man, is the teaching of much Scripture. These celestial beings are mentioned at least 108 times in the Old Testament and 165 times in the New Testament, and out of this extended body of Scripture the student may construct his doctrine of the angels (cf. Gaebelein, *Angels of God*, p. 12).

The designation *angel*—whether *mal›āk* of the Old Testament Hebrew or *aggelos* of the New Testament Greek—means 'messenger.' These beings execute the purpose of the One whom they serve. The holy angels are the messengers of their Creator, while the fallen angels are the messengers of Satan—"the god of this world"—whom they elect to serve. Men, too, are sometimes styled *messengers*, as they seem to be addressed in Revelation 1:20, though certain expositors, as well represented by Alford, contend that spirit beings are the messengers of the seven churches of Asia. The term *angel* is not only *generic*, in that it is applied to all orders of created spirits, but it is expressive, also, of their office or service.

When considering the angels, as in other doctrines, there is some field for the exercise of reason. Since God is spirit (John 4:24), partaking in no way of material elements, it is natural to assume that there are created

beings who more closely resemble God than do the mundane creatures who combine both the material and the immaterial. There is a material kingdom, an animal kingdom, and a human kingdom; so, it may be assumed, there is an angelic or spirit kingdom. However, Angelology rests not upon reason or supposition, but upon revelation.

As the universe has been ordered, it has not pleased God to give to man any intercourse with the angels, or any consciousness of their presence; yet the Bible states that angels not only observe the affairs of men, but that good angels minister to man's well-being (Heb. 1:14) and evil angels wage a warfare against that in man which is wrought of God (Eph. 6:12). The reality of angelic influence in human affairs is not restricted to a limited portion of human history. The angels are reported to be present from creation and on into the eternity to come. Under a comprehensive fivefold division of God's finite creatures, as they now exist, the angels comprise two divisions, namely, the holy angels and the fallen angels. To these are added the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Christians. However, all classes of beings, regardless of the order or time of beginning, being originated and constituted as they are, go on in their group distinctions into eternity to come. There is no evidence that other orders of finite beings will be introduced in this age or future ages.

In the Middle Ages, unprofitable and often grotesque speculation so characterized the discussion of the doctrine of the angels that a depreciation of this body of truth is abroad today. Of these discussions Dr. Augustus Strong writes: "The scholastics debated the questions, how many angels could stand at once on the point of a needle (relation of angels to space); whether an angel could be in two places at the same time; how great was the interval between the creation of angels and their fall; whether the sin of the first angel caused the sin of the rest; whether as many retained their integrity as fell; whether our atmosphere is the place of punishment for fallen angels; whether guardian-angels have charge of children from baptism, from birth, or while the infant is yet in the womb of its mother" (*Systematic Theology*, sixth edition, p. 221). Thus, also, Rossetti in his *Shadow of Dante* (pp. 14–15) says of Dante: "The fall of the rebel angels he considers to have taken place within twenty seconds of their creation, and to have originated in the pride which made Lucifer unwilling to await the time

prefixed by his Maker for enlightening him with perfect knowledge" (cited by Strong, *ibid.*).

The presence of spirit beings has been recognized in almost all systems of religion. On this fact, Dr. William Cooke makes this comment: Indeed, in nearly all the systems of religion, ancient or modern, we trace such beings; in the Aeons of the Gnostics, the Demons, the Demi-gods, the Genii, and the Lares, which figure so largely in the theogonies, poems, and general literature of heathen antiquity, we have abundant evidence of almost universal belief in the existence of spiritual intelligences, ranging in different orders between man and his Maker. Here, however, we often find truth draped in fiction, and facts distorted by the wildest fancies of mythology. The doctrine of the heathen, respecting spiritual beings, may be thus briefly stated. They believe the souls of departed heroes and good men were exalted to dignity and happiness; these were called demons, and were supposed to be employed as mediators between the supreme divinity and man. There was, however, another class of demons, who were supposed never to have inhabited mortal bodies at all; and of these, there were two sorts: the good, who were employed as the guardians of good men; and evil ones, who were said to envy human happiness, and sought to hinder their virtue and effect their ruin. In these notions we see a substratum of truth; but in the Scriptures we have the truth itself in its original purity, free from the corruptions of superstition and the licentious imagery of the poet; and truth the more majestic from its unadorned simplicity.

> Heathen philosophers and poets often spoke of the ministry of spiritual beings. Socrates often spoke of a good demon attending him, and directing and guiding him by his admonitions. Plato taught that the higher kind of demons, such as had never dwelt in mortal bodies, were appointed guardians unto men. But old Hesiod ascribes a ministering agency to the spirits that had once inhabited mortal bodies during the golden age, and speaks of them as Aerial spirits, by great Jove design'd To be on earth the guardians of mankind.
>
> > Invisible to mortal eyes they go, And mark our actions good or bad below; The immortal spies with watchful care preside, And twice ten thousand round their charges glide; They can reward with glory or with gold, A power they by divine permission hold.
>
> We have here a brief representation of that general sentiment on the offices of these superior beings, which we find so abundantly amplified in the speculations of philosophers, and the dreamy fictions of the poets. But with what steadfast foot we tread when, leaving the flitting theories and amusing dramas of the heathen, we come to the substantial verities of revelation, and in the narrative of simple truth hear what God has said and saints have seen of the angel world.—*Christian Theology*, 5th edition, pp. 610–11, 21–22

Chapter II

General Facts About the Angels

The doctrine of the angels lends itself to twelve general divisions, which are now to be attended.

I. Angelic Spheres

In approaching the Biblical revelation relative to angelic beings, it is necessary to consider the broader sphere of the whole universe and not to restrict this contemplation to the limited boundaries of the earth. Modern astronomy has presented evidence for the vastness of material creation. Solar systems greater than this extend on beyond the range of human power to comprehend. Other suns with all that surround them, removed from this earth and its sun by thirty to sixty billion miles, are known to exist. Camille Flammarion states: "Then I understand that all the stars which have ever been observed in the sky, the millions of luminous points which constitute the Milky Way, the innumerable celestial bodies, suns of every magnitude and of every degree of brightness, solar systems, planets and satellites, which by millions and hundreds of millions succeed each other in the void around us, that whatever human tongues have designated by the name of universe, do not in the infinite represent more than an archipelago of celestial islands and not more than a city in a grand total of population, a town of greater or lesser importance. In this city of the limitless empire, in this town of a land without frontiers, our Sun and its system represents a single point, a single house among millions of other habitations. Is our solar system a palace or a hovel in this great city? Probably a hovel. And the earth? The Earth is a room in the solar mansion—a small dwelling, miserably small" (cited by Gaebelein, *The Angels of God*, pp. 8–9).

From earliest times men have considered the question whether this earth is the only inhabited planet. Science ventures guesses, but the Bible speaks with authority on this age-old problem. It is disclosed that the angels dwell in the heavenly spheres and in numbers beyond human computation. They are gathered in groups which are identified as *thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, authorities,* and *the hosts of heaven.* Yet all these are wholly subject to the Lord Jesus Christ who created this universe and all it contains, including angelic beings. He created "things … visible and

invisible" (Col. 1:16). Peter declares that these beings are subject to Christ (1 Pet. 3:22). No intimation is ever given that these beings are limited to the sphere of this earth or to any restricted part of the universe. Christ said, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14:2). The "Father's house" is no less than the universe in which there are many abodes. Jude asserts (1:6) that angels have their own dwelling places. On this passage Dr. A. C. Gaebelein writes: "In the epistle of Jude we find this significant statement: 'And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day' (Jude 6) … The one thing we wish to consider is the fact, the outstanding fact, that these angels had 'their own habitation.' They had an estate given to them. This seems to us conclusive that angels have in the heavens habitations, places where they dwell, which they can leave as the unseen ministers of God" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 39–40). Hooker states: "Angels are linked into a kind of corporation amongst themselves.… Consider the angels of God associated, and their law is that which disposeth them as an army, one in order and degree above another (Luke 2:13; Matt. 26:53; Heb. 12:22)" (*Ecc. Polity*, Book I, 4:2, cited by Gerhart, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, I, 644). This consideration is important since it is natural for men to suppose that the human sphere forms a center about which other orders of beings are gathered. Angelic existence antedates that of humanity by countless ages, and what is germane to the united, interrelated commonwealth and accomplishments of angels, for which they were created, has been continuously executed without reference to, or dependence upon, the lower and later order of human subsistence. The meaning of the above cited designations—*thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, authorities*—is little related to or dependent on mundane things. These terms betoken the cooperation amongst the angels themselves. Another sphere of relationship is reflected which is itself as vast as the universe wherein it resides and wherein it functions. The angelic beings are declared to have interest in the things of earth and some service in this direction; but no revelation is given as to the extent and nature of the facts and forces which constitute the reality in which the angels live, which reality was in action ages before the creation of man. The Bible is not addressed to the angels, nor does it enter upon an exhaustive description of their estate or interrelationships. It is implied, however, that a vast universe

which the human eye but feebly penetrates is inhabited by unnumbered spirit beings, and that, upon release from the limitations of this sphere, the dwellers of earth are inducted into those extended domains—not to be angels, but to enter the sphere which divine teleology has designed for them.

The natural human vision is not able to discern the presence of angels, but that fact does not impugn the truth that the angels are about us on every hand. Milton has written by poetic fancy and not by inspiration: "Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep" (cited by Strong, *Systematic Theology*, sixth edition, p. 227). When the natural vision of the young man of 2 Kings 6:17 was augmented, he saw the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha. One reason angels are rendered invisible to human sight may be that, if they were seen, they would be worshiped. Man, who is so prone to idolatry as to worship the works of his own hands, would hardly be able to resist the worship of angels were they before his eyes. The Apostle admonishes against the "worshipping of angels" (Col. 2:18), and John testifies: "And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God" (Rev. 22:8–9).

II. The Reality of the Angels

In the light of so much revelation, the speculations of gnosticism regarding angels must be rejected. The angels are living beings of the highest position and greatest consequence in the universe. They are more than mere powers emanating from God. Though in no way independent in the sense that they are self-originating, self-sustaining, or capable of self-annihilation, they are free moral beings and have, in past ages at least, held their own destiny within the power of their own choice. It is revealed that some of the angels "sinned" and that they "kept not their first estate" (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6). Of the tremendous issues involved and the far-flung epochs of history embraced in these brief declarations, no complete disclosure is proffered. Whatever occurred, there could be no breaking away from the

creature's relation to the Creator, and, as stated in the Scriptures, these fallen angels must in the end account to the One whom they repudiated (Ezek. 28:16–17; Matt. 25:41). The sufficiency of the angels, like that of all created beings, is of God alone. They live and move by virtue of divine enablement. Even Michael the archangel when in controversy with Satan asserted his dependence on God (Jude 1:9).

III. Relative Importance of Angels and Men

The Scriptures maintain that man was "made a little lower than the angels" (Ps. 8:4–5; Heb. 2:6–7). Whether this refers to estate, or to essential, inherent qualities, is not determined. It is probable that the angels are superior to man in both respects. Much dispute has arisen in earlier days over this question. Among more recent writers, Martensen, with many others, argues that the angels are inferior to men, while Dorner, with even a larger group, contends that the angels are superior. The Bible avers that man was made in the image of God; no such word is spoken of angels. Man possesses a material body with its experiences; no such experience is reported of the angels, though it is evident that demons seek embodiment whenever that is possible. Discoursing on the angels, Dr. Gerhart writes on the relative importance of angels and men: "Man is a physico-spiritual being, organically uniting in his constitution body and soul. The body is not, as has frequently been taught, a clog to the soul or a degradation of manhood, or the infliction of a penalty. It is an element of dignity, a condition of spiritual vitality. Conjoining body and soul in indissoluble unity, man is connected with two worlds. On the one side, bodily organization binds human life, human personality, with matter, with all the forces and processes of nature backward to its beginnings. On the other side, spiritual life allies man to the pre-mundane dominion of Spirit. Connected with the heavenly realm and with the economy of earth, his constitution qualifies him to be the mediator between the infinite and the finite, between the heavenly and the earthly, the material and the spiritual, the representative of God in His relations to the world, the organ of the world in its relations to God. Revelation does not accord this position of dignity to any order of angelic spirits" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 648–49). Martensen in his *Dogmatics* (pp. 132–33) states: "Although the angel, in relation to man,

is the more powerful spirit, man's spirit is nevertheless the richer and the more comprehensive. For the angel in all his power is only the expression of a single one of all those phases which man in the inward nature of his soul, and the richness of his own individuality, is intended to combine into a complete and perfect microcosm. … It is precisely because the angels are only spirits, not souls, that they cannot possess the same rich existence as man, whose soul is the point of union in which spirit and nature meet" (cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*). No consideration of the relative importance of angels as compared to man will be complete which fails to observe that man, though now sunken to "an horrible pit" and "miry clay," is, when redeemed, lifted up to a place of secure standing on the Rock (Ps. 40:2) and destined to be conformed to the image of Christ, which final estate is far above that of the angels. There is a marked discrepancy in much of the effort to draw a contrast between these two orders of divine creation. The Bible is the only source of trustworthy information and is primarily a revelation to man of his own relation to God. Beyond the mere part that angels have in the affairs of men, there is little intimation about those larger spheres of activity into which the angels enter. The discussion reaches no satisfactory conclusion for want of even elementary knowledge regarding the angels.

IV. The Personality of the Angels

Truth bearing on the personality of angels is also attended with difficulties. Agreement cannot be accorded the following vague statement by Martensen:

> There are many sorts of spirits under the heavens, and for this very reason also many degrees of spirituality and spiritual independence; and we may therefore very properly assert that the angels are divided into classes. … If we contemplate the angels in their relation to the conception of personality, we may say: there are powers, whose spirituality is so far from being independent, that they possess only a represented personality; in short, are only personifications. Of such a character are the tempests and flames, which execute the commands of the Lord. … There exist other powers in the creation which possess a higher degree of spirituality, an intermediate state of existence between personification and personality. Under this category may be classed the spiritual powers in history, as for instance the spirits of nations and the deities of mythology. … But if in this matter we find powers in history, which hover in the region lying between personality and personification, it is no less certain that revelation recognizes a third class of cosmical powers which constitute a free and personal spiritual kingdom.—*Christian Dogmatics,* p. 131, cited by Gerhart, *op. cit.*, p. 642

Though their service or dignity may vary, there is no implication in the Bible that some angels are more intelligent than others. Every feature of personality is predicated of the angels. They are individual beings, and, though spirits, experience emotions; they render intelligent worship (Ps. 148:2); they behold with due understanding the face of the Father (Matt. 18:10); they know their limitations (Matt. 24:36), their inferiority to the Son of God (Heb. 1:4–14); and, in the case of the fallen angels, they know their ability to do evil. The angels are individuals, yet, though sometimes appearing in a separate capacity, they are subject to classifications and varying ranks of importance.

V. The Creation and Mode of Existence of the Angels

It is assumed from Colossians 1:16–17 that all angels were created simultaneously. In like manner, it is assumed that the creation of angels was completed at that time and that none will be added to their number. They are not subject to death or any form of extinction; therefore they do not decrease as they do not increase. The plan by which the human family is secured through propagation has no counterpart among the angels. Each angel, being a direct creation of God, stands in immediate and personal relation to the Creator. Of certain of the human family as they appear in the next world, it is said by Christ, “They neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven” (Matt. 22:28–30). Thus it is concluded that there is no decrease or increase among these heavenly beings.

The existence of angels is assumed in the Scriptures, and the Scriptures form the only source of worthy information bearing on those beings who, aside from supernatural appearances, are not allowed to come into the sphere of human consciousness. As man is the highest creation of earthly spheres, so the angels are the highest creation of larger spheres described in Colossians 1:16–17, where it is written: “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” As the angels, in common with all other moral

beings, were created by Christ and for Christ, so they abide forever unto the praise of His glory. Though some human beings and certain angels now withhold their worship of God, the greater part of the angels are before His throne in ceaseless adoration. It can be no small issue in the divine counsels that certain creatures fallen in sin withhold their note of praise from the One to whom all honor is due. This repudiation could not go on forever. It is gratifying to read that, in His kingdom reign, Christ will put down all rule and authority, and that, at the close of this present age, He will, by the ministry of angels, gather out of human spheres all things that offend. Of the disposition of enmity in higher spheres it is said: “For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:25–26), while of the disposition of enmity in the lower spheres it is written: “The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear” (Matt. 13:41–43).

As compared with human and animal existence, the angels may be said to be incorporeal, but only in the sense that they do not sustain a mortal organization. The Scriptures imply that the angels do have embodiment. God is a Spirit, yet, when addressing the Jews, Christ said of the Father, “Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape” (John 5:37; cf. Ex. 33:23; Ezek. 1:1–28; Ps. 104:1–2). It is essential to a spirit that it have localized, determinate, spiritual form. Too often the problem is confused by imposing upon spiritual beings those limitations which belong to humanity. For the saints in heaven there is promised a “spiritual body”—a body adapted to the spirit of man (1 Cor. 15:44). Such, indeed, is the body of the glorified Lord (Phil. 3:21). There are many kinds of bodies even on the earth, the Apostle points out (1 Cor. 15:39–40), and goes on to say: “There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestial.” It is small evidence that there are no celestial bodies, if the issue rests on no more than the truth that man has no power to discern such bodies. Spirits have a definite form of organization which is adapted to the law of their being. They are both finite and spacial. All this may be true though they are far removed from this mundane economy. They are able to approach the sphere of human life, but

that fact in no way imposes upon them the conformity to human existence. The appearance of angels may be, as occasion demands, so like men that they pass as men. How else could some “entertain angels unawares” (Heb. 13:2)? On the other hand, their appearance is sometimes in dazzling white and blazing glory (Matt. 28:2–4). When Christ declared, “A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have” (Luke 24:37–39), He did not imply that a spirit has no body at all, but, rather, that they do have bodies which in constitution are different from those of men. In a discreet and prudent manner Dr. William Cooke has canvassed the complicated field of truth relative to the nature and corporality of the angels thus:

> In the Old Testament the Psalmist calls them spirits—“*Who maketh his angels spirits,* ” civ. 4. And in the New Testament they are designated by the same term—“*Are they not all ministering spirits?*” Heb. 1:14. Here, however, a question arises—are angels so spiritual as to be absolutely immaterial like God? or are they enshrined in a refined material fabric? Opinions both ancient and modern are much divided on this subject. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nicene, Cyril, and Chrysostom held that angels are absolutely immaterial; but Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Caesarius, and Tertullian, among the earlier fathers, thought those blessed beings were enshrined in a refined material fabric. The term spirit, applied to them, does not of itself absolutely decide the question; for as that word in both Hebrew and Greek is primarily a material term, indicating wind, air, or breath, it may without violence be applied either to a pure spirit or to a refined material nature. It is true that, on the appearance of angels to man, they assumed a visible human form. This fact, however, does not prove their materiality; for human spirits in the intermediate state, though disembodied, have in their intercourse with man appeared in a material human form: on the Mount of Transfiguration Moses, as well as Elias, was recognized as a man; and the Elders who appeared to and conversed with John, in the Apocalypse, had also the human form.—Rev. 5:5, and 7:13. Yet such appearances cannot absolutely decide the question. Theologically, there is nothing incongruous or improbable in the supposition that angels are invested with a refined material nature. Heaven is undoubtedly suitable as a habitat for such. Enoch and Elijah were exalted body and soul to heaven by translation; the glorified humanity of our Lord is there enthroned; and angels, though enshrined in a material fabric, may dwell in the splendours of the Divine presence. … Yet, as it is a law of adaptation, that no such gross materiality as “flesh and blood” can enter that region of blessedness, it follows that if angels are enshrined in a material frame, it must be so refined in its nature as to exclude all that involves the possibility of decay, and any organization with animal appetites and wants. Our Lord himself has decided this, by affirming that human beings in heaven neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God (Matt. 22:30). In this comparison between the final state of the righteous and the present state of angels, we have a glimpse of the condition of both. It invests our theme with augmented interest to know that the exalted beings with whom we are to live for ever, have a nature so much in common with our own; it is still more interesting to know that in the higher attributes of both, angels and men so much resemble the human nature of Christ.—*Christian Theology,* pp. 613–14

Medieval art has seized upon the account (Dan. 9:21) that an angel “flew swiftly” as the ground of their imposition of wings upon all angelic beings. It is true, however, that the cherubim, seraphim, or living creatures, are said to have wings. And thus the cherubim appear in golden images above the ark of the mercy seat. Angels pass from one locality to another with incredible speed (Dan. 9:21).

VI. The Abode of the Angels

The abode of the angels is likewise a matter of definite revelation. An intimation has been recorded earlier of the truth that the whole universe is inhabited by innumerable hosts of spirit beings. This vast order of beings with all their classifications have fixed abodes and centers for their activities By the use of the phrase, “the angels which are in heaven” (Mark 13:32), Christ definitely asserts that angels inhabit heavenly spheres. The Apostle writes, “though an angel from heaven” (Gal. 1:8), and, “the whole family in heaven and earth” (Eph. 3:15). Likewise, in the prayer which Christ taught His disciples, they were instructed to say: “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:10). Dr. A. C. Gaebelein has written of the abode of the angels, saying:

> In the Hebrew, heaven is in the plural, “the heavens.” The Bible speaks of three heavens, the third heaven is the heaven of heavens, the dwelling place of God, where His throne has always been. The tabernacle possessed by His earthly people, Israel, was a pattern of the heavens. Moses upon the mountain had looked into the vast heavens and saw the three heavens. He had no telescope. But God Himself showed to him the mysteries of the heavens. Then God admonished him when he was about to make the tabernacle and said to His servant, “See, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mountain” (Heb. 8:5). The tabernacle had three compartments, the outer court, the Holy part and the Holiest. Once a year the high priest entered this earthly place of worship to pass through the outer court, into the Holy part, and, finally, carrying the sacrificial blood, he entered into the Holiest to sprinkle the blood in Jehovah’s holy presence. But Aaron was only a type of Him who is greater than Aaron, the true High Priest. Of Him, the true Priest, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, it is written that He passed *through the heavens* (Heb. 4:14). “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. 9:24). He passed through the heavens, the outer court, the heaven surrounding the earth; the holy part, the immense universes, with their immeasurable distance, and finally He entered the third heaven, that heaven astronomy knows exists, but which no telescope can ever reach. In the heavenlies, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, are the principalities and the powers, the innumerable company of angels. Their dwelling places are in these heavens. God who created them, who made them spirits and clothed them with bodies suited to their spirit

nature, must have also assigned to them habitations. … It is also significant and not without meaning that the phrase "the host of heavens" means both the stars and the angelic hosts; the "Lord of Hosts" has also the same double meaning, for He is the Lord of the stars and the Lord of the angels.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 34–35

VII. The Number of the Angels

Its allusion to the number of the angels is one of the superlatives of the Bible. They are there described in multitudes "which no man could number." It is reasonable to conclude that there are as many spirit beings in existence as there will have been human beings in all their history on the earth. It is significant that as the phrase "the host of heaven" describes both the material stars and the angels, the latter may be as much beyond number as the former (Gen. 15:5). To quote Dr. Cooke, again, where he gathers Biblical testimony on the number of the angels:

Hear what Micaiah says, "I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left."—1 Kings 22:19. Hear what David says, "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even many thousands of angels."—Psal. 68:17. Elisha saw one detachment of these celestial beings sent to be his bodyguard, when "the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about him."—2 Kings 6:17. Hear what Daniel saw, "Thousand thousands were ministering unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand were standing before him." —Dan. 7:10. Behold what the watchful shepherds saw and heard on the morn of the Redeemer's birth, "A multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest."—Luke 2:13. Hear what Jesus says, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?"—Matt. 26:53. Look again at the magnificent spectacle which John saw and heard as he gazed into the heavenly world, "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living ones and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," etc.—Rev. 5:12. If these numbers be taken literally, they indicate 202 millions, yet they were only a part of the celestial host. It is probable, however, these figures were not intended to indicate any precise number, but that the multitude was immense, beyond what usually enters into human computation. Hence in Hebrews 12:22, we read not of any definite or limited number, however great, but of "an innumerable company of angels."—*Op. cit.*, pp. 614–15

VIII. The Power of the Angels

What is true of all creatures relative to the power they exert, is equally true of the angels: their power is derived from God. Their power, however great, is restricted. They are unable to do those things which are peculiar to Deity—create, act without means, or search the human heart. They may

influence the human mind as one creature may influence another. The knowledge of this truth is of great importance when, as later, contemplation will be given to the ascendency evil spirits may assume over human beings. It will be found that human beings are able to thwart the influence of evil spirits only by divine enablement (Eph. 6:10–12; 1 John 4:4). Even an angel may claim divine assistance when in conflict with another angel (Jude 1:9). Continuing in his same comprehensive manner, Dr. Cooke writes of angelic power:

> "Strong angel" and "mighty angel," are terms we read in the Apocalypse. The name Gabriel means *the mighty one of God*; and among the designations of angelic orders we find that of powers (δυνάμεις). The attribute of extraordinary power pertains to angelic natures in general, as we learn from David, who exclaims, "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, who excel in strength." It is impossible to form any comparison between the power of a spiritual being, such as an angel, and the physical power of man, which is limited by his organization. If, however, the power of man be estimated by the wondrous effects he can produce by his superior knowledge, and the appliances he can use, we have then displays which may give us some faint idea of the resources of angelic power, for probably their superior knowledge of nature would enable them to employ in a far higher degree than ourselves the resources of the universe, to fulfil any commission which God might give them to perform. Whatever be the mode or media by which their powers are exerted, the effects thereof are astounding. Milton describes them as plucking the seated hills from their foundations and hurling them on their antagonists. This is poetry; but in the records of Scripture we have truth without the colour of fiction; and here we find one angel, as a minister of vengeance, destroying 70 thousand persons of the kingdom of David in three days; another destroying in one night 85 thousand stout warriors in the mail-clad army of Assyria's proud monarch; and another destroying all the first-born of Egypt in one single night. In the Apocalypse we see angels holding the four winds of heaven, discharging the vials, and wielding the thunders of Jehovah's wrath upon the guilty nations; the old earth trembles under the displays of their mighty power as the ministers of a sin-avenging God. But angels are equally powerful for good; and while their holy nature makes them the faithful executors of justice, their benevolence, as well as their holiness, makes them delight to employ their energies in the service of mercy.—*Ibid.*, pp. 620–21

IX. The Classification of the Angels

1. Governmental Rulers. Revelation specifies certain groups as well as various important individuals amongst the angels. Mention has been made of five major representations of supremacy among these beings, namely, thrones (θρόνοι), dominions (κυριότητες), principalities (ἀρχαί), authorities (ἐξουσίαι), and powers (δυνάμεις). Since the Bible does not indulge in useless tautology, it may be believed that there is a specific meaning to each

of these denominations, which meaning no doubt corresponds to earthly realities which bear these appellations. The revealed truth regarding the angels is not sufficiently complete for a full analogy to be set up. The term *thrones* refers to those who sit upon them, *dominions* to those who rule, *principalities* to those who govern, *powers* to those who exercise supremacy, and *authorities* to those invested with imperial responsibility. Though there is seeming similarity in these denominations, it may be assumed that representation is made by these titles to incomprehensible dignity and varying degrees of rank. Heavenly spheres of rule exceed human empires as the universe exceeds the earth.

2. Elect Angels. Reference in 1 Timothy 5:21 to "elect angels" at once opens an interesting field of inquiry regarding the extent to which the doctrine of sovereign election is to be traced in the relation of angels to their Creator. It will be conceded that angels are created for a purpose and that in their realm, as with man, the designs of the Creator are to be executed to infinity. The fall of some angels is no more unanticipated by God than the fall of man. It may be implied, also, that angels have passed a period of probation.

3. Cherubim, Seraphim, and Living Creatures. Interpretations bearing on this threefold classification of the angels vary greatly. Dr. A. H. Strong contends that they are "artificial, temporary, symbolic figures" which have "not themselves personal existences." He seeks to sustain this idea by the assertion that these specific designations are not coupled with the angels in any Scripture passage. Smith (*Bible Dictionary*) and Alford (*Greek Testament*) maintain that these are only symbols of the attributes of God. The great proportion of expositors salute these as exalted angels of the highest station, quite apart, perhaps, from governments. Some expositors seek to discover distinctions of position and rank between those to whom these appellations are assigned. It is more satisfactory to accord to them not only the highest station, but one and the same general grouping. The different terms used seem to indicate a distinction in service rendered rather than in essential position. Because of the exalted state of these angels, the service they render should be considered with due attention.

a. Cherubim. The *cherubim* title speaks of their high and holy position and their responsibility as such is closely related to the throne of God as defenders of His holy character and presence. In a note under Ezekiel 1:5, Dr. C. I. Scofield, in his *Reference Bible,* makes the following statement:

> The "living creatures" are identical with the Cherubim. The subject is somewhat obscure, but from the position of the Cherubim at the gate of Eden, upon the cover of the ark of the covenant, and in Rev. 4., it is clearly gathered that they have to do with the vindication of the holiness of God as against the presumptuous pride of sinful man who, despite his sin, would "put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life" (Gen. 3:22–24). Upon the ark of the covenant, of one substance with the mercy-seat, they saw the sprinkled blood which, in type, spake of the perfect maintenance of the divine righteousness by the sacrifice of Christ (Ex. 25:17–20; Rom. 3:24–26, *notes*). The living creatures (or Cherubim) appear to be actual beings of the angelic order. Cf. Isa. 6:2, *note.* The Cherubim or living creatures are not identical with the Seraphim (Isa. 6:2–7). They appear to have to do with the holiness of God as outraged by *sin;* the Seraphim with *uncleanness* in the people of God. The passage in Ezekiel is highly figurative, but the effect was the revelation to the prophet of the Shekinah glory of the LORD. Such revelations are connected invariably with new blessing and service. Cf. Ex. 3:2–10; Isa. 6:1–10; Dan. 10:5–14; Rev. 1:12–19.

The cherubim first appear at the gate of the Garden of Eden after man has been expelled and as protectors lest man return to pollute the holy presence of God. They appear again as protectors, though in golden images, over the ark of the covenant where God was pleased to dwell. The curtain of the tabernacle, which separated between the divine presence and the unholy people, was embroidered with figures of cherubim (Ex. 26:1). Ezekiel refers to these beings under this title nineteen times and the truth concerning them is to be derived from these passages. He presents them as having four appearances—the face of a lion, the face of an ox, the face of a man, and the face of an eagle (Ezek. 1:3–28; 10:1–22). This symbolism relates them at once to the living creatures of John's vision (Rev. 4:6–5:14, etc.—the translation of ζῶον by *beast* is unsatisfactory).

b. Seraphim. The *seraphim* title speaks of unceasing worship, their ministry of purification, and their humility. They appear in Scripture but once under this designation (Isa. 6:1–3). Their threefold ascription of worship as recorded by Isaiah is again stated by John (Rev. 4:8) and under the title of the living creatures, which fact goes far to establish the identity of this group. Dr. Scofield writes as a note under Isaiah 6:1–3: "Heb. *Burners.* The word occurs only here. Cf. Ezk. 1:5, *note.* The Seraphim are, in many respects, in contrast with the Cherubim, though both are expressive of the

divine holiness, which demands that the *sinner* shall have access to the divine presence only through a sacrifice which really vindicates the righteousness of God (Rom. 3:24–26, *notes*), and that the *saint* shall be cleansed before serving. Gen. 3:22–24 illustrates the first; Isa. 6:1–8 the second. The Cherubim may be said to have to do with the altar, the Seraphim with the laver" (*Op. cit.*).

c. Living Creatures. The *living creatures* is a title which represents these angels as manifesting the fullness of divine life, unceasing activity, and abiding participation in the worship of God.

Uncertainty, at best, must characterize human understanding regarding the angels. Of their majesty and worship of God and of the surpassing glory of the Object of their adoration, Bishop Bull (1634–1710), as quoted by Dr. Gaebelein (*Op. cit.*, pp. 46–47), wrote:

> When we consider what glorious beings the angels are, and yet that they are but creatures of, and servants to, the God whom we serve, waiting before His Throne, and humbly attending His commands; this consideration, if we let it sink deeply into our hearts, must needs possess us with most awful apprehensions of the glorious majesty of our God at all times, but especially in our approaches to Him in His worship, and fill us with the greatest reverence and humility. We should do well often to call to mind Daniel's vision, to whom was represented the "Ancient of Days sitting upon His throne, a thousand thousand ministering unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand standing before Him."
>
> With what reverence should we behave ourselves in our addresses to the Divine Majesty, before whom the Seraphim themselves hide their faces! And if they cover their feet, are conscious to themselves of their natural imperfection, compared to the infinitely glorious God; how should we clods of earth, we vile sinners, blush and be ashamed in His presence, assuming no confidence to ourselves, but what is founded on the mercies of God and the merits of our blessed Redeemer and Advocate, Jesus Christ!
>
> And when we find ourselves inclined to pride and vanity, to think highly of ourselves and of our services to God, let us reflect at what a vast distance we come behind the holy angels; how far short our poor, lame, imperfect services are of their holy and excellent ministry. Yet, when we think of the ministry which the holy angels perform towards God, and for us; let us at the same time propound them to ourselves, as patterns and examples for our imitation.

4. Individual Angels.

a. Lucifer, Son of the Morning (Isa. 14:12). This, the most exalted one of the angels—both by creation and by appointment—occupies a place in the text of Scripture next to the Persons of the Godhead. By his sin—the first in the universe, so far as revelation discloses—he became Satan and appears in the Word of God under about forty different titles. As he is the theme of the

following section on Satanology, further examination of the truth bearing on this mighty angel will be deferred at this point.

b. Michael (Dan. 12:1). The meaning of this name, which meaning is significant, is *Who is like God?* In what respect he is like God is not disclosed, but from the three passages wherein he is directly mentioned it is to be seen that he is in great authority. According to Daniel 12:1, he is said to be the one who "standeth" for Daniel's people, Israel, doubtless in some form of defense. In Jude 1:9 he is seen to be in controversy with Satan over the body of Moses; but in such a situation and in spite of all his greatness, he dare not "bring a railing accusation against Satan," but, falling back in dependence upon God, he declares, "The Lord rebuke thee." In this text he is given the added title of *archangel;* and there is but one archangel. Michael is again seen in prediction recorded in Revelation 12:7–12. He, as head of the armies of heaven, fights a victorious battle in heaven against Satan and his angels. It is further revealed that the "voice of the archangel" will be heard when Christ returns for the Church (1 Thess. 4:16).

c. Gabriel (Dan. 9:21). The meaning of this designation is *the mighty one*, and he is evidently all that the name implies. He is never said in the Bible to be an archangel, though often so styled by men. He appears four times, as the Scriptures record, and always as a messenger or revealer of the divine purpose. He spoke to Daniel concerning the end time (Dan. 8:15–27). Similarly, he brought to Daniel the almost incomparable prediction of Daniel 9:20–27. The prophet had discovered from the writings of Jeremiah (25:11–12) that the allotted period for Israel in Babylon was seventy years, and at the time when these years were about completed. He therefore gave himself to prayer for his people. The prayer, as recorded, could have occupied but a few moments, yet in that time Gabriel passed with incredible swiftness from the throne of God to the praying prophet on earth. It was then this angel unfolded the purpose of Jehovah concerning the future of Israel. It was Gabriel who brought the message to Zacharias of the birth of John, and he it was who came with the greatest of all messages to the Virgin Mary regarding the birth of Christ and of His ministry as King on David's throne (Luke 1:26–33).

5. Angels Especially Designated. Certain angels are known only by the service they render. Of these, there are those that serve as angels of judgment (Gen. 19:13; 2 Sam. 24:16; 2 Kings 19:35; Ezek. 9:1, 5, 7; Ps. 78:49). Account is made of the "watcher" (Dan. 4:13, 23); "angel of the abyss" (Rev. 9:11); "angel over fire" (Rev. 14:18); "angel of the waters" (Rev. 16:5); and of "seven angels" (Rev. 8:2). In the Apocryphal writings mention is made of three angels not spoken of in the Bible, namely, Raphael, Uriel, and Jeremiel.

Properly, no reference is made in this enumeration to the Angel of Jehovah since, as has been demonstrated in a previous section, that Being in none other than the preincarnate Christ—the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Being in no way related to created angels, He should not be classed with them.

X. The Ministry of the Angels

The 273 references in the Bible to the angels are largely accounts of their activities, and by these a very wide field of achievement is disclosed. However, that which is most important is not their relation to the inhabitants of earth, but rather their service to God. This is primarily a service of worship and suggests the ineffable majesty and glory of God, which unfallen angels understand, and which, because of the infinity of the worthiness of God, continues without ceasing forever. John states that in their worship the living creatures "rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come" (Rev. 4:8). Isaiah asserts that they "cried one unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. 6:3). To the same end the Psalmist writes: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word" (Ps. 103:20); "Praise ye the Lord. Praise ye the Lord from the heavens: praise him in the heights. Praise ye him, all his angels: praise ye him, all his hosts" (Ps. 148:1–2). Their humility, suggested by the covering of their feet (Isa. 6:2), is natural since they are ever before Him whose majesty and glory is transcendent. The birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ were to the angels stupendous realities. It is of no small consequence that, as stated by the Apostle, Christ, while here on the earth,

“was seen of angels” (1 Tim. 3:16). Their interest in, and devotion to, the Lord of glory is measured to some degree by the worship they have offered Him from their creation to the present hour. Only feebly does the most spiritual of saints anticipate what it will be to look directly and unendingly upon the face of the Lord of glory. The response that will be awakened in the heart of man—enlarged as to its capacity beyond measure—as he views his Creator and Redeemer cannot be foreseen; but such has ever been the experience of the angels. They behold the Lord without a veil between. Their consideration of Him while here on earth is befittingly presented by Dr. Cooke:

> How constant their attendance on the Incarnate Saviour during his mysterious life amongst men! At his birth they are his heralds, and with songs exultant announce the glad tidings to mankind. In his temptation they minister to him; in his agonies they succour him; on his resurrection they are the first to proclaim his triumph; on his ascension they come to escort him to the mediatorial throne; in his glorified state they render him supreme homage as their Lord; and when he returns to judge the world they will form his retinue! What sublime thoughts would be suggested, what emotions of wonder and joy would be excited, by the scenes they witnessed on earth and still witness in heaven, in reference to Christ, his two-fold nature, and his great redeeming work. *God incarnate!* This was new to them. They had seen the Son in his Deity; but never till now enshrined in humanity. What amazing condescension! *Obeying his own law as if he were a mere creature, and in the attitude of a servant!* This was new. They had seen him as the governor of the universe; but never till now as a subject! *Encountering Satan in conflict and prolonged temptation!* This was new. They had seen him frown the arch-rebel from his presence and hurl him to perdition; but never till now submitting to be tempted by him whose subtilty and power had seduced myriads to eternal ruin. *Suffering the scorn and reproach of sinful men!* This was new. They had seen myriads of happy spirits worship, adore, and love him; but never till now had they seen him personally insulted, reproached, and maltreated by his creatures. *Groaning in Gethsemane, and crucified between two thieves, and dying as a sacrificial victim!* This was new. They had seen him supremely happy and glorious; but to see him agonize, to hear that dying wail, and to behold him a bloody corpse, and all this to save the world which had revolted from him! What mysterious love! *To see him, after all this, enthroned and glorified in human nature.* This was a new fact in the moral history of the universe. The whole scenes were full of interest, wonder, and mystery; a gradation of wonders rising in succession, until they culminated in the permanent presence of the God-man, resplendent with a glory that fills the heaven of heavens. Here were chapters of instruction for angelic minds to ponder; here were developments of hidden truths; here were discoveries of the Divine perfections, never known before; and still unfolding in brighter effulgence as ages roll on!—*Op. cit.*, pp. 622–23

The faithful service of angels to mankind cannot be explained on the ground of their own love for humanity. They are interested in that which concerns their God. If He would give His Son to die for a lost race of men,

they would follow Him as far as possible and at least give instant service, for His sake, wherever it is appointed unto them. It is not imagination, but reality, that the angels are servants of men in a thousand ways. No truth is more established by Scripture than that stated in Hebrews 1:14: “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?”

With respect to the specific ministries of the angels in the earth and in behalf of mankind—especially the saints—the details form a very extensive field of investigation such as cannot be undertaken here to any extent. Though angels were present at creation, no reference is made to their ministries on earth until the days of Abraham. In company with the LORD, they visited the patriarch at Mamre (Gen. 18:1–2), and from there went on to deliver Lot. The angels appeared to Jacob and were familiar to Moses. It is written that the Law “was ordained by angels” (Gal. 3:19), and it was administered by the “disposition of angels” (Acts 7:53). Their care of God’s elect people is asserted in both Testaments. In Psalm 91:11–12 it is written: “For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone”; and in Hebrews 1:14: “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” It is an angel with the three men in the furnace of fire (Dan. 3:25), and with Daniel in the den of lions (Dan. 6:22).

In Old Testament terminology, sometimes angels are called *sons of God* while men are called *servants of God*. In the New Testament this is reversed. Angels are servants, and Christians are sons of God. This peculiar order may be due to the fact that, in the Old Testament, men are seen as related to this sphere over which angels are superior; while, in the New Testament, saints are seen as related to their final exaltation into the likeness of Christ, compared to which estate the angels are inferior.

Turning to the New Testament, it is to be observed that many of the references to the angels are found in the Gospels and the Acts. In view of the truth that it was their Creator, the Lord of glory, whom they worship and adore, that was laying aside His glory and descending to a sphere “lower than the angels,” it is not strange that one from the heavenly hosts should announce the birth of the forerunner to his father; the birth of the Savior to Mary; that the angels should announce His birth to the world; that they

should direct the flight into Egypt; that they ministered to Him in the wilderness; that they succored Him in the garden; that they were ready in legions to defend Him should He call; that they saw Him die and His body placed in the tomb; that they were present to announce His resurrection; and that they gave counsel to His disciples at the moment of His ascension back to heaven. Thus it is seen that the relation of the angels to the incarnate Son of God is one of the major features of revelation, and upon these disclosures the devout mind may dwell with profit. In the plan of God, the present age is evidently void of angelic manifestations. This could easily be due to the fact that, as in no other age, the saints of God are indwelt by the Holy Spirit and are subject to His leading, which leading is more constant, vital, and exalting than angelic visitations could possibly be. However, the angels are prominent at the close of this age. It is then that the Lord returns with the shout of the archangel. At His second advent, "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 13:41–42; cf. vs. 30). It is then, also, that Christ shall "send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect [Israel] from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matt. 24:31). The presence of angels in the scenes of the second advent is emphasized generally. It is written: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works" (Matt. 16:27); "Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8–9). To these may be added Jude 1:14–15, in which context the words *ten thousands of saints* is better rendered *holy myriads*, and may refer to the angels.

Following the kingdom age, in which no angelic ministrations are predicted and when the King is present in His visible glory to rule and the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28–32; Acts 2:16–21), the angels are again seen and finally and eternally related to the city which comes down from God out of heaven (Heb. 12:22–24; Rev. 21:12).

Certain New Testament passages indicate specific angelic ministrations. Luke 16:22 asserts that the angels transported at death a soul into another

sphere; whether this is always the case is a pure conjecture. Acts 5:19 and 12:7 relate the deliverance of apostles from prison. Acts 8:26; 10:3; 27:23 recount messages which angels bore.

XI. The Progressive Discipline of the Angels

The Scriptures disclose the truth that the angels are learning much from their observations of men on earth—especially in the outworking of redemption. Incidentally, this indicates that the angels are not omniscient. However, it should not be concluded that the angels know less than men. What, indeed, would be the field of discovery and interest to men were it given to them to see all that transpires in angelic spheres? Peter's declaration, "which things the angels desire to look into" (1 Pet. 1:12), divulges the truth relative to their interest in the affairs of men. It is significant that these "things" referred to relate to God's program in the first and second advents of Christ and the gospel of divine grace now to be preached to the whole world. To the same end, the Church on earth is an unveiling to the angels of the wisdom of God. It is written: "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10). Thus, also, the Church will yet be an unveiling to angels of divine grace; for it is said: "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:7). Writing on this theme, Otto Von Gerlach pointed out: "By the revelation of Himself in Christ, by the institution of the Christian Church on earth, God after a manner hitherto unknown glorifies Himself before the heavenly principalities. They who until now had, filled with awe, been praising Him for the wonder of creation, now see His wisdom glorified in a new form in the Christian communion through the manifold ways by which lost men are saved. Entirely new and inexhaustible wealth of divine wisdom was manifested in redemption" (cited by Gerhart, *op. cit.*, p. 664).

There is no basis for a belief that redemption through Christ's death is extended to the fallen angels (cf. Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10). The holy angels evidently are benefited and pass into higher spheres of knowledge and consequent spirituality through what they see of redeeming love in Christ.

Thus Christ becomes to them a Mediator. No writer has stated this with more clarity than Dr. Gerhart; to quote:

> Emphasis is put by the apostle on the fact that unto principalities God's wisdom is made known *through the Church.* The existence of the Church, and the preaching of the unsearchable riches by the Church, condition the growth of the angels in spiritual knowledge. How much more of Christian truth will not the "principalities" know when the Church, now imperfect, shall attain to perfection; now militant, warring against enemies both human and diabolical, shall become the Church triumphant? The final consummation at the Second Coming will affect not only the relative position and the spiritual knowledge of the angels, but Scripture suggests that the final consummation will likewise affect the *life* of the angels. Indirectly at least, they will participate in the spiritual benefits which come to the Church from the Son of Man. Paul teaches that God the Father made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He purposed in the Beloved unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth. Both the human race upon the earth and the angelic orders in the heavens are embraced in "all things" to be summed up in Christ. Angelic spirits will then bear a relation to the Head of the Church which they do not bear to Him now, and which they will not realize before "the fulness of the time." Of similar import is the prophetic vision of Paul in Eph. [correction: Colossians] 1:20. It was the good pleasure of the Father through the Son to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heaven. Things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created through the Son, and unto the Son. Accordingly all angelic orders exist for the Son; He is their *end.* In the Son these orders of spirits consist, hold together; He is the law by which they are upheld and governed. Having made peace between God and men, between Gentiles and Jews through the blood of His cross, He becomes also for the angels a Mediator through whom their life passes from its present plane to a higher plane of spiritual perfection and glory. The kingdom of the Son of Man comprehends all orders of angelic spirits no less than all races of mankind. When the impending transcendent eon now in process of ripening shall supersede the current eon, angels as a consequence of the glorification of the body mystical will rise into more intimate fellowship with the fontal Source of life, of light, and love. But though as to their life and knowledge advanced to a higher status of spiritual perfection through the Church, yet in the final glory of the kingdom the position and office of the angels will be subordinate to the authority and office of the saints.—*Ibid.*, pp. 664–65

XII. The Angels as Spectators

In four instances angels are said to be observing. In Luke 15:10 they are seen beholding the joy of the Lord over one sinner who repents. It is not the joy of the angels, as too often supposed (cf. Jude 1:24). In Luke 12:8–9, the word of Christ is written, "Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of

God.” So, also, the whole earthlife of Christ was “seen of angels” (1 Tim 3:16), and in Revelation 14:10–11, the angels are said to observe the eternal woes of those who “worship the beast and his image.” Over against this, the Church, it is predicted, shall judge angels (1 Cor. 6:3), as poorly prepared as they are at present to judge in the least of matters on the earth.

The presence of the angels is recorded at the creation of material things (Job 38:7); at the giving of the Law (Gal. 3:19; Acts 7:53; Heb. 2:2); at the birth of Christ (Luke 2:13), at the temptation (Matt. 4:11), at the resurrection (Matt. 28:2), at the ascension (Acts 1:10), and at the second coming (Matt. 13:37–39; 24:31; 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:7).

Conclusion

A consciousness of the reality of the vast hosts of angelic beings—the benefit derived from the good, and the opposition of the bad—can be gained only through meditation upon the Scriptures that record these truths, and through prayer.

Chapter III

Angelic Participation in the Moral Problem

By the words *moral problem* is indicated the conflict which is ever present where free moral agents confront the issues of both good and evil. The force of this conflict reaches a climax in three major instances: (a) the fall of the angels, (b) the fall of man, and (c) the sin-bearing death of Christ. Of these, the first and second are closely related, as are the second and third; but the relation between the first and third is remote, being of principles rather than persons. Evil began with the lapse of an angel. That lapse was followed by a multitude of other angels (Rev. 12:4). The same lapse was enacted by the first man and transmitted to his race in the form of a depraved nature. Tracing backwards over this historical sequence, it is possible to recognize that the race was injured in the sin of its federal head, that the federal head was tempted by the angel who first sinned in heaven, and that a multitude of angels sinned under the influence of that same original sinner. Thus far no insuperable problem arises; but it is difficult, indeed, to go one step further and assign a reason why an unfallen, untempted (that is, from without), highly enlightened angel, who stood in the immediate presence of God and who must have comprehended the difference between moral light and moral darkness, should have chosen the darkness. How can the birth of moral evil from the womb of moral good be explained? The metaphysical aspect of the origin of evil is a problem which theologians have never solved, and, regarding it, only certain consequential features may be observed by the finite mind.

As in the case of the fall of man, it is imperative, in the light of revelation concerning God, to recognize certain unchangeable truths when approaching the perplexing subject of the fall of the angels. These are: (a) That God is Himself holy and in no sense is He directly or indirectly the instigator of angelic sin. (b) Though angels were created to fill a divine purpose, their fall was anticipated from all eternity. (c) They were given the autonomy of angels, which assigned to them the freedom to remain in, or depart from, that holy estate into which they were inducted by creation. (d)

Angels who fell, unlike men who by physical birth inherit the corrupted nature which their federal head acquired through the first human sin, stood directly related to God in original angelic holiness from which position each fell individually as did the first angel. And (e) though the fall of man opened the way whereby the grace of God might be displayed in redemption (Eph. 2:7), there is no compensating good of any degree to be seen in connection with the fact that angels sinned.

Angels were created with the responsibility of self-determination. This was the divine ideal represented by them in creation. The possibility of evil was not with them in any sense a necessity. To assert that God should have prevented their fall since He had power to do so, is to array the divine will in government against the divine will in creation— against the divine will as represented in the constitution of the angels. Though the angels when created awakened to consciousness in an estate of holiness and untempted by any outward solicitation, it was, nevertheless, incumbent upon them both to will and to do that which pertains to holiness. As in the case of man, a period of probation seems to have been extended to the angels. God's love for them was that of the Creator for His creature; but they were assigned to that freedom of action which is germane to angelic responsibility. Such freedom was accorded to the first man, but with this far-reaching exception: there was already in existence a kingdom of evil with its outward and forceful solicitation to wickedness. No such untoward, outward influence challenged the angels when they entered upon their conscious existence. The multitude of angels who sinned under the influence of the first sinning angel are at once eliminated from the problem. They fell each one individually, but by the force of influences which arose after they had experienced their holy estate. Confirmed good is for unfallen angels who ever behold and enjoy the presence of God a far more probable consequence than it could be with fallen man, who has never beheld God nor experienced a moment of untarnished holiness. Augustine states: "Let none doubt that the holy angels in their heavenly abode are, though not, indeed, co-eternal with God, yet secure and certain of eternal and true felicity" (*City of God*, Book XI, 33, cited by Gerhart, *Institutes*, I, 670). So, also, Richard Hooker asserts: "God which moveth mere natural agents as an efficient only, doth otherwise move His holy angels: for beholding the face of God (Matt. 18:10), and being rapt with the love of His beauty, they

cleave inseparably forever unto Him. Desire to resemble Him in goodness maketh them unweariable and even unsatiable in their longing to do by all means all manner of good unto all the creatures of God, but especially unto the children of men" (*Book I,* iv. 1, cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*, 670–71).

Angels were definitely influenced in the direction of holiness. That constant communion with God which is accorded the holy angels and was originally extended to all angels, is measureless in its potentiality. The one law of angelic existence was the will of their Creator. That law answered every need of angelic experience and felicity. It determined every detail of their relation to God and to each other. To depart from that will was to assume a false attitude toward all things. To what extent this departure changed love into hate and bitterness, will be considered at a later time.

Concerning the problem of the first sin of the first angel, it may be observed that, under existing conditions, almost every avenue along which sin advances was wanting. Self-assertion against God was the only direction in which such a being could sin. On this patent truth Hooker has written: "It seemeth therefore that there was no other way for angels to sin, but by reflex of their understanding upon themselves; when being held with admiration of their own sublimity and honor, the memory of their subordination unto God and their dependency on Him was drowned in this conceit; whereupon their adoration, love and imitation of God could not choose but be also interrupted" (*Ecc. Pol.*, Book I, ch. iv. 2, cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*, 672). This conceit which assumed self-direction where the Creator proposed to be the authority and guide, is alluded to by the Apostle when he wrote of a "novice" in matters of church order: "lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation [crime] of the devil" (1 Tim. 3:6; cf. Isa. 14:12; Ezek. 28:17). Though the nature of the first sin be thus so definitely disclosed, it yet remains a mystery how this principle of evil could find welcome in such a being. To go on with God as infinite wisdom has specified was angelic sanity, to say the least. To depart from that course was angelic insanity—but that sort of insanity which is responsible. Sin has no place in the constitution and status of an unfallen angel. Its presence is lawlessness and void of reason.

Both philosophy and theology have approached the problem which the first sin presents and have offered their solutions. Whatever vestige of truth these may suggest, none is sufficient. To attempt the discovery of an

understandable reason where the mind recognizes that reason failed, as it did when the angel sinned, is to undertake the impossible. Sin, being a contradiction of reason and irrational in itself, is not subject to reason. It is quite possible that an irrational creature accustomed to unholy ways may lend sympathetic understanding to the insanity which a fellow creature exhibits, but that provides no reason which might serve as an explanation for an unfallen angel's sin.

The creature—whether angel or human—is created to be God-centered. To become self-centered is a contradiction of the basic law of creature existence. The falsification of God's moral order, is, when self-centered, complete. It is also found to be a violation of the original design relative to interrelationships between finite beings themselves. Sin is not only against God, but is against all other fellow beings.

The lapse of an unfallen angel at once gives rise to two important theological questions, namely, (a) How could a holy God permit any creature to sin? and (b) How could an uninfluenced, unfallen angel sin? In considering the issue presented in the former of these questions, it may be said—though the subject is foreign to the present discussion —that God's original creation is declared to be *good* in His own holy eyes; that He, being omniscient and knowing that certain moral beings would lapse and fall, nevertheless brought them into being when possessed with that certain knowledge; yet everywhere, in the case of angels as in the case of men, He predicates moral failure of those who fail and never of Himself. As for the second question, this much may be added to what has gone before: Moral evil is an ultimate fact in the universe which can neither be explained nor explained away. When traced to its inception as committed by the first unfallen angel, the truth is developed which estimates sin to be a mystery, irrational, and exceedingly sinful. Sin is not in God as it is not in any part of His original creation. The decree of God anticipated all that would ever be; yet sin originates, not in the divine decree, but in the free act of the sinner. Sin is not in the constitution of creatures as they came from the creative hand of God, else all would sin. Sin is not an inherent weakness of the creature, else all would have failed. Sin is not a concomitant with free moral agency, else all free moral agents must fall. Dr. Gerhart, writing of the first sin, says: "*Ego* asserts itself against its own fundamental law, a fact for which no reason is to be assigned other than this, that the possibility of false

choosing is a prerogative of finite autonomous being" (*Ibid.*, 688). But Dr. Gerhart would admit that the mere power of choice constitutes no reason for choosing. The problem is unanswered. Augustine has discoursed on this feature of sin with genuine profit: "If we ask the cause of the misery of the bad angels it occurs to us, and not unreasonably, that they are miserable because they have forsaken Him who supremely is, and have turned to themselves who have no such essence. And this vice, what else is it called than pride? … If the further question be asked, What was the efficient cause of their evil will? There is none. For what is it which makes the will bad, when it is the will itself which makes the action bad? And consequently the bad will is the cause of the bad action, but nothing is the efficient cause of the bad will.… When the will abandons what is above itself, and turns to what is lower, it becomes evil, not because that is evil to which it turns, but because the turning itself is wicked. Therefore it is not an inferior thing which has made the will evil, but it is itself which has become so by wickedly desiring an inferior thing" (*City of God*, Book XII, vi, cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*, 685).

Sin is self-centered living and action on the part of a creature who is by creation designed to be wholly centered in God. One course is present anguish and leads to perdition; the other is present tranquillity and leads to eternal glory. Some measure of these truths must have been understood by the angels, hence the more is the inception of sin a mystery. Evil in the world is not an accident or a thing unforeseen by God, else He could not predict, as He does, its course and end. The conflict of the ages is compressed into the few words of Genesis 3:15. Evil must run its course and make its full demonstration that it may be judged, not as a theory, but as a concrete actuality. "The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" (Gen. 15:16). The wheat and tares must grow together to the end of the age (Matt. 13:30). And He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained (Acts 17:31). And the man of sin will be revealed only in God's appointed time (2 Thess. 2:6–8). Thus it is disclosed that evil must continue along with good until each shall reach its determined end. That the evil will be judged and dismissed forever is the assuring testimony of the Scriptures.

Chapter IV

SATANOLOGY: INTRODUCTION WHETHER HOLY, OR UNHOLY, THE SPIRIT BEINGS ARE ALIKE DESIGNATED *ANGELS* (REV. 12:7). THE UNHOLY ANGELS ARE USUALLY REFERRED TO AS ΔΑΊΜΟΝΕΣ OR ΔΑΙΜΌΝΙΑ, BEING PROPERLY TRANSLATED *DEMONS*. THERE IS BUT ONE ΔΙΆΒΟΛΟΣ OR *DEVIL*. AS THERE IS ONE ARCHANGEL AMONG ANGELS THAT ARE HOLY, SO THERE IS ONE ARCHANGEL AMONG ANGELS THAT ARE UNHOLY. THE CHIEF OF THE FALLEN ANGELS APPEARS UNDER AT LEAST FORTY APPELLATIONS. OF THESE SOME ARE DESCRIPTIVE TITLES AND SOME ARE PROPER NAMES. WHEN HE IS STYLED "THE ACCUSER OF OUR BRETHREN" (REV. 12:10), A DESCRIPTIVE TITLE APPEARS. THERE IS MUCH REVEALED, ALSO, IN THE PROPER NAMES. THESE ARE: *SERPENT* (ὄΦΙΣ), WHICH IMPLIES HIS *GUILE*; *LUCIFER, SON OF THE MORNING*, WHICH IS HIS TITLE IN HEAVEN BEFORE HIS FALL (ISA. 14:12); *DEVIL* (ΔΙΆΒΟΛΟΣ), WHICH MEANS *ACCUSER*, OR *SLANDERER*, AND IS GREEK IN ORIGIN; *SATAN*

(Σατανᾶς), which means *resister*, and is Hebrew in origin; *Apollyon* (᾽Απολλύων), which means *destroyer; Dragon* (Δράκων), which implies his *power; the prince of this world; the prince of the power of the air; the god of this world*. Four of these personal titles appear in one verse (Rev. 12:9). The designation *Belial* may be applied to the chief of the unholy angels only by implication, though the Apostle assigns to this name a personal and definite character when he inquires "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" (2 Cor. 6:15). H. A. W. Meyer (cf. Gerhart, *Institutes*, 691) contends that that term is a general reference to Satan, much like Πονηρός—*the evil one* (cf. Matt. 6:13; John 17:15; 2 Thess. 3:3; 1 John 5:19). It is evident from Matthew 12:24 (cf. vs. 27) that the Jews were wont to refer to this great being by the name Beelzebub (Βεελζεβούλ, cf. 2 Kings 1:2–3, 6, 16), which

implies that he is "prince of the demons." As Διάβολος he stands alone, the infernal agent who is in command of all δαιμόνια or demons. This mighty angel appears in the Bible with prominence, importance, and power second only to the Godhead Three. He is as often mentioned in the text of the Scriptures as all of the angels together. He is drawn into the story of human history from its first page to its last and always presented as a most vital factor in the ongoings of men, of angels, and of the universe itself. It is of great significance that the Scriptures trace with detail and care this archfiend from his creation, through all his career, and on to his final judgment. Such distinction is not accorded to another angel, or to any human being, however he may be used of God. No other is so analyzed and published concerning his motives, methods, character, and purpose as

IS THIS ONE. THE THEOLOGIAN IS CONFRONTED WITH THIS VAST REVELATION AND IS CHALLENGED TO GIVE HEED TO THIS, A MAJOR DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE—THE TRUTH CONCERNING A BEING WHO IS THE ORIGINATOR OF SIN, THE PROMOTER OF IT BOTH IN ANGELIC AND HUMAN SPHERES, AND THE MOST IMPERIOUS OPPONENT OF THE THINGS OF GOD. BUT FEW CAN SAY WITH THE APOSTLE, "WE ARE NOT IGNORANT OF HIS DEVICES." THIS BEING IS ONE "WHICH DECEIVETH THE WHOLE WORLD" AND IN NO MANNER MORE EVIDENT THAN THAT THE WORLD DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT HE REALLY EXISTS. THIS UNBELIEF, DOUBTLESS, IS GREATLY TO HIS ADVANTAGE. BEING UNINFORMED AND MISINFORMED, PEOPLE, TO AN APPALLING DEGREE, BECOME AN EASY PREY TO THE POWER OF THE ENEMY OF SOULS. MODERN SADDUCEES SEEK TO RESOLVE THIS AWFUL BEING INTO A "FIGURE OF SPEECH," "A METAPHORICAL PERSONIFICATION OF EVIL," OR A "DELUSION OF UNSOUND MINDS." THEY DENY HIS PERSONALITY AS THEY DO THAT OF

THE DEMONS. SATAN WOULD ENCOURAGE SUCH IMPRESSIONS SINCE THEY DISARM PREJUDICE AND FEAR IN RELATION TO HIS INFERNAL UNDERTAKINGS. AS FOR THIS MIGHTY ANGEL BEING ONLY A "FIGURE OF SPEECH" WITHOUT REAL PERSONALITY, IT MAY BE OBSERVED THAT FIGURES OF SPEECH ARE NOT CREATED ANGELS WHO SIN AND SERVE IN REALMS OF DARKNESS AND ARE DOOMED TO A FINAL AND DREADFUL JUDGMENT AT THE HAND OF GOD. A METAPHOR WOULD HARDLY ENTER A HERD OF SWINE AND PRECIPITATE THEIR INSTANT DESTRUCTION. NOR WOULD A METAPHOR OFFER THE KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD TO THE LORD OF GLORY, ASSERTING THAT THOSE KINGDOMS WERE DELIVERED UNTO IT AND THAT IT GAVE THEM TO WHOMSOEVER IT WOULD. DR. GERHART HAS SPOKEN EMPHATICALLY ON THIS PHASE OF THIS THEME WHEN HE SAYS: THE RATIONALISTIC EXEGESIS WHICH ASCRIBES DEMONIACAL POSSESSIONS TO SUPERSTITION AND TURNS THE RECORDS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ON THIS DARK THEME INTO DELUSIVE FANCIES, IF APPLIED TO ALL BIBLE TEACHING ON

THINGS INVISIBLE AND PRETERNATURAL, WOULD RESOLVE THE ENTIRE SPIRITUAL WORLD INTO UNREALITY. THERE IS BUT A SHORT STEP BETWEEN A MOCKERY OF THE DEVIL AND A MOCKERY OF THE REDEEMER. IT IS NOT FORGOTTEN THAT BELIEF IN THE PERSONALITY OF THE DEVIL AND IN THE INFLUENCE OF DEMONS ON HUMAN AFFAIRS ASSUMED GROTESQUE FORMS DURING THE MIDDLE AGES; NOR THAT MISTAKEN INTERPRETATIONS OF DIABOLICAL POSSESSIONS HAVE LED GOOD MEN TO COMMIT DEEDS OF HORROR. BUT DOES THE ABUSE OF THE FACTS OF SCRIPTURE PROVE THAT THERE IS NO TRUTH IN THEIR REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING THE POWER OF THE DEVIL OVER BAD MEN AND OVER NATURE? IS IT SUPERSTITION TO HOLD THAT SATAN IS THAT "EVIL ONE" WHO IS THE "PRINCE OF THIS WORLD"? BECAUSE SOME THEOLOGIANS AND SCHOLARS HAVE IN OTHER AGES MISUNDERSTOOD AND MISAPPLIED SOME OF OUR LORD'S MIRACLES? IF THIS PRINCIPLE OF REASONING WERE APPLIED TO REAL SUPERSTITIONS, WOULD NOT THE MONSTROUS ERRORS OF POLYTHEISM PROVE THAT THERE IS NO GOD? WOULD NOT THE ORACLE AT DELPHI PROVE THAT ISAIAH CANNOT BE A GENUINE PROPHET? OR THE FETISH WORSHIP OF AFRICA PROVE THAT NO WORSHIP IS WORTHY OF MAN? OR THE *TOTEM* OF OUR AMERICAN INDIANS PROVE THAT THERE IS NO DIVINE PROVIDENCE?—*OP. CIT.*, PP. 709–10

As fully as of any person in the Bible, every element of personality is predicated of Satan. By the contriving method which would deprive Satan of personality, the Lord Himself and the Holy Spirit could also be thus deprived, and by such torturing of the Bible that Book becomes one adapted only to mislead those who read it. The world strangely retains the Biblical terminology relative to Satan, though every vestige of that terminology is emptied of its true meaning. Without reference to revelation, the world has imagined a grotesque being, fitted with strange trappings, who has been made the central character in fiction and theatrical performances and then, being convinced that no such a being as they portray exists, they have consigned the whole body of revealed truth to the limbo of myths of a bygone age. Unfortunately, the real being set forth in the Bible is not dismissed by such puerile and wicked disregard of God's solemn truth. There is no want of evidence for the personality either of Satan or the demons. The record of their doings, like their destiny, forms the darkest pages of the Word of God. The lake of fire is prepared, not for men, but "for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41). Characters of fiction and metaphors are not judged by the death of Christ nor are they consigned to the lake of fire.

The fall of this mighty angel was not a compromise between good and evil. He became the embodiment of evil and wholly void of good. The essential wickedness of this being could not be estimated by the finite mind. His wickedness, however, is constructive and in line with vast undertakings and ideals which are evil because of their opposition to God. Further consideration of the consummate sin of this being will be seen as this thesis advances. It need only be added here that Satan is a living personification of deception. Most revealing are the words of Christ addressed to the Jews: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it" (John 8:44). Thus also a threefold testimony is given in the Revelation. In 12:9 it is declared that Satan is the deceiver of the whole world; in 20:2–3 it is predicted that he will be cast into the abyss and shut up and sealed, to the end that he shall "deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled." Similarly, when released, he is said to "go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of

the earth" (20:7–8). Thus, also, in the tribulation, the man of sin will cause the people to believe *the lie*, which lie is instigated by the devil and received by the people because of "strong delusion." With all this before the mind, it is not difficult to account for the present deceptions which are so general; that modern teachers disbelieve in the personality of Satan; that the unregenerate give no consideration to his reality; and that Christians everywhere are misinformed about his devices. Few indeed would knowingly march under Satan's banner. Yet, it will be seen that there are but few who do not to some degree give allegiance to him. Since the whole truth regarding the angels is strangely unreal to human minds, it is perhaps somewhat to be expected that there will be little actuality in the thinking of many people concerning Satan and the demons. However restricted the natural mind may be in this direction, there is no excuse for an open denial of revelation, which revelation is both clear and extensive.

He who would be found faithful and useful as a worthy exponent of the Scriptures and a guide to human souls, should comprehend, next to knowing the triune God and the positive values of His redeeming grace, the truth relative to the enemy of God, who "as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet. 5:8). The Christian's conflicts and trials are wholly accounted for within the three realities—the *world*, the *flesh*, and the *devil*—but this mighty enemy is "the god of this world," and the evil nature which dominates the flesh was born of Satan's lie in the Garden of Eden, and he is himself a living contender against the believer—not alone in the sphere of flesh and blood, but in the realms of spiritual life and activity.

If the text of the Scriptures is observed, it will be found that this greatest of foes is held before the Christian's contemplation next only to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Should the knowledge of this foe be wanting —as it must be so far as usual theological studies are concerned—the results can be no less than tragic, reaching on to eternity. If this theme is given the corresponding attention in a course of study which it sustains in the Bible, many pages must be assigned to it with no apology for so doing. Above all, let it not be deemed superstition when attention is given to such extended and explicit revelation and when this portion of Scripture is taken in its natural and literal meaning. Utterly unscriptural and fanatical notions are easily engendered relative to evil spirits among those less instructed in

the Word of God; but so much the more is it imperative that care shall be exercised to conform to that which has been revealed. The heathen have ever been tortured by their unfounded imaginations about the presence and influence of evil spirits, and gratitude becomes the Christian in view of the clear revelation which God has given.

Belief in the malign influence of evil spirits antedates the Bible and extends to regions into which the Bible has never penetrated. Plutarch states: “It was a very ancient opinion, that there are certain wicked and malignant demons, who envy good men, and endeavour to hinder them in the pursuit of virtue, lest they should be partakers at least of greater happiness than they enjoy” (*de Defect. Orac.*, p. 431, tom. 2, Edit. Paris, 1624, cited by Cooke, *Christian Theology*, p. 628). The devil worship of Africa, Burma, Ceylon, Persia, and Chaldea is a development which is evidently a perversion of the earlier divine revelation at the beginning of the race. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* states: “There are, no doubt, serious difficulties in the way of accepting the doctrine of a personal, superhuman, evil power as Satan is described to be. It is doubtful, however, whether these difficulties may not be due, at least in part, to a misunderstanding of the doctrine and certain of its implications. In addition, it must be acknowledged, that whatever difficulties there may be in the teaching, they are exaggerated and, at the same time, not fairly met by the vague and irrational skepticism which denies without investigation. There are difficulties involved in any view of the world. To say the least, some problems are met by the view of a superhuman, evil world-power” (IV, 2695).

By many it is believed that the earth was, in its first order, like other planets, the abode of spirit beings; that Satan was in authority over this realm; and that the chaos which is indicated in Genesis 1:2 was the direct result of Satan’s sin. Little may be known of these matters and again the silence of God should be respected.

Three general objections have been raised against the Biblical doctrine of Satan. (1) It is asserted that it has its origin in mythology. This conception cannot be sustained. The Bible does not systematize this division of doctrine more than any other. All that is set forth is with that saneness and restraint which characterizes the divine world-conception as a whole. (2) The second objection is that the doctrine of Satan conforms to

the dualism of Zoroastrianism. To this it may be replied that the whole doctrine of evil—apart from the eternal divine anticipation of it—had its beginning and will as definitely come to its end. All evil not only exists by divine permission, but is under divine restraint. (3) It is yet said that the doctrine of Satan destroys the unity of God; but the creation by God of other wills than His own, since, in the end, they are accountable to Him, in no way militates against the unity of God. In the end, as from the beginning, "God is all in all."

The main divisions of satanology, as here to be attended, are: (a) Satan's career; (b) Satan's evil character; (c) the satanic *cosmos;* (d) Satan's motive; and (e) Satan's method.

Chapter V

SATANOLOGY: THE CAREER OF SATAN

AT THE OPENING of this division of satanology it is fitting to pause in thanksgiving to God for the Book He has prepared, preserved, and presented to His people, which Book discloses truth with infinite accuracy relative to the dwellers in spirit realms and points out the nature of these beings with specific reference to the relation they sustain to humanity. As before asserted, the Word of God dwells at great length on the truth concerning one mighty angel. Extended revelation is given about his creation, his original estate, his fall, the development and manifestation of his authority, his various judgments and his final consignment to the lake of fire. The revealed career of Satan is a long story reaching back into the dateless past and on into eternity to come, and is full of important details.

I. Satan's Creation, Original Estate, and Fall

These three features of the history of this great angel are so interrelated that they can hardly be treated separately. The central passage bearing specifically on these aspects of Satan's career is—

Ezekiel 28:11–19. A considerable portion of this immediate context is to be taken up verse by verse, but in preparation for that undertaking it may be observed that revelation concerning Satan begins with the dateless period between the creation of the heavens and the earth in that perfect form in which they first appeared (Gen. 1:1) and the desolating judgments which ended that period, when the earth became waste and empty (Gen. 1:2; Isa. 24:1; Jer. 4:23–26). This extended passage from Ezekiel, it will be seen, is a delineation of the mightiest of the angels—most significant indeed is the fact that more is said of this one angel than any other and more than is said of all other angels together —of the age of earth's primal glory, and of the initial angelic sin. It is reasonable to expect that the Bible will provide information on history so vital and determining as this; and it does. The immediate, surrounding context of Ezekiel's prophecy presents a record of divine judgments upon Israel's enemies, and, according to 1 Chronicles 21:1, Satan belongs to that group. The portion which presents truth

regarding Satan is somewhat concealing since it is couched in oriental imagery. This is as legitimate a means of divine expression as any other form of literature, but it yields its message to those only who pursue its deeper meaning with worthy attention. In the right understanding of this so vital disclosure concerning Satan, it is of no little importance to note that the preceding verses of this chapter (Ezek. 28:1–10), though addressed to "the prince of Tyrus," are as clearly a word to the man of sin—Satan's final embodiment and masterpiece—as is that which follows a word to Satan himself. There is notable significance in the manner in which these two addresses are related and placed in sequence. The man of sin is identified throughout the Word of God by his blasphemous assumption to be God. This, indeed, is the substance of the resemblance between Antiochus Epiphanes and the man of sin (cf. Dan. 8:9 with 7:8. Note, also, on the man of sin Matt. 24:15; 2 Thess. 2:3–4; Rev. 13:6). Ezekiel 28:1–10 asserts this characteristic with peculiar emphasis. As a prince is inferior and subject to a king, thus it is that the man of sin is subject to Satan.

Preceding this address to a "prince" and a "king" in Tyrus, allusion is made to four nations—Ammon, Moab, Edom, and Philistia—and the messages to these are compressed into seventeen verses, while the message to the one city, Tyrus, occupies eighty-three verses. This proportion is arresting, suggesting as it does the symbolic importance of that one city. Tyre was the merchant city of the world, as was Babylon the Great. By this emphasis is intimated the promotion of the world's ideal of success. As in the world today, to leave everything here and take nothing into the next world is deemed *success*, but to leave nothing here and take all into the next world is *failure*. Tyre is the symbol of a mammon-loving world.

This address to the "king of Tyrus" identifies the person in view by one of his forty titles by which he is designated in the Bible. As David's greater Son is distinguished in the Messianic Psalms from David by the supernatural features set forth, in like manner the person saluted in this Scripture as "king of Tyrus" is discovered to be the highest of the angels. It could not be a mortal. Some of the important features of this Scripture are here attended:

28:11–12. "Moreover the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus

saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty."

Surpassing importance will be assigned to this Scripture when it is recognized that this is the word of Jehovah to the "king of Tyrus," and not the word of the prophet. A lamentation, which means intense anguish accompanied with beating of the breast, is a most impressive term when it describes Jehovah's sorrow poured out over the erring; and is it not ever so? Does Jehovah ever fail to lament over His erring creatures? If it were conceded that there might be a secondary application of this lament to some king in Tyrus, such a conjecture would be of little value or meaning in view of the supernatural features which are immediately introduced; for "Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty." Such an expression is superlative even according to divine standards. The intimation is that all divine creative power along the two lines of *wisdom and beauty* are represented in this being. Such terminology has no place in the mouth of Jehovah concerning a fallen man who, at best, is but a heathen king. The expression, however, is according to truth when seen to be a message to the greatest of angels in his unfallen state.

28:13. "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created."

It makes little difference whether this is a reference to a primal Eden or the Eden of Genesis, chapter 3. Satan has been in both; but no one will assert that any king of Tyrus was so favored. The bedecking with jewels suggests his great importance and the luster of his appearance. Thus in splendor was he exhibited in the Garden of Eden, for his name, *nāḥāsh*, translated "serpent," means 'the shining one.' The Apostle states that he is even now transformed into an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14). These precious stones are displayed but three times as recorded in the Bible: (a) in the high priest's breastplate, and were a manifestation of divine grace; (b) in the New Jerusalem, which reflects the glory of God; and (c) as the covering of this great angel, which signalizes the highest in creation. No distinction could be imposed on any creature more exalting than is imposed by these covering stones. Similarly, this imagery presents this angel as created to

have been a diadem of praise to his Creator. “Tabrets and pipes” were prepared in him. He did not need an instrument of praise to glorify his Creator; *he* was a diadem of praise. But by far the most revealing declaration in this verse is the affirmation that he is a *created* being. This essential truth is announced again in verse 15 where it is said that he was “perfect” in all his ways from the day in which he was created. The power and wisdom of this being are so vast that not a few have supposed him to be as eternal as God Himself. Being a creature, he must, regardless of his estate, be subject, in the end, to his Creator, and account to Him. This Satan will yet do.

28:14. “Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.”

That this being belongs to the order of the cherubim is arresting. As before indicated, this group of angels is related to the throne of God as protectors and defenders of His holiness. The proofs of this contention, so recently listed, need not be repeated here. Jehovah addresses a special word at this point to this angel: “I have set thee so,” and this is followed by the revealing words “Thou wast upon the holy mountain of God.” This specific service as cherub, or protector, was over the very throne of God—since the phrase, *the mountain of God*, is, in its Old Testament usage, the seat of God’s authority (cf. Ex. 4:27; Ps. 2:6; 3:4; 43:3; 68:15; Isa. 2:2; 11:9). From these disclosures it may be concluded that this great angel was created above all angels and to be a defender of the throne of God. If it be suggested that God, being the Almighty, would not need such defense, it may be said that it is not a question about what God needs, but rather a revelation about what God has chosen to arrange. He doubtless did not *need* the cherubim at the gate of Eden, yet He placed them there.

The remaining phrase—“Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire”—is somewhat obscure. It might refer to a primal glory of the earth. The stones of fire may be the manifestation of that consuming fire which Jehovah is. In such a case, this declaration would suggest that the first estate of this angel was one in which he walked in unbroken relation to divine holiness.

Returning for the moment to the identification of this being, it will be acknowledged that no king of Tyrus answers to this exalted description. No

such fallen man was ever a diadem of praise, nor was he directly created of God, nor did he belong to the cherubim, nor had he been placed on the holy mountain of God, nor walked amidst the stones of fire, nor was he perfect in all his ways from creation.

28:15. "Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee."

The description now changes and the fact of the first sin of this angel is disclosed. Iniquity was found in him. The intimation is that a secret sin was uncovered. The omniscience of God cannot be deceived nor does it fail to know all things. If our secret sins are in the light of His countenance (Ps. 90:8), it would be equally true of the secret sins of the angels.

28:16. "By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire."

The word *merchandise* is full of suggestion. The same thought occurs respecting the man of sin as expressed by the word *traffic* (vs. 5). The thought here expressed is far removed from the barter and trade in merchandise by human beings. The meaning of the term is 'to go about.' Pember suggests that it is a matter of slander. It may indicate that going about among the angels which was necessary to secure their allegiance to his program of rebellion against God. The direct accusation, "Thou hast sinned," and the casting out, are important features in the career of Satan and these will be considered in more detail presently.

28:17. "Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee."

The sin of Satan is here intimated, which sin is described more fully in other portions of Scripture. The self-centered nature of all sin is evident in this instance. It is, however, a long step from "the stones of fire," with all the exalted honor and glory that such language expresses, to the lake of fire to which Satan's career is tending.

28:18–19. "Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffick; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. All they that know

thee among the people shall be astonished at thee: thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more."

It is obvious that these verses point out the immediate, future, and final judgment of God upon this mighty angel, all of which is more completely described in other parts of the Bible.

In this one context God records the origin, estate, character, and sin of the greatest of angels. The importance of this revelation as it bears upon the doctrine of the angels and on the doctrine of man generally cannot be overestimated. God did not create Satan as such; He created an angel who was perfect in all his ways, and that angel sinned by opposing the will of God. By this act he became Satan the resister, and all else that all his titles imply. The ancient question raised by the skeptics of the past with respect to who made the devil has been answered in this passage just considered. There it is seen that God created a holy angel possessing the power of choice between good and evil, and he chose to do the evil. Through the degenerating power of sin, Satan, as did Adam, became an entirely different being from that which God created. When God creates a being to fill a purpose, that being must be a perfect fulfillment of that divine ideal. It is, therefore, well, when seeking to discover the measurements of this great angel, to identify the purpose for which Satan was created and evaluate the qualities which were his in view of that purpose. By his sin he lost his original holiness and heavenly standing, but he retains his wisdom, and he has turned his surpassing abilities into ways of evil and his understanding has been prostituted to the level of *lies, deceptions, snares,* and *wiles.* The extent of these evil undertakings, their exalted character, his motive, and method, constitute a portion of this vast theme which will yet be pursued. In his book *Satan,* F. C. Jennings sums up at the end of his lucid exposition of the Ezekiel passage after this manner: "(a) By its setting and language it can apply to no child of fallen man—that is impossible. (b) It must therefore necessarily refer to a spirit or angel. (c) This angel or spirit, whoever it was, was personally the topstone of that primal creation. (d) His office was to protect the Throne of God, to forbid the approach of evil, or any unrighteousness. (e) Iniquity was found in him, and that iniquity was self-exaltation. (f) Sentence of expulsion from his place is pronounced, although not actually, or at least fully, executed" (pp. 55–56).

II. Satan's Sin

With the same clarity and extended detail the precise sin of Satan is delineated in the Sacred Text, and in one central passage, namely, Isaiah 14:12–17. It is true that, from the beginning, Satan has not ceased sinning; but interest is focused specifically upon his initial sin, which sin, so far as God has been pleased to reveal, was the first sin to be committed in the universe. A partial exposition of this momentous passage has already been undertaken in an earlier division of this thesis, and it properly appears again as a fundamental consideration in hamartiology. In fact, the first sin to be committed not only bears much on our understanding of the one who commits it, but is the norm or pattern of all sin, demonstrating, as it does, the element in sin which makes it what it is—"exceeding sinful" (Rom. 7:13).

By reference to a fall from heaven, this passage (Isa. 14:12–17) raises the weighty question whether Satan is now with respect to his abode veritably cast out of heaven, or still dwelling in the sphere into which he was placed when created. A popular notion, which obtains quite apart from revelation, assumes that Satan is dwelling in lower regions, if not in hell itself. In this connection, it is essential to consider again the truth that there are three heavens in view in the Bible: (a) that of the atmosphere in which "the birds of the heavens" move, and in which the "prince of the power of the air" has authority and is active; (b) the stellar spaces which, as before indicated, are the abode of angelic beings; and (c) the "third heaven" which is the abode of the triune God, the location of which cannot be determined. The question at issue is whether Satan, and with him the fallen angels, are cast out of their original habitation. Certain passages shed light on this problem. Of Christ it is written that "he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke 10:18). Whether this was history or prophecy must be determined by the verdict of other Scriptures. Revelation 12:7–9 relates a casting out of Satan from heaven to the earth and, as there described, it is evidently future. The passage states: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into

the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." The prophet Ezekiel foresees a casting out of Satan. He writes of Satan: "Thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God" (28:16–19). This word does not disclose the time when that promise will be fulfilled, beyond the fact that it is in these verses associated with the final judgments that are to come upon Satan. Certain passages assume that Satan is now in that heaven to which he has title by creation. In Job 1:6 and 2:1 it is asserted that Satan was then present in heaven. It is written: "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them" (Job 1:6). Apparently, there was nothing unusual in Satan's presence in that place, or on that occasion. He is called upon to report on his activities; and he does so. In that report he incidentally discloses the truth that he has sufficient freedom and latitude to go "to and fro in the earth," as well as to appear in the very presence of God on high. Christ gave to Peter this warning: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired [ἐξῃτήσατο, 'demanded by asking'] to have you, that he may sift you as wheat" (Luke 22:31). The implication is that Satan appeared personally before God with this request. Again, the Apostle enjoins: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:11–12, R.V.). To the same end this passage declares that the evil powers are yet in heavenly spheres. The evidence which this body of Scripture presents—and apparently there is no counter testimony—is that Satan is yet in his original abode and will be until, according to Revelation 12:7–9, he will be, as a part of the tribulation experience, cast into the earth.

It is requisite, as well, if the two great passages—Ezekiel 28:11–19 and Isaiah 14:12–17, which contribute most to the making known of Satan's early history—are to be interpreted according to truth, to distinguish the different viewpoints of these human authors. Ezekiel in his prophetic vision stood on the threshold of angelic history and saw in *prospect* on to the end of Satan's career, whereas Isaiah in his prophetic vision stood at the end of this history and saw in *retrospect* what he records. The truth that Isaiah thus looked backwards from the end time accounts for the opening sentence of his prophecy, which assumes that this mighty angel will have then fallen

from heaven. Much that is found in this prediction is yet unfulfilled in its complete measure. The colossal undertakings of this angel as Isaiah saw them are not yet concluded.

Yet again, extreme contrasts are employed by these two prophets in the titles they apply to this angel. When entering upon his description of the high and holy estate of this angel as first created, Ezekiel addresses him, speaking for Jehovah, by the earthly title, “king of Tyrus”; while Isaiah, essaying to set forth the degradation of this being, addresses him by his heavenly title, “Lucifer, son of the morning.” It would seem that these titles are thus purposely employed to the end that these two estates —that which is of the highest of all creative power, and that which is the lowest debasement of an angel—may be brought into startling juxtaposition. The title “Lucifer, son of the morning” is the glorious heavenly designation of this great angel before his moral fall. *Lucifer* means ‘bright’ or ‘shining one’—and is almost identical with *nāḥāsh*, the serpent, which means ‘the shining one.’ Christ bears the titles, “bright and morning star” and “Sun of righteousness.” The titles “Lucifer, son of the morning” and “bright and morning star” are much the same. Christ is called “the last Adam” as a successor to the first Adam who fell. Is it not possible that, in some unrevealed manner, He is “the bright and morning star” as successor to the fallen “Lucifer, son of the morning”? This is but one of many parallels and contrasts between Christ and Satan, between Christ and Adam, and between Satan and Adam.

The prophecy by Isaiah is as follows: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; that made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners?” (14:12–17).

Thus the prophet announces the fall of this angel, the occasion of the fall, and something of his stupendous power. Of the latter, it is said that he it was

who didst "weaken the nations," "that made the earth to tremble," "that did shake kingdoms," "that made the world as a wilderness," "destroyed the cities thereof," and "opened not the house of his prisoners." Much of this vast program is yet unaccomplished, and the authority and power which it connotes belongs to a later discussion. Again it is emphasized that Satan's sin was intended to be a secret. This is the meaning of the words, "Thou hast said in thine heart." Likewise, it is stated in this passage that Lucifer's sin consisted in five awful *I will's* against the will of God. Feeble indeed is the power of human imagination to picture the crisis in this universe at the moment when the first repudiation of God took place in heaven. These five "I will's" of Satan are evidently various aspects of one sin. Writing of the acceptable characteristics of an officer of the church, the Apostle states that he must not be a novice "lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation [crime] of the devil" (1 Tim. 3:6). Christ stated that Satan abode not in the truth, that he was dominated with an unholy desire, and that he was a murderer from the beginning (John 8:44). All these disclosures are, no doubt, but various ways of describing one sin—that of seeking to rise above the sphere in which he was created, and above the purpose and service assigned to him. This, it will be observed, is the essential character of human sin, as it is of the angels. Satan's five "I will's" are:

1. "I WILL ASCEND INTO HEAVEN." In this, the first aspect of Satan's sin, he apparently proposed to take up his *abode* in the third or highest heaven where God and the redeemed abide (2 Cor. 12:1–4). The abode of the angels is evidently on a lower plane; for, when returning to the highest heaven after His resurrection, Christ is said to have been seated "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion" (Eph. 1:20–21); but Satan, whose abode is that of the angels, even though his duties give him access to both earth and the higher spheres (cf. Job. 1:6; Ezek. 28:14), in unholy self-promotion determined that his abode should be higher than that sphere to which he had been appointed by his Creator. The redeeming grace of God will not be satisfied until some among men, who by original position are lower than the angels (Ps. 8:4–6; Heb. 2:6–8), are lifted to eternal citizenship in the highest sphere (John 14:3; 17:21–24; Col. 3:3–4; Heb. 2:10; 10:19–20); but Satan has no right either by position or

redemption to claim that sphere as the place of his abode. His self-seeking intention as disclosed in this declaration is an outrage against the Creator's plan and purpose.

2. "I Will Exalt My Throne Above the Stars of God." By this statement it is revealed that Satan, though appointed to the guardianship of the throne of God, aspired to the possession of a throne of his own and to rule over the "stars of God." The angelic beings, rather than the stellar system, are obviously in view (Job 38:7; Jude 1:13; Rev. 12:3–4; 22:16). Evidently very much of Satan's unholy ambition to possess a throne has been permitted, for it is revealed that he is now a recognized, though judged, king with throne-authority both in the heavenly realm (Matt. 12:26; Eph. 2:2; Col. 2:13–15) and earthly sphere (Luke 4:5–6; 2 Cor. 4:4 and Rev. 2:13, where "seat" is an inadequate translation of θρόνος). The sinful character of Satan's purpose to secure a throne is apparent.

3. "I Will Sit Also Upon the Mount of the Congregation, in the Sides of the North." As has been stated, "the mount" is a phrase which evidently refers to the seat of divine government in the earth (Isa. 2:1–4), and the reference to "the congregation" is as clearly of Israel. Thus this specific assumption seems to aim at a share at least (note the word *also*) in the earthly Messianic rule. That rule is to be from Jerusalem, the city of the great King. The Messiah, we are told (Ps. 48:2), will reign from Mount Zion "on the sides of the north." It is also disclosed that in the cross, which was set up on the north side of Jerusalem, Christ judged and spoiled principalities and powers (Col.2:15). It is possible that when thus judged, Satan's unholy designs upon the Messianic rule were thwarted forever.

4. "I Will Ascend Above the Heights of the Clouds." The meaning of this assumption will probably be discovered in the use of the word *clouds.* Of upwards of one hundred and fifty references in the Bible to clouds, fully one hundred are related to the divine presence and glory. Jehovah appeared in the cloud (Ex. 16:10); the cloud was termed "the cloud of Jehovah" (Ex. 40:38); when Jehovah was present the cloud filled the house (1 Kings 8:10); "Jehovah rideth upon a swift cloud" (Ps. 104:3; Isa. 19:1); Christ is to come, as He went, upon the clouds of heaven (Matt. 24:30; Acts 1:9; Rev. 1:7); so the ransomed people appear (Israel, Isa. 60:8;

and the Church, 1 Thess. 4:17). Satan's "man of sin" will exalt himself "above all that is called God, or that is worshipped" (2 Thess. 2:4), and by this assumption Satan is evidently seeking to secure for himself some of the glory which belongs to God alone.

5. "I Will Be Like the Most High." This, the fifth and last of Satan's "I will's" against the will of God, may be considered as a key to the understanding and tracing of his motives and methods. In spite of an almost universal impression that Satan's ideal for himself is to be *unlike* God, he is here revealed as being actuated with the purpose to be *like* God. However, this ambition is not to be like Jehovah, the self-existent One, which no created being could ever be; but to be like the Most High, which title signifies the "possessor of heaven and earth" (Gen. 14:19, 22). Satan's purpose, then, is to gain authority over heaven and earth. The essential evil character of sin here, as everywhere, is an unwillingness on the part of the creature to abide in the precise position in which he has been placed by the Creator. In pursuing this life-purpose as imitator of God and counterfeiter of God's undertakings, Satan, apparently with sincerity, recommended to Adam and Eve that they, too, "be as gods." The original word here translated "gods" is *Elohim* and the plural form of *Elohim* evidently accounts for the plural "gods." What Satan really said was, "Ye shall be as *Elohim*." In response to that suggestion, which only reflected Satan's own supreme ambition to be like the Most High, Adam entered upon the same course of unholy repudiation of the divine purpose. So universal has this form of sin become that man thinks he has accomplished much when, if ever, he, through divine grace, reaches the place where his will is surrendered to God—the place, indeed, from which man should never have departed. In the strange, inexplicable permission of God, Satan's ideal man, the man of sin, will yet declare himself to be God, sitting in the temple of God (2 Thess. 2:4); but this appears to be the climax of man's unholy assumption and constitutes the sign of the end of the age (Matt. 24:15).

Satan's sin may thus be summarized as a purpose to secure (1) the highest heavenly position; (2) regal rights both in heaven and on earth; (3) Messianic recognition; (4) glory which belongs to God alone; and (5) a likeness to the Most High, the "possessor of heaven and earth."

There can be no adequate estimation of the immediate effect of Satan's initial sin, first upon himself, and then upon that vast host of spirit beings who, in allegiance to Satan, "kept not their first estate"; or of the final effect of that sin upon the entire human race whose federal head adopted the same satanic repudiation of God.

III. Satan According to the Old Testament

Satan is presented in the Old Testament under various characterizations, but he appears only four times in the Old Testament under the Hebrew appellation *Satan.* In 1 Chronicles 21:1 a record is made of the truth that Satan moved David to number Israel contrary to the will of God, and this act on Satan's part well illustrates his purpose and character. Both Psalm 109:6 and Zechariah 3:1–2 disclose the same satanic design. In the former of these two passages, Satan's presence is invoked as a judgment on the enemies of Jehovah, while, in the second, Satan is seen standing in an attitude of readiness to resist the divine purpose in behalf of Joshua, the high priest. It is Jehovah who directly rebukes Satan, which truth has its parallel in Jude 1:9 where it is said that Michael calls on Jehovah to rebuke Satan for his opposition. The remaining Old Testament reference to Satan is the illuminating account of Jehovah's controversy with Satan over Job. As this Scripture makes claim to an extended consideration under the next division of satanology, no further attention will be given it at this point beyond the recognition that Satan here, as always, appears as the opposer of God.

The whole revelation of Satan's rebellious world-power is not found in the Old Testament, but is reserved for the New Testament. Such a disclosure was doubtless withheld as being too demanding upon those of the Old Testament to whom a fuller revelation of truth had not come. There is a progress of doctrine concerning things evil as there is concerning things good, and these two developments could not lose their interrelation and balance. In the Old Testament, Jehovah is Himself presented as permitting that which occurs, which is always the basic fact (Ex. 10:20; 1 Sam. 16:14; Isa. 45:7; Amos 3:6). The divine permission here, as ever, in no way relieves those who sin of the responsibility for their sin. The very first title

by which this great angel is introduced in the Bible is not fully clarified with respect to its meaning until as late as Revelation 12:9 (cf. 2 Cor. 11:3).

IV. Satan According to the New Testament

At the opening of the New Testament the student is confronted with the extreme activity of Satan and the demons. It would seem that all possible opposition resident in the fallen angels was marshaled for the encounter. As certainly as the eternal purpose of God in redemption was about to be actualized, the more violent contrariety is set up by the powers of darkness. Such utmost effort on Satan's part is according to revealed truth, but also is according to reason. There is but one situation to compare with this, namely, the period that will immediately precede the second advent of Christ when, as announced in Revelation 16:13–14, "the spirits of devils, working miracles, go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." This situation is more completely portrayed in the second Psalm, as also in Revelation 19:17–21. The true character of that coming conflict is divulged when it is thus observed that these warring kings will be demon-possessed.

Satan's activity as described in the New Testament may be given a twofold classification—that which arises through his authority as a king over evil spirits, and that which arises through his world-dominion. In reply to those who accused Him of casting out Satan by the power of Satan, Christ said that a house that is divided against itself cannot stand, and asked the question, If Satan cast out Satan how shall his kingdom stand? This passage is mentioned only to bring forward the truth that Satan has a kingdom of evil spirits. This statement by Christ is more than implication; it is a direct assertion and its reality must be heeded. So, also, Satan is said to be the "god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4) and in authority over this world to the extent that he gives its kingdoms to whomsoever he will (Luke 4:6). It is probable that every activity of Satan will be found to be related to one or the other of these spheres of authority.

At the threshold of Christ's ministry on earth, Satan met Him in the wilderness. There is mystery concealed in this encounter which, it is probable, extends to realms of angelic reality. It also penetrates into the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. The temptation is apparently

within the sphere of His humanity and suggests the exercise of the human features—body, soul, and spirit—in their adjustment to the presence and exactings of His Deity. Into that sphere of relationship the human mind may not enter; yet the clear statement which the Bible sets forth should be accepted. Without doubt these supernatural issues are within the range of Satan's understanding, and afford a wide field for conflict which human experience cannot parallel. The features of the situation are faithfully presented. Christ being filled with the Spirit, He is led of the Spirit into the wilderness and there undergoes a testing which continued forty days and nights. As a climax to this testing, Satan presents a threefold suggestion. The first involved the breaking down of that separation which Christ faithfully preserved between His Deity and His humanity. If the common demands of food and drink were supernaturally supplied by His Deity, He would not be in all points tested as are His followers in this world. The second test involved a short cut, apart from sacrifice, to the possession of the kingdoms of this world. These are covenanted to the Son (Ps. 2:8–9) by the Father and the securing of them with respect to title formed a part of His triumph in the cross. To some degree Satan has personal interests to serve, for there is a wide difference between exchanging the kingdoms of the world for the worship of the Son of God as compared with going on to a doom which deprives him of everything but the lake of fire. In the third instance, there is offered to Christ the securing of a recognition from the people apart from the path of suffering and shame. In all three testings Christ met Satan's proposals with the Word of God, and demonstrated the fact that the action which Satan suggests is not the will of God. The first Adam was overcome by Satan; the Last Adam drove Satan from the field. As Son of God with His Deity in view, the outcome could not be otherwise; as a man with His humanity in view, the victory is measureless and forms a pattern for all the saints of God in all the ages.

What may be suggested about Satan's later attacks upon Christ by the words, "And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season" (Luke 4:13), is not easy to trace; but that other attempts were made, which may have characterized much of the life and work of Christ in all the days before the cross, is certain.

V. Satan Judged in the Cross

When tracing his career, the cross as a judgment of Satan and all his hosts of spirits is the next event in order, and again the theme reaches out into the larger realms where the life and service of angels are situated. Issues are involved which lie outside the earthly sphere. For this reason the theme should be approached with caution. That which is revealed is to be received as God's revelation and from this certain general conclusions may be drawn. In His death, Christ dealt with sin as a principle, or as a whole; and while it is the joyous privilege of a human being to know that his personal sin is met to the satisfaction of God in the death of Christ, it is evident that the thing achieved by Christ is as boundless as the universe and as timeless as eternity. The Colossian Epistle contains two notable passages which enunciate the limitless character of Christ's work upon the cross. Having in 1:15–18 assigned to Christ the creatorship of all things and the pre-eminence above all His creation, the Epistle goes on to state in verses 19 through 22: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight." The scope of this reconciliation which the cross provides is as limitless as that realm which includes both heaven and earth. The term *reconciliation* is not the equivalent of *restoration*, or *salvation.* Its precise meaning is 'to change thoroughly,' and its achievement is seen in the fact that the divine estimation of all things has been changed completely by the cross. When it is said, as in 2 Corinthians 5:19, that God has reconciled the world unto Himself, it is not by so much declared that all men are saved, or that all will be saved. And with a similar meaning, the reconciliation of "all things," as asserted in Colossians 1:20, does not intimate that all things in heaven and on earth are now perfected in the sight of God, or that they necessarily ever will be. The reconciliation which is now wrought by the cross has provided a ground for the redemption of those before chosen of God and a ground for the judgment of those who reject His provisions for them. The Scriptures do not even hint that fallen men who continue impenitent, or that fallen angels, will be rescued from their doom (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:12–15). It is probable that what is thus

involved cannot be reduced to the level of human understanding, but the truth that Christ's death extends a benefit to things in heaven and to things on earth is made clear. Satan and his hosts are judged. Their fallen beings and their evil deeds have come up for divine judgment, and are now judged, though the execution of that judgment is yet future. Though the heel of the Judge of all things was bruised, it is also as certain that the head of "the serpent" has been bruised. It is impossible that one shall be bruised without the bruising of the other.

The second passage in Colossians is exceedingly explicit, though all that it announces may not be understood by dwellers in this sphere. It reads: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (2:14–15). Here, as before, the value of the cross is seen to extend into two realms, that which is human (vs. 14), and that which is angelic (vs. 15). That which extends to human realms is not now being considered; but within the realms of that which is angelic, stupendous accomplishments are indicated by the disclosure that Christ in His death *spoiled* principalities and powers, made a shew of them openly, and *triumphed over* them. The human imagination might picture all this as being brought to pass in a final assize, but here it is taught that its achievement through the cross of Christ is a present reality. Since the theme is as vast as the sphere and destiny of the angels, it is the part of wisdom that the student shall approach its consideration with due humility. The truth that Satan was judged in the cross of Christ is confirmed by two recorded statements by Christ: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John 12:31); "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:11). These were made immediately before the crucifixion and relate Satan's judgment to Christ's anticipated death. To these statements may be added Hebrews 2:14, which declares: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Thus by explicit teaching the Bible reiterates the truth that Satan and his hosts came to judgment, even being spoiled, unveiled, triumphed over, judged, and cast out by Christ in His death. Such, indeed, is the historical fact, though it yet

remains to discover something of the issues of that judgment with its immediate and future results. Of the immediate results, it may be repeated that a distinction must be drawn between a judgment gained which is in the nature of a legal sentence not yet executed, and the final administering of the penalty. The evidence is conclusive that the sentence is not yet executed since throughout this age following the cross Satan is, by divine authority, given the designations “the prince of the power of the air” (Eph. 2:2), and “the god of this world” (2 Cor. 4:4). He evidently is permitted to continue as a usurper until the time of his execution. An illustration of Satan’s present relation to this world may be taken from the history of Saul and David. It is natural that David, the first to occupy the Davidic throne, should be a type of Christ predicted to be the last and most glorious occupant of that throne (Luke 1:31–33). As there was a period between the anointing of David and the final banishment of Saul, in which Saul reigned as a usurper, though under divine sentence and David was the God-appointed king, in like manner there is now a similar period in which Satan rules as a usurper, though under sentence, and the actual occupation of Christ’s throne is still future. In this period Satan, the rejected monarch, still rules, hunting to the death all those who have allied themselves with Christ, the God-anointed King. On this so important period of Satan’s career and the peculiar character of it as typified in Saul, F. C. Jennings writes:

> Thus you remember that God permitted Israel to choose their first King, and they chose Saul; as to whom we are told that “*from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people.*” Why are we told this? Have we exhausted its significance when we picture to ourselves the towering height of that human king? I am sure not; but rather would the Spirit of God, provide a perfect figure or type of him, who, exactly in the same way, towered over *his* fellows: in other words was, as the other Scriptures we have glanced at show, the most exalted of all created spiritual intelligences. But Saul disobeys, or, to use language that shall suggest the parallel I desire to keep before us;— “iniquity *was found in him*”; see Ezek. 28:15; and he was set aside from his kingly office: the kingdom was rent from him (I Sam. 15:27, 28), and then God anointed another king of His own choice: *A shepherd king*, David! Now no one questions David being a type of the beloved Son of God; why should not Saul afford us also a type of His opponent? He surely does. But,—and this is the point that must be carefully noted and weighed,—*Saul retains the throne of Israel, and is still recognized as the king, long after he is divinely rejected;* the sentence is pronounced, but judgment is not at once executed, whilst David, the now true king, is “hunted like a partridge upon the mountains, or finds his refuge in the cave of Adullam!” God does not at once intervene by *power*, and take the dignities of the kingdom from Saul,—although he has lost all *title* to them—and put them in David’s hand: the power is Saul’s,—the title is David’s. The latter is king *de jure*, the former *de facto.* Do you not see the marvellous and clear analogy? Satan

> too, whilst he may have forfeited all *title* to the throne of the earth—we shall consider this more carefully directly—still cleaves as did Saul, to its power and dignity; claims, as did Saul, all the power of its government; whilst the true David, to whom all belongs in *title*, is, as it were, in the cave of Adullam, where a few "discontented" ones, those who are not satisfied with such a condition of things—have found their way to Him, and own Him, even in the day of His rejection, as rightful Lord of all. Therefore whilst Satan is the prince of this world at the present time, we are led by the analogy of the inspired history, as by every clear Scripture, to regard him as its *usurping* prince: a prince in *power*, but not in *title.* Yet whilst now a usurper, as Saul was: still since he was, also as Saul, divinely anointed as king, the dignity of that anointing still lingers on him, so that Michael recognized that dignity—not speaking evil, but reverently (even as David spoke of Saul ever as "the Lord's Anointed") and saying "*the Lord* rebuke thee."—*Op. cit.*, pp. 25–27

Returning to the central truth as recorded in Colossians 2:15, it will be remembered that the specific crime which caused Satan's fall, the fall of the angels, and the fall of man, though being prompted by pride (1 Tim. 3:6; Ezek. 28:16–17) and leading on to a career of iniquity, is that this mighty angel assumed to oppose the plan and purpose of God both for himself and for other creatures. He introduced a philosophy of life, a mode of procedure, which is directly opposed to the revealed will of God. It is a lie in the sense that it contradicts that which is infinitely true. What form of judgment a holy God must impose upon such an immeasurable offense is not for men to determine. The judgment properly has in view the crime itself. Such, indeed, is the reason for an unending confinement in the lake of fire. Satan declared, "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God … I will be like the most High." This, it is evident, is the essential feature of Satan's program. In line with that purpose, he wrested the scepter from Adam and has held sway over the vast majority of the human family throughout all its generations. They being separated from God, as described in Ephesians 2:12, possessed no way to God until the sacrifice of Calvary was made. It is true that to the small company of people, Israel, as to the patriarchs, was extended the cure of sin by blood sacrifice; but the great mass of humanity remained without hope and without God in the world. It would seem, therefore, that the basis of Satan's dominion over humanity was largely the fact that they were not eligible to any higher relationship. On this basis, had God approached any fallen human beings, Satan would have pleaded God's own holiness as the reason why God should not so act. Satan is committed to his infernal philosophy and to the defense of those who have embraced it. At least he will not surrender them apart from the most drastic resistance

within his power. As long as man's unholiness was not yet taken to the cross, the conflict was largely in Satan's favor. In Isaiah 14:17 it is written of Satan that "he opened not the house of his prisoners." This statement is illuminating. However, when referring to what Christ would do by His sacrifice, the same prophet goes on to say that Christ would come "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" (Isa. 61:1; cf. Luke 4:16–21). The incarceration to which these Scriptures refer is more serious and extensive than anything that obtains in human governments. No suggestion will be found here that those justly in prison for crime are to be released from that judgment. The bondage came with the repudiation of God on the part of the responsible head of the race. These prisoners are not only bondslaves to sin, but are in bondage to the evil one. He it is who energizes all the sons of disobedience (Eph. 2:2); Satan had bound in physical distress a "daughter of Abraham" (Luke 13:16); by him had been exercised the "power of death" (Heb. 2:14–15); and the Apostle witnesses frequently to the activities of Satan (cf. 1 Cor. 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor. 12:7; 1 Thess. 2:18). The incomparable invitations—"Come … whosoever will" and, "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out"—are possible only through the redemption which Christ has wrought. The door is open wide. The gospel is to be preached to "every creature."

Thus it is seen that Christ's judgment of Satan which was wrought through the cross had primarily to do with Satan's original crime and with the God-repudiating philosophy which that crime represents. The *principle* of evil was judged. The cross-judgment reaches out to a lost world for whom Christ died and becomes the basis of the gospel of salvation.

Investigation into the very extensive body of literature which bears on Satan's activity and influence upon both the saved and unsaved in the present age must be passed over at this point and included in later divisions of this general theme.

VI. The Execution of Satan's Judgments

The execution of those judgments which were secured against Satan by Christ through the cross is anticipated in the Word of God in three stages or successive events. These are to be considered quite apart from three judgments already past, namely, (a) the moral degradation and

corresponding loss of standing which was due to that fall, (b) the sentence pronounced against him in the Garden of Eden, and (c) the judgment of the cross. The future threefold execution of judgment upon Satan may be stated thus:

1. Satan Cast Out of Heaven. The casting of Satan out of heaven and the confining of him with his angels to the restricted sphere of the earth is described in Revelation 12:7–12. This passage reads: “And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.” Beyond the disclosure of the central truth that Satan and his angels will be cast out of heaven, this passage unfolds much vital revelation. The means that will be employed to cast Satan and his angels down is none other than the authority and power of the holy angels under the leadership of Michael. These fallen angels, being overcome, are as exiles from their native spheres, confined to the earth. A song of rejoicing ascends in heaven because of the relief which the absence of these fallen angels secures. All this is most suggestive. Likewise a woe is addressed to the earth in view of the calamity which their presence imposes upon the dwellers of earth. It is in connection with this exile that Satan’s great wrath is stirred, and it is then, apparently, that he becomes aware that the cause which has engaged him from the first has been lost forever. The presence of Satan and his hosts restricted to the earth and in measureless wrath could hardly be cause for joy on the earth. On the contrary, this situation is one of the most essential contributing factors in that great tribulation which is predicted for those very days (Matt. 24:21;

Dan. 12:1). That this tribulation falls heaviest upon the nation Israel is asserted here (cf. 12:13–17), as in all the Scriptures.

The casting out of the satanic hosts from heaven means much, also, to the "brethren" whom Satan has not ceased to accuse before God night and day, and it is a most vital truth which is added in the words, "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." The question may be raised at this point about what it is that constitutes Satan's opposition to God's ways with men. No little resentment may exist against the truth that redemption has not been extended to fallen angels as it is extended to fallen men. It would seem that Satan still exercises some of his original responsibility, as the defender and promoter of righteousness on which the throne of God must ever rest. Satan's ministers pose as "ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:15); but reference is made in this text to *personal* or *self-promoted* righteousness. The redemptive plan proposes to constitute sinners righteous before God through the merit of Christ which He released and provided for the lost in His death. The constituting of sinners to be righteous through the saving work of Christ is easily believed to be a point of satanic opposition against God. There is nothing else about the gospel which Satan would resist, or concerning which he would "blind the minds" of those who are lost (2 Cor. 4:3–4). The one who specializes in self-promoted righteousness has always been the least able to comprehend and the greatest objector to the doctrine of imputed righteousness. Certainly it is not to be counted as strange if Satan himself is, like those among men who are energized by him, opposed to that which is the abiding fruit of redeeming grace. The accusations which Satan has hurled against the brethren have no doubt been concerning actual sin and unrighteousness on their part. It is inconceivable that he would charge them with that which is wholly untrue. Such a course would fall by its own weight. It is rather that Satan is as offended by the arrangement whereby saints are preserved in spite of their unworthiness as he is by the imputing of righteousness to meritless sinners in the first place. The Scriptures offer an illustration of this unassailable position of those who are redeemed God said to Balak through the unwilling prophet Balaam, I have "not beheld iniquity in Jacob," or "perverseness in Israel." There was evil in this people, but, when attacked by the foe of divine grace, Jehovah delighted to declare that He did not *see* or *behold* that on which the enemy

based his accusations. God does not assert that these wicked things do not exist; He states that He, having covered them with redeeming blood, does not see or behold what the enemy points out. However, when dealing with these whom He has redeemed, Jehovah is tireless in His effort to separate them from all their evil ways. Of this great truth the Psalmist writes: "If thou, LORD, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" (Psalm 130:3). That He does not mark iniquity is possible only through redemption and is never a matter of mere graciousness. The wrathful attitude of Balak is a reflection of the attitude of Satan who energized him. In like manner, the evil which was condemned in Cain is not immorality, but rather the Satanic ideal of self-worthiness as a basis of divine acceptance. The blood-sacrifice of Abel, looking on to the fruits of redemption, provided a perfect relationship to God to which no fallen being could ever attain by works of personal righteousness.

The saints are to be rewarded before the judgment seat of Christ in heaven. At that time no mention is to be made of sins already washed away by the blood of the Lamb. Such silence with respect to canceled sin could not be in heaven until the accuser is cast out. Great joy will be the portion of those who thus enter into the full realization of divine forgiveness and acceptance.

2. SATAN'S JUDGMENT AT THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST. As a part of that which transpires at the glorious return of Christ—which coming terminates the great tribulation (Matt. 24:30), and ends the reign of the man of sin (2 Thess. 2:8–10)—Satan is bound by a great chain and cast into the abyss. This event is described by these words: "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season" (Rev. 20:1–3). In this passage, as in that previously cited, there is much revealed beyond the fact that Satan is bound and cast into the abyss and sealed. It is asserted that Satan is the deceiver of the whole world, and assurance is given that the earth will be free from these deceptions for a period said to be "a thousand years." His

wrathful presence in the earth during a preceding period has contributed much to the agony of the great tribulation. Thus, also, his restraint from all activity contributes much to the peace and righteousness on the earth for the thousand years. The human mind could not comprehend all that is involved in these disclosures. Further on in this context it is revealed that, at the end of a thousand years, Satan will be loosed for a "little season." It is written: "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them" (20:7–9). The nations are said to be deceived again and that deception plunges them once more—and for the last time—into war. It is predicted that war shall cease during that kingdom age of peace (Isa. 2:1–4), and that it is immediately resorted to upon the release of Satan from the abyss. This twofold truth that there is no war on earth when Satan's power and deceptions are withdrawn and that it is immediately revived as soon as these deceptions are again cast over the earth, demonstrates clearly the cause of all war in the earth. It is the last war, for God Himself intervenes with supernatural judgments and destruction.

A corresponding Old Testament prediction adds much to the disclosure that Satan will be in the abyss. It is said in Isaiah 24:21–23: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." If, as seems justified, the "high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth [that are then] upon earth" is a reference to fallen angels and their principalities and powers, it is made clear that the fallen angels, along with their chief, are also placed in the abyss. Where else could they be at such a time? It is generally true that in the Scriptures a king and his kingdom are closely related and whatever befalls one befalls the other (cf. Dan. 2:37–38). On this principle of interpretation, it may be assumed that these fallen

angels accompany Satan on to the end of his career. It will be observed that some of these are already in chains awaiting the final judgment which shall come upon all evil spirits (Jude 1:6; 2 Pet. 2:4); and it is of great significance that, as witnesses at least, the saints will be associated with Christ in this judgment (1 Cor. 6:3).

3. Satan's Final Judgment. The Scripture itself will best describe the last step in the execution of Satan's judgment: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10).

Chapter VI

SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S EVIL CHARACTER

IN APPROACHING this difficult and intricate subject, a certain inquiry is in order, namely, What latitude is accorded angels in the exercise of their powers in the direction of evil? The implications of Scripture and the deductions of reason contend, in answer to this question, that much that is possible as sin with men is impossible with angels and is foreign to them. There is no evidence that angels are tempted in the realms of those sins which find expression through the human body—immoral relations, gluttony, and the perversion of normal bodily functions. It is equally certain that there is no occasion for avarice, parsimoniousness, or thievery among the angels since, so far as is known, they are not burdened with possessions of any description whatever. In truth it is easier to discover the sins which are predicated of the angels than to list those which they, for obvious reasons, do not practice. Angelic sin is along the lines of two closely related evils—*ambitious pride* and *untruth*—as these may be manifested within the range of angelic existence. Within the scope of these two sins the evil character of Satan must be computed. The sinfulness of Satan's sin is not to be discovered by comparing it with wickedness in human spheres, but rather by a due comparison of it with the holiness of God, and in the light of that which God has required of the angels.

As God is the embodiment of good, so Satan, in his restricted sphere, is the embodiment of evil. God, being infinite, is infinitely good; Satan, being finite, is evil to the extent of his resources and means. Since he is the highest of all creation, Satan is the one of all creatures to assume the position of *antigod.* It is recognized that Satan will yet introduce and exalt the Antichrist; but, it is clear, from the beginning he has arrogated to himself the function of antigod. This assumption is the supreme conception which actuates his ambitious pride. To a like degree he is *antitruth,* but in realms and ways which challenge the closest attention of every student of Bible doctrine. To the same extent to which this great angel surpasses human understanding, his evil nature and undertakings reach beyond human comprehension. However, it is anticipated that the Spirit-taught believers

shall pursue these vast themes with some discernment and to a large degree of profit. Popular impressions of the character of Satan are erroneous. Doubtless, if called to face the truth of the precise nature of Satan's sin, the man of the world would find little fault in him. It could not be otherwise since the worldling has himself adopted as his prototype the very, evil ideals of Satan. The world could not be expected to sit thus in judgment upon itself, and this is especially true in view of the fact that Satan has blinded the minds of those who believe not that which is of God. The evil character of Satan will be found embraced in the twofold wickedness—ambitious pride and untruth—which is charged against him.

I. Twofold Wickedness

1. Ambitious Pride. Though the entire career of Satan is but an unbroken manifestation of his pride, there are three passages of Scripture which directly indict Satan with respect to this specific sin:

1 Timothy 3:6. This notable passage urges the unwisdom of appointing a young and inexperienced convert to the office of bishop or elder in the church. Such an officer should not be a "novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation ['judgment'] of the devil" —not a judgment to be imposed by the devil, but the judgment God imposes on the devil for the same sin of pride. The next verse asserts that there is a *reproach* of the devil (cf. Jude 1:9; 2 Pet. 2:11), and a *snare* of the devil (cf. 2 Tim. 2:26); but the text in question warns against the experience of Satan's judgment which follows the enacting of Satan's sin—ambitious pride. Citation of this passage at this point is for the purpose of enforcing the truth that Satan's notable sin was pride. The effect upon the novice would be, as it was upon Satan, a beclouding of the mind with respect to real values. The verb τυφόομαι, translated "lifted up," means 'to make a smoke' and by it to be blinded (cf. 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:4). It is of interest to observe that the intimation is that Satan himself experienced a besotting of the mind which to some extent made his sinful course a possibility.

Ezekiel 28:17. Reference must be had again to this passage because of its clear revelation relative to Satan's sinful, self-promoting pride. To quote: "Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay

thee before kings, that they may behold thee." He who had been created for the highest position and service, before described, has become conscious and proud of his wisdom and beauty. It will be seen from verse 12 that the wisdom is *full* and the beauty is *perfect.* The meaning of such terms, describing, as they do, the mind of Jehovah in His appreciation of this angel, cannot be traced by man. Doubtless there were these qualities in this angel which made pride a natural consequence. With that befogging of mind which pride engenders, it is possible so to be misguided as to undertake the very opposite line of action from that which infinite wisdom has dictated.

Isaiah 14:12–14. Though quoted and expounded before, this illuminating passage is cited again: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High."

Pride is here seen to prompt this great angel to unholy ambition. With a beclouded mind, he easily repudiates the Creator and displays dissatisfaction with the estate into which he was divinely placed. He proposes by ambition and self-promotion to advance his estate to the highest heaven and into the likeness of the Most High.

Thus it is set forth by divine authority that Satan's career of evil began with pride and that, through its power to confuse the mind, it has led him on into all the ways of evil which are recorded of him. The all-important fruit of Satan's pride is the fact that "he abode not in the truth."

2. Untruth. An extended list of indictments against Satan is to be presented shortly and it would seem impossible that all that is charged against this evil angel could originate from the one sin of untruth which was engendered by pride. Christ's own word in reference to Satan's first procedure in the way of sin is both revealing and final. He said: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it" (John 8:44). And to this may be added: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For

this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:8).

The charge that these Jews, to whom Christ spoke, were of their father the devil is a serious one, and has provoked perplexity and controversy. There being a spiritual birth in which the one who believes in Christ is the recipient of the divine nature—that which is foreign to normal human life—thus there is such a thing as a reception of satanic ideals to the end that the life which receives them is, to a marked degree, the child of the one who originates the manner of life which is embraced. The designation three times employed by the Apostle, *children of disobedience* (Eph. 2:2; 5:6; Col. 3:6), and Peter's phrase *cursed children* (2 Pet. 2:14—cf. *obedient children* of 1 Pet. 1:14), are all most significant, the context of which passages invites the student's most careful exegesis to the end that the exact import of these appellations may be apprehended. The characterizing disobedience to which reference is made is federal—as is the characterizing obedience (cf. Rom. 5:19). By natural birth all are subject to divine wrath which is due to the disobedience of the federal head of the race and by which the race fell; yet children, with respect to their personal childlikeness and innocence, portray citizenship in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 18:1–4). Since federal and not personal disobedience is in view, the implications of the title are as applicable to one unregenerate person as to another and without regard to personal subservience. Hence, also, it is right to conclude that all unregenerate persons are alike in need of the provisions of divine grace.

All of this substantiates the truth that there is a solemn reality in Christ's words, "Ye are of your father the devil," and it is on the ground of this filiation and the unavoidable expression of its inner qualities that He goes on to say, "and the lusts of your father ye will ['your will is to'] do." With unquestionable authority Christ relates the parentage which sin generates, not at all to Adam who is only a link in the chain (Rom. 5:12), but to the originator of evil—Satan. *Children of Adam* is a mild designation compared with *children of the devil.* Christ asserts the reality of the latter.

The statement that Satan "was a murderer from the beginning" seems to be the result of Satan's influence upon other creatures. Whether there is any sense in which this charge might apply to Satan's injury to other angels or not, it is easily traceable that he seduced men into sin which subjected them to death. It is reasonable to assume—and not without Scripture warrant—

that the one who caused man to sin also caused the lesser angels to sin. The origin of sin is not distributed among various individuals; it is invariably assigned to the one who must, therefore, have degraded angels as he has degraded men. The satanic principle manifested in Cain moved Cain to slay Abel who, in turn, manifested the divine purpose and ideal. According to the Bible, murder is in the intent as well as in the overt act (1 John 3:12, 15). Satan slew Adam and Eve, though their years were many before death came to them. They who were by creation as immortal as the angels, paid the assured price of death which Satan's counsel imposed upon them.

The root of the matter lies concealed in the accompanying accusation by Christ in which He said that the devil "abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." As set forth in the Bible, the general theme of untruth is vast indeed; but specific importance is given to untruth as the opposite of that truth which God is. In its essential nature untruth is antigod being as it is not only a misrepresentation of the Person and character of God, but a distortion of His purpose and ways. As human understanding fails to apprehend the crisis involved when Satan "abode not in the truth," so, to even a greater degree, human language is impotent as a means of depicting the untruths which were involved. Satan chose not to continue in the precise sphere into which he was placed by the infinite will and benevolence of God. But it is not alone a case of one sphere as over against another; it is also a case of the choice of one principle or philosophy of life as over against another. What God had revealed of Himself as the supreme authority and designed with respect to relationships and activity for this great angel was *the truth* in which a perfect whole embraces all its parts. Such an extensive incorporation of truth which reflected the infinity of the Designer in every particular of it could not suffer the slightest disarrangement of its perfect balance and symmetry—let alone a complete shattering of all its vital aspects. In his impious action, the great angel proposed a course of independent achievement which at once in principle dethroned the God of truth and enthroned self. Every feature of this intention was in opposition to, and independent of, God. Such violence will not be rightly estimated apart from a due consideration of the fact that the creature—angel or man—is designed to be guided by God alone. Of man's need of divine guidance, Jeremiah writes: "O LORD, I know that the way of

man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jer. 10:23). As before indicated, to attempt independent, self-directed life is the only course open to the creature wherein he may satisfy his satanic desire to resemble God. The resemblance is feeble indeed, but it serves to satisfy the insanity which sin really is. There is little wonder that misery bulks so large in the world when it is recognized that almost every human life is lived without any conscious reliance upon God. What anguish independence of God has inflicted on fallen angels is not fully revealed. Their destiny, like that of fallen unregenerate humanity, is but a normal consummation of their wretched career. God Himself, with all that enters into His perfect plan and purpose, is *truth* in its absolute and plenary sense. To continue with Him in the course He has designed, is the highest destiny possible for any creature. To depart from that course is to experience the present and future penalties of evil. Two Greek words which are translated into English by terms which connote evil, are most revealing with respect to the essential character of sin. These are ἁμαρτία, which means missing the mark, and ἄνομος, which means without law, or lawless. The latter may mean only the fact concerning the Gentiles that to them the Mosaic Law was never given (1 Cor. 9:21), or it may imply *willful* rejection of authority (1 John 3:4). The former word is capable of expressing that colossal failure which is missing God's perfect purpose and end, while the latter suggests all the rebellion of the evil one in his original sin. In missing the divine purpose for him, Satan became the antigod destined to the lake of fire forever. Such an end as a miscarriage of so perfect a beginning is tragedy to an incomprehensible degree. However, the present discussion has more to do with Satan's lawless sin when he repudiated God and rejected God's will for him. His lawlessness was not a mere disregard for an existing code of regulations; it was a complete rejection of the Lawgiver and all His benevolent intentions for an endless life.

It is notable, also, that the wickedness of sin is not exhausted in the high crime of disowning God and His benevolent plan; it goes on to enthrone self and espouse a different and wholly unworthy, God-dishonoring manner of life. Satan's sin was not merely *negative* in its rejection of God; it was *positive* also in that it constructed a philosophy of life, a line of action, which originated with Satan, was self-centered, and excluded God. The entire treatment of satanology must be adjusted to these stupendous facts.

It may be concluded that, in its ultimate form, untruth is a substitution of self for God and the assumption of a self-designed plan of life for that purposed by the Creator. This is *the lie*. It is such because it is antigod from every angle of consideration. This is the limitless meaning of Christ's word regarding Satan when He said that "he abode not in the truth," which is the negative feature of Satan's sin. Christ also declared that Satan was a liar from the beginning, which as fully represents the positive feature of that original sin. A partial or compromising departure from God is impossible. God is either everything or nothing in these relationships. All untruth as seen in misguided lives partakes of, and grows out of, Satan's lie in disowning the truth which God is. Satan is "a liar, and the father of it" (cf. Rom. 1:25; Eph. 4:25; 2 Thess. 2:11).

It is not without specific meaning that Christ goes on in this context to say that He Himself tells the truth, that none might convince Him of sin, and that those who are of God hear God's words. Similarly, since Christ came forth from God, it is impossible that one should be of God and at the same time reject the One whom God has sent into the world. How very much is declared when Christ said "I am … the truth"! He was not only God [the Truth] manifest in the flesh, but as the perfect man, He abode in the truth in the sense that He did always and only those things which were well-pleasing to His Father. In the most drastic testing which Satan could impose upon Him, He did not sin by departing from the precise purpose of His Father for Him.

The satanic lie was imported into the Garden of Eden and was there adopted by the first parents of the race. Satan said to them, "Be as Elohim" (Gen. 3:5). The untruth did not in this instance consist in the mere fact that they would not really be as *Elohim*, though Satan said they would; it consisted in rejecting God and His purpose for them. The philosophy represented by these words is diabolical in all its parts. Its hellish character is not mitigated by the fact that it is well-nigh universal, or by the truth that those who are under its curse are unaware that there is any other and better philosophy extant. The Apostle records of those who embrace this devilish philosophy, "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.… Who changed the truth of God into a ['the'] lie, and worshipped

and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. … And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful" (Rom. 1:21–22, 25, 28–31). The lamentable sins which follow the repudiation of God are but the innumerable lies which are the legitimate offspring of the first lie. The whole present world-system is a product and manifestation of the lie—but more of this anon. The spectacle of a world in open rebellion against Jehovah and His Messiah is pictured in Psalm 2:1–3, which reads: "Why do the heathen ['nations'] rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." It is evident that this Scripture is to be fulfilled at the end time, when the lie is in its fullest manifestation. The course of evil moves on to its determined end, and slight indeed has been the adjustment of theology to the Scriptures when theology so generally anticipates a converted world before the King returns. The lie is not predicted to become the truth by any process whatsoever. It develops in its own evil course and is terminated at the zenith of its wickedness by the One into whose hands all judgment has been committed and in the program of His second advent.

No more determining passage of the Bible may be contemplated relative to the final manifestation of the lie than 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12, in which all the forces of lawlessness are seen to concentrate in the lawless one. Assurance is advanced also that all will be judged of God on the sole ground that they believe the lie. The passage being central and final on this theme is quoted in full and according to a translation by Dean Alford in his New Testament notes:

> (1) But we entreat you, brethren, in regard of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together to Him,—(2) in order that ye should not be lightly shaken from your mind nor troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by epistle as from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is present. (3) Let no man deceive you in any manner: for [that day shall

not come] unless there have come the apostasy first, and there have been revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition, (4) he that withstands and exalts himself above every one that is called God or an object of adoration, so that he sits in the temple of God, skewing himself that he is God. (5).… (6) And now ye know that which hinders, in order that he may be revealed in his own time. (7) For the MYSTERY ALREADY is working of lawlessness, only until he that now hinders be removed: (8) and then shall be REVEALED the LAWLESS ONE, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of His mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of His coming: (9) whose coming is according to the working of Satan in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, (10) and in all deceit of unrighteousness for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of the truth in order to their being saved. (11) And on this account God is sending to them the working of error, in order that they should believe the falsehood, (12) that all might be judged who did not believe the truth, but found pleasure in iniquity.—*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., Vol. II, Pt. I, Introd., p. 79

A temptation at once arises to enter fully into this context, which may better be attempted under Eschatology. However, three forces must be identified in the interest of even a tentative contemplation of all that is here disclosed—(a) the force of the man of sin, (b) the force of the Restrainer, and (c) the force of the Destroyer.

a. Three Forces.

(1) *The Force of the Man of Sin.* With unequivocal language the Apostle predicts that before the Day of the Lord (not the "Day of Christ," as in the A.V.) can come the man of sin must appear. The title is specific and no warrant exists for confusing it with the more general name of Antichrist. Doubtless the man of sin is antichrist with respect to doctrine and practice. In fact, he appears as the supreme satanic counterfeit of Christ. He is Satan's last and most misleading deception after whom the world is destined to follow (Rev. 13:4–8); but in no Scripture is this individual styled *Antichrist.* This point is stressed because of the fact that much interpretation of this passage falls back on the more general declarations respecting Antichrist and thus fails to arrive at the essential truth here set forth regarding a specific *person.* He appears throughout this context in the singular and of him are predicated only those things which belong to a person. Having quoted at length from the early fathers—Irenaeus, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, and Jerome—Dean Alford goes on to say: "The first particulars in the history must be gleaned from the early Fathers. And their interpretation is for the most part well marked and consistent. They all regard it as a prophecy of the future, as yet unfulfilled when they wrote.

They all regard the coming (*parousia*) as the personal return of our Lord to judgment and to bring in His Kingdom. They all regard the adversary here described as an individual person, the incarnation and concentration of sin" (*ibid.*, 79–80). In spite of the added titles given here to this person—*son of perdition and lawless one*—with all that they imply, the Church of Rome has professed to see this person realized in Martin Luther and all that follow him, and not a few of the Protestants return the doubtful compliment by professing to see this one fulfilled in the Pope and the system he represents. In respect to the latter belief, which has had wide favor, it may be said that although much stress may be laid on the assumption of the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ and that he sits in a place of ecclesiastical power, he could not under any worthy interpretation of the text be made to correspond to the one who "withstands and exalts himself above every one that is called God." In like manner, if the Papacy is the man of sin, then all has been fulfilled fifteen centuries ago—even the destruction of this one by the return of Christ. Though a superman because of satanic power, the man of sin is, nevertheless, a *man* and his predicted appearing and career are unfulfilled. Any departure from this conclusion must involve doubts with regard to the inspiration of the text itself. After nineteen hundred years this prophecy stands unfulfilled. The Apostle could not change his terminology were he to write today of this expectation. The man of sin has not appeared; nor has the Day of the Lord begun. The mystery of lawlessness is yet working as it was in Paul's day. Whatever may be conjured up to resemble Antichrist, it must be required again that the present issue pertains to a person styled "the man of sin, the son of perdition" and "the lawless one." The last designation—*the lawless one*—relates him directly to the satanic lie and the consummator of all that lie holds in store.

Disagreement has been recorded with respect to the identification of the temple in which this lawless one is to be seated. Early writers contended that it is a church of some description. Later writers are more agreed that it is a restored Jewish temple. It may be no more than a temporary tabernacle which will be serving for the Jewish worship of Jehovah, which will be in progress at that time (cf. Dan. 9:27; Rev. 13:6).

(2) *The Force of the Restrainer.* Having identified the anticipated man of sin, the Apostle proceeds to assert that the satanic consummation will not be allowed its realization until the time which God has determined. Doubtless,

Satan would hasten this consummation, but it awaits God's appointed time. The Restrainer will go on restraining lawlessness until He—the Restrainer—be taken out of the way. The antigod philosophy is working and none could be able or worthy to restrain evil on so vast a scale other than a Person in the Godhead; and, since the Holy Spirit is the resident active power of God in the world during this age, it is reasonable to conclude that He thus restrains. Of no other force could it be said that it will be at a given time removed in order that the climax of all evil may be realized in the appearing and power of the man of sin. In His resident presence as One who tabernacles in the Church and not as an omnipresent One, the Spirit will remove from the world at the time the Church is translated to heaven (1 Thess. 4:13–18). What the corruption of the world really is will be demonstrated in those few terrible years following the removal of restraint, in which the lawless one prospers.

(3) *The Force of the Destroyer.* The returning Christ destroys the lawless one. Writing of this great event and using, as was common, the title *Antichrist* when the man of sin was in view, Chrysostom states: "Just as a fire, when it is approaching, merely causes the lesser insects to shrivel up, and consumes them, so shall Christ, with His word alone and His appearing, consume Antichrist. It is enough that the Lord is come: forthwith Antichrist and all belonging to him have perished" (cited by Alford, *ibid.*, 80–81). The coming on to the scene of the man of sin is said to be "according to the working ['energizing'] of Satan and in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and in all deceit of unrighteousness for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of the truth in order to their being saved." Such is the imposition of the lawless one in the exercise of Satan's power and falsehood. Upon those who are perishing, having rejected the love of the truth—the opposite of Satan's falsehood—God is Himself sending a working of error in order that they should believe the lie, to the end that all may be judged who rejected the truth and found pleasure in that which is opposed to truth. What is latent evil in these Christ-rejectors is brought out into a place of obvious recognition, that there may be none to question the righteousness of that judgment which comes upon them. This judgment is said to be due directly to the fact that they believed the lie—the original lie which repudiates the God of all truth and rejects His benevolent purpose. This lie becomes the *I will* of the creature against the

will of the Creator to whom all obedience, deference, and submission belong. These two possible courses of action—agreement or disagreement with God—are presented by the Apostle John, when writing on the general theme of the cure of the Christian's sin, in these words: "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth" (1 John 1:6). *The truth* is something to be done, and to fail to do the truth is to perform, or commit, a lie by action. In its mad adjustment to Satan's philosophy of life and purpose apart from God, the whole world is enacting the lie, and their judgment must be that which falls on Satan and all who repudiate God.

II. Satan's Sinfulness

In this universe there are "heights and depths" which might hinder a child of God (Rom. 8:39). In relation to wisdom and knowledge concerning God, there are depths (Rom. 11:33; 1 Cor. 2:10). In the love of God there are both heights and depths (Eph. 3:18). The term *depths* is most suggestive and is used, with but one exception, to represent the realities which are hidden in God, the exception being found in Revelation 2:24 where there is reference to the *deep* things of Satan. Satanic doctrine is in view as in 1 Timothy 4:1, where *doctrines of demons* are mentioned. Naturally, Satan's doctrine does not run in the way of redemption through Christ's death or the exalted position secured by being in the resurrected Christ. Satan's doctrine exalts self and directs in the way of Cain, or self-promoted righteousness. It is a way of life wholly independent of God whatever elements of truth it may borrow or incorporate. Satan's original God-rejecting sin has spawned into the dimensions which embrace the fallen angels and the whole human family in its hundreds of generations. For the fallen angels there is no hope; but for fallen humanity a gospel of divine grace, made possible through the blood of Christ, is provided. By the grace of God the saved one is returned to right relations with God.

Satan holds the unenviable title of chief of all sinners. He is the original sinner. He has wrought the most injury. He has practiced sin longer than any other. He sinned against the greatest light. Only God can compute the extent and hideous character of Satan's sinfulness. Yet this very sin is of such a nature that the so-called self-made man of the world would extol it. It is the

thing which the unregenerate claim to be their personal right, when they live on in independence of God. A partial record of the indictments which God brings against Satan is here appended:

(1) He repudiated God in the beginning (Isa. 14:12–14).

(2) He drew a third part of the stars of heaven after him (Rev. 12:4).

(3) He sinned from the beginning (1 John 3:8).

(4) He is a liar from the beginning (John 8:44).

(5) In the Garden of Eden he belittled God and advised the first parents to repudiate God (Gen. 3:1–5).

(6) He insinuated to Jehovah that Job loved and served Him only as he was hired to do so (Job 1:9). No greater insult could be addressed to Jehovah than that He is not really to be loved on the ground of His own worthiness, but, being rich, is able to hire men like Job to *pretend* that they love Him.

(7) When permitted to act his own part, Satan brought five terrible calamities on Job (Job 1:13–2:7).

(8) He stood up against Israel (1 Chron. 21:1; Ps. 109:6; Zech. 3:1–2).

(9) He weakened the nations (Isa. 14:12).

(10) He made the earth to tremble (Isa. 14:16).

(11) He did shake kingdoms (Isa. 14:16).

(12) He makes the world a wilderness (Isa. 14:17).

(13) He destroys the cities thereof (Isa. 14:17).

(14) He opened not the house of his prisoners (Isa. 14:17).

(15) He causes war on earth with all its horrors; for when bound, war ceases, and when loosed, war is resumed (Rev. 20:2, 7–8).

(16) He tempted the Son of God forty days and then left Him but for a season. He proposed to Christ that He forsake His mission, that He distrust His Father’s goodness, and that He worship the devil (Luke 4:1–13).

(17) He bound a daughter of Abraham eighteen years (Luke 13:16; cf. Acts 10:38).

(18) He entered Judas and prompted him to betray the Son of God (John 13:2).

(19) He blinds the minds of those who are lost (2 Cor. 4:3–4).

(20) He takes away the Word out of the hearts of the unsaved, lest they should believe and be saved (Luke 8:12).

(21) He deals with saints with wiles and snares (Eph. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:26).

(22) He has exercised and abused the power of death (Heb. 2:14; cf. Rev. 1:18).

(23) He, an adversary, as a roaring lion goeth about seeking whom he may devour (1 Pet. 5:8).

(24) He is opposed to God; is the persecutor of saints, the "father" of lies. Through his emissaries he dethrones reason, tortures human beings, and moves them to superstition and idolatry.

Dr. William Cooke writes with great clearness of the depravity of Satan and his angels:

> The law of dependency is universal, because God alone is the fountain of all being and of all good. Every creature, however high in the scale of existence, is dependent on God, not only for its being, but for its goodness; and therefore its goodness or holiness can be perpetuated only by union with Him. Sin severs the soul from God; and severed from him, the soul is deprived of his favour, and of his strength to uphold it in virtue and goodness; and deprived of his favour and sustaining power, it is thrown upon itself, and becomes actuated by its own selfish instinct; and as selfishness becomes intensified, there is no sin, however deep in guilt and malignity, that may not grow out of it. Such has been the direct effect of the apostasy of angels. The selfishness which engendered the first sin has, during the lapse of ages, produced and developed every malignant principle which now so darkly stains their condition. Hatred of God produces hatred of all good—of all good in itself, and of all beings that are good, and of envy at their happiness. From hatred and envy springs the desire to corrupt whatever is good, and destroy whatever is happy. This desire seeks its end by stratagem, deceit, and all available means within reach. The archfiend is called "Satan," which means an adversary; "The old serpent," because of his guile; "A liar," "a liar from the beginning," "the father of lies," and "when he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own." He is called "Apollyon," which means Destroyer, because he delighteth in destroying the souls of men, and "goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." Not only is he a destroyer, but "a murderer," a murderer of both bodies and souls; all his arts of seduction having murder as its ultimate object. All the sin and misery of our world for six thousand years, and all the sin and misery of its future history, and all the misery of hell, is not only the result of his agency and influence, but results in which he and his minions find their gratification.— *Christian Theology*, pp. 631–32

The power of Satan and his fallen angels is limited. They are but finite creatures who can do nothing outside the permissive will of God. Satan could do nothing against Job (and this was his complaint) until divinely permitted to do so. Satan and his angels are in possession of great knowledge, but they are not omniscient; they have vast power, when permitted to employ it, but they are not omnipotent; they cover the world by their delegated responsibility, but they are not omnipresent. They can suggest evil, but cannot coerce the will of another creature. They may

spread snares and devices to ruin the children of God, but they cannot compel any other being to comply with their designs. They have power over nature when permitted to use it, but they can create nothing, nor can they employ God's creation other than as He decrees. They never defeated God. In truth, God uses Satan as an instrument to chasten and correct the erring saints (Luke 22:31–32; 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20). The knowledge of these limitations cannot but be a comfort to those Christians who take seriously their conflict with the powers of darkness.

Chapter VII

SATANOLOGY: THE SATANIC *COSMOS*

THE PRESENT division of satanology is a theme of vast proportions—incomprehensible, unrecognized, and unidentified. To an extent which seems to have no parallel in the Bible, this great body of truth is represented by one word, which word—κόσμος (‘cosmos’)—is found in the New Testament 187 times and is translated in every instance, but one, by the English word *world*. No moment need be given to the closely related fact that the English word *world* is also a translation of two other Greek terms—αἰών, in its various forms and having a time meaning, 41 times; and οἰκουμένη, meaning an inhabited district, 14 times. Of these two additional words, the latter has no bearing upon the present consideration; but the former, when referring to the present age, carries with it the important disclosure that this age is *evil* in character. It was the reprehensible sin of Demas (2 Tim. 4:10) not only that he forsook the Apostle, but that he loved the age that now is. His love was not going out to a period of time as such, but to the evil which characterizes that time (cf. Gal. 1:4; Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; 6:12).

In his second Epistle, the Apostle Peter mentions three phases of the world or earth—(a) the world before the flood, or “the world that then was” (3:5–6); (b) “the heavens and the earth, which are now” (3:7); and (c) the “new heavens and a new earth” that are yet to be (3:13). The *cosmos* of the New Testament concerns only the world that now is.

Lexicographers agree that *cosmos* means ‘order, regularity, disposition, and arrangement,’ and that, as Exodus 33:4–6 and Isaiah 49:18, etc. are translated by the LXX, the meaning is extended to imply ornamentation. The idea of order and arrangement inheres in the Hebrew text of Genesis 1:1, God having created a perfect order or *cosmos*, which for some unrevealed cause became *chaos*—the opposite to *cosmos* (cf. Isa. 34:11; Jer. 4:23). Investigation will prove that the LXX, though employing *cosmos* as a translation of the idea of ornamentation (and once in the New Testament—1 Pet. 3:3), never uses *cosmos* to translate the thought of world. The translation of ‘world’ by *cosmos* is peculiar to the New Testament and

presents a wholly new revelation in the progress of doctrine. The etymological development is from that which represents *order* in the arrangement of things to the contemplation of humanity in its relation to those things, and, following the fall, as separate from, and foreign to, God, being under authority which is antigod. An attentive consideration of the 186 uses of *cosmos*, where it is translated 'world,' will reveal that in every instance where moral values are involved, the sphere of satanic influence and authority is indicated. The New Testament conception of *the world* is that it is opposed to God as worldliness is opposed to spirituality. Though he may have a vague notion that so-called *worldliness* is contrary to God, the inattentive Bible reader apparently thinks of the world, as mentioned in the Scriptures, as merely a place of abode, a planet whereon both good and evil are equally at home. The truth that the great portion of instances where *cosmos* is used in the New Testament invests that which the term represents with an antigod character, cannot but be a surprise to many. They, as are all the world, being under the delusion of Satan's deception, are unaware of the revelation which the word *cosmos* conveys. The darkness of the *cosmos* is implied when Christ said, "I am come a light into the world" (*cosmos*—John 12:46). Thus, likewise, it is promised of the Spirit that He would "reprove the world" (*cosmos*— John 16:8). To the believer it is said, "In the world [*cosmos*] ye shall have tribulation" (John 16:33). And, again, "They are not of the world [*cosmos*], even as I am not of the world" (*cosmos*—John 17:14). Thus equally definite is the word of Christ, "The world [*cosmos*] hath not known thee" (the Father—John 17:25). Similarly, "My kingdom is not of this world" (*cosmos*—John 18:36). Certain other short phrases are most expressive: "Sin entered into the world" (*cosmos*—Rom. 5:12); "That … all the world [*cosmos*] may become guilty" (Rom. 3:19); "The world [*cosmos*] by wisdom knew not God" (1 Cor. 1:21); "The fornicators of this world" (*cosmos*—1 Cor. 5:10); "That we should not be condemned with the world (*cosmos*—1 Cor. 11:32); "Without God in the world" (*cosmos*—Eph. 2:12); "Keep himself unspotted from the world" (*cosmos*—James 1:27); "The corruption that is in the world" (*cosmos*—2 Pet. 1:4); "Escaped the pollutions of the world" (*cosmos*—2 Pet. 2:20).

The *cosmos* is a vast order or system that Satan has promoted, which conforms to his ideals, aims, and methods. It is civilization now functioning apart from God—a civilization in which none of its promoters really expect

God to share, who assign to God no consideration in respect to their projects; nor do they ascribe any causativity to Him. This system embraces its godless governments, conflicts, armaments, jealousies, its education, culture, religions of morality, and pride. It is that sphere in which man lives. It is what he sees, what he employs. To the uncounted multitude it is all they ever know so long as they live on this earth. It is properly styled *the satanic system,* which phrase is in many instances a justified interpretation of the so-meaningful word, *cosmos.* It is literally a *cosmos diabolicus.*

A vital revelation is presented by the words, "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world [*cosmos*], that we might live through him" (1 John 4:9). It is further revealed that this great mission on the part of the Son is due to the truth that "God so loved the world [*cosmos*], that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). In this passage, as almost no other, a restricted use of the term *cosmos* is presented; not restricted, as the Limited Redemptionist demands, to the elect of this age, but restricted to humanity itself apart from its evil institutions, practices, and relationships. God loved the lost people who make up the *cosmos* and this love was great enough to move Him to give His only begotten Son, in providing a way of salvation through Him so complete that by believing on the Son as Savior the lost of this *cosmos* might not perish but have everlasting life. It is also true that the spiritual Christian will experience this divine compassion for a lost *cosmos* in so far as, by the Spirit, the love of God is shed abroad in his heart.

Over against this revelation concerning a worthy divine love for the *cosmos,* is the instruction given to Christians relative to their love of the *cosmos.* It is written: "Love not the world [*cosmos*], neither the things that are in the world [*cosmos*]. If any man love the world [*cosmos*], the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world [*cosmos*], the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 2:15–16). A disagreement is apparent. God loves the *cosmos,* yet if the believer loves the *cosmos* the love of the Father is not reproduced in him. Naturally, the solution of the problem is found in the precise meaning of the word *cosmos* as thus employed. While, as has been stated, God's love is for humanity apart from its evil institutions, the believer is warned not to love the institutions which are

wholly evil in God's estimation and are not, therefore, loved by Him. This evil *cosmos* is the very thing from which the Christian has been saved. No restriction is imposed in 1 John 2:15–16 that would preclude the child of God from loving nature, or that which has not come under the satanic authority. James writes most clearly when he says, "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world [*cosmos*] is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world [*cosmos*] is the enemy of God" (James 4:4).

Satan has created nothing. The order and system of God's material creation are involved in the *cosmos* only as Satan has been permitted to assume authority and is misdirecting it. The *cosmos* manifestations are almost wholly those which arise from misguided, Satan-governed humanity in their blind subscription to principles of life and action which are outworkings of the original *lie*. Creation itself is affected by the fall (Rom. 8:19–23), but it retains the character which God gave it and is never the property of another. In this same connection it is noteworthy that the present age, as referred to in Matthew 13:11, is the kingdom in its "mystery" form. Any rule of God at any time is *kingdom* in its character. He is now ruling only to the extent that those things which are termed *mysteries* and which constitute the peculiar features of His own purpose in this age are being realized. More of this important subject will appear under Eschatology.

It is significant that of the 187 uses of *cosmos* in the New Testament, Christ employed the term more than all others together. The word occurs 68 times in John's Gospel and 23 times in his first Epistle. Christ used the word *cosmos* 41 times in His Upper Room Discourse and 19 times in His priestly prayer as recorded in John, chapter 17. It is as though the reality of the essential character of the *cosmos* is made emphatic in ratio to the exalted point from which it is viewed and by the holy character of the One who views it. If, as has been suggested, the Upper Room Discourse corresponds to the holy place in the temple and the priestly prayer to the holy of holies, it is not only noticeable that the Holy One is conscious of the real meaning of the word *cosmos*, but, as the revelation of truth is intensified, the disclosures concerning the opposing satanic system are multiplied. To Christians who are taught of God and who, to some extent, have the mind of Christ, the *cosmos diabolicus* should appear in its essential, evil character to be the outworking of that lie which moves in independence of God and is

opposed to the purposes of God. The whole truth regarding the nature and extent of this satanic *cosmos* or system, is found in the Scriptures wherein this system is mentioned. This revelation is subject to certain divisions:

I. Satan's Authority Over the *Cosmos*

Startling and almost incredible statements are made in the New Testament relative to Satan's rights and control over the *cosmos.* This disclosure is foreign to the popular mind. Even the believer who is amenable to the Scriptures finds himself confronted with statements which seem impossible, were they not written down by the hand of God. It may be assumed that Satan will do all in his power to avoid a worthy understanding of these stupendous truths on the part of any human being. Certain major passages should be examined with due attention:

Luke 4:5–7. This passage, taken from the record of the threefold temptation of Christ by Satan, reads thus: "And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine."

The method Satan employed in bringing the panorama of the earthly kingdoms in a moment of time before Christ is most arresting. At once the entire procedure advances beyond the realms of humanity's experiences and resources, and functions in the realities of another sphere. Seeing all the kingdoms of the world from one mountain and in a moment of time connotes things supernatural. There is room for thought, also, in the assertion that Satan took the Lord anywhere and for any reason. There are forces at work here which the mind of man cannot comprehend. Yet the amazing feature of this revelation is the declaration by Satan, which declaration Christ did not brand as an untruth, that the kingdoms of this *cosmos* (cf. Matt. 4:8 for the specific use of *cosmos*) are delivered unto Satan and to whomsoever he wills he gives them. It is predicted that at some future time the world-rule will be conferred by Satan on the man of sin, which fact tends to strengthen Satan's claim to the disposition of these kingdoms. It has been a rather common method of dealing with this

Scripture to say that Satan presented to Christ no more than the territory of Palestine; but at that time Palestine was a very minor portion of the government of Rome and could not itself answer to the kingdoms of this world. Likewise, it has been assumed that this offer on Satan's part is but one of Satan's falsehoods; but had it been an untruth there would have been no temptation in the offer to the One from whom no deception could ever be hidden. Nor, had it been an untruth, would the answer of the Son of God have been confined to Satan's shocking request that worship be given by the Son of God to a creature of His own hand. It should not be forgotten in this connection that all authorities and powers in spirit-realms were created by the very One to whom Satan was speaking (Col. 1:16). Whether it be consonant with human reason or not, the plain word of inspired truth lends full support to the idea that earthly governments are in the hands of Satan. History records many instances where it is not difficult to believe that Satan was guiding the action and destiny of certain governments. It is more a problem how to accept this satanic claim in connection with governments which are commendable in the eyes of men; but Satan's method is not one of eliminating all that is good. It is evidently true that all human governments, however they appear to men, are run in independence of God.

Satan's assertion in this passage is twofold: (a) the dominion of the whole *cosmos* is delivered unto him, which must mean that divine permission is given to this end, and (b) Satan gives the kingdoms to whomsoever he wills. Doubtless this last assertion is true from Satan's own point of view, but it is as certain, also, that every such bestowment is within the sovereign purpose of God. It still remains true that "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1). As elsewhere, God is seen to be sovereign over all, and yet the creature is permitted to go on in willful and evil ways and to become guilty thereby.

John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11. The revelation that Satan is in authority over the *cosmos* does not rest alone upon his own claim. Christ referred to Satan as the *prince of this cosmos*. The record reads: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John 12:31); "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30); "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:11). Again, by the authority which belongs to all Scripture, the Apostle writes of Satan as "the prince of the

power of the air" (Eph. 2:2), and as "the god of this world" ('age'—2 Cor. 4:4). To the same end, the Apostle, when writing of the Christian's conflict against evil powers (Eph. 6:12), states that this warfare is against—not *the rulers of the darkness of this world* as in the Authorized Version, which statement would confine them only to such darkness as exists—*age-rulers of this darkness*, implying that this age is all darkness in itself and has over it specific evil rulers. Thus faithfully the inspired Word of God directs all its testimony to the one truth that the *cosmos* is ruled by evil powers. Bearing the same message, the ascended Lord spoke to the church in Pergamos: "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat ['throne'] is" (Rev. 2:13). While the extent of Satan's authority is not defined in this passage, it does state that Satan occupies an earthly throne. Lastly, when magnifying the superior power of the Holy Spirit, who indwells every believer, as in contrast to Satan's power, the Apostle John declares: "Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 4:4). The specific phrase, *in the world*, identifies the sphere of the exercise of Satan's power. Much added light as to the relationship between Satan and the *cosmos* is also gained from the following passage:

1 John 5:19. This decisive passage reads, "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." The world here mentioned is *cosmos*—the entire *cosmos*. The two members of this sentence comprehend the whole human family. "We are of God" is a recognition of the truth that Christians are *in* the world, but not a part of that which pertains to it. The point in view, however, is discovered in the second averment, namely, *The whole world* [entire *cosmos*] *lieth in the wicked one*. The translation of πονηρῷ by *wickedness*, as in the Authorized Version, is unsatisfactory. The translation of this word as used in 1 John 2:13–14; 5:18 demands the same in 5:19. The same correction is demanded in John 17:15. The identity is clear, being none other than *diabolos*, to whom direct reference is made in 1 John 3:8, 10. That the entire *cosmos lieth in* the wicked one is a revelation which is both unusual and far-reaching. The words "lieth in" convey the truth that the *cosmos* is both located in, and under the power of, the evil one. Dean Alford states: "*The wicked one* is as it were the inclusive abiding-place and representative of all his, as, in the expressions *'in the Lord,' 'in Christ,' 'in Christ Jesus,' 'we are in the true*

One,' ver. 20, the Lord is of His. And while we are *from God*, implying a birth and a proceeding forth and a change of state, the *world*, all the rest of mankind, *lieth in the wicked one*, remains where it was, in, and in the power of, *the wicked one.* Some Commentators have been anxious to avoid inconsistency with such passages as ch. 2:2, 4:14, and would therefore give **the world** a different meaning here. But there is no inconsistency whatever. Had not Christ become a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, were He not the Saviour of the whole world, none could ever come out of the world and believe on Him; but as it is, they who do believe on Him, come out and are separated from the world: so that our proposition here remains strictly true: the *world* is the negation of faith in Him, and as such lies in the wicked one, His adversary" (*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 917–18). It is likewise the teaching of Pope and Moulton in Schaff's Commentary that the wicked one "holds the entire world, so far as the new life has not transformed it, in his power. It is not said that the world is 'of the wicked one.' … The men of the world are 'in him that is false'; but the 'in' is not used in its bare simplicity, but 'lieth in,' a phrase nowhere else occurring, and to be interpreted according to the tenor of the Epistle. The 'whole world' is not, however, the men of the world only; but its entire constitution, its entire economy, its lusts and principles and motives, and course and end; all that is not 'of God' lies in the power and bondage of the wicked one. This the apostle adds as an old truth, never so fearfully expressed as here" (cited by Gerhart, *Institutes*, p. 708). The conclusion in this passage, as in all others bearing on the relationship indicated, is that the whole *cosmos*—from which some have been saved—is located in, and under the power of, *diabolos.*

Isaiah 14:12, 16–17; Job 1:13–19; 2:7. Turning to the sixfold indictment against Satan recorded in Isaiah and the fivefold record chronicled in Job concerning Satan's influence upon, and ascendency over, mundane things, it will be seen that the divinely permitted exercise of his power results in accomplishments too vast for the human mind to grasp. These eleven stupendous achievements of Satan are to be considered apart from those more remote manifestations of Satan's power recorded in Revelation 12:4, 15, and of the exercise of his power through the man of sin (2 Thess. 2:9–10), and through the two beasts of Revelation 13:1–17.

It is written in Isaiah, chapter 14, that Satan, under the title of *Lucifer, son of the morning* and with reference to a yet future time when his mighty deeds will have been accomplished, (1) did *weaken the nations.* In the Word of God the nations, as such, are seen to be opposed to God (Ps. 2:1–3), and especially as in contradistinction to the one elect nation, Israel. These nations form the essential factor in the *cosmos.* What they might have been, had they not embraced the satanic ideals, none can estimate but God alone. Whatever their brute strength may be as self-measured, they are before God as "a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance" (to be blown away). "All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him as less than nothing, and vanity" (Isa. 40:15, 17). Thus, also, it is written in Isaiah 14:16–17: (2) that Satan, at the end of his evil career, will have *made the earth to tremble;* (3) he will have *shaken kingdoms;* (4) he will have *made the world a wilderness;* (5) he will have *destroyed the cities thereof;* and (6) he will have hindered the benefits of humanity to the extent that he has *not opened the house of his prisoners.* Imagination fails to follow these undertakings and can add nothing to what is here set forth. The sum total of all the evil Satan will have wrought is beyond estimation. With the same disclosure in view, it is written that, when having secured the permission of Jehovah concerning Job, Satan displayed a fivefold power over creation in the exercise of his evil purposes: (7) he caused the raiding Sabeans to destroy Job's oxen and asses and to kill Job's servants with the sword; (8) he caused fire to descend from heaven and to burn up the sheep and the servants who tended them; (9) he caused the Chaldeans to rob Job of his camels and to kill the servants; (10) he caused the death of all of Job's children by a wind from the wilderness which crushed the house in which they were assembled; and (11) he smote Job with the most grievous bodily suffering he could impose. To this he doubtless would have added death for Job, had not Jehovah restrained him. That he was told by Jehovah *not* to destroy Job, is evidence that he both *could* have done so and *would* have done so had this restraint been lifted. At this point the entire field of revelation with respect to Satan's power over the physical welfare of human beings is naturally introduced, which theme cannot be pursued here.

II. The *Cosmos* is Wholly Evil

This is indeed a hard saying. Though it be true, it calls for elucidation. Satan does incorporate into his vast system certain things which are good in themselves. Many humanitarian ideals, morals, and aspects of culture are consonant with spiritual realities, though resident in the *cosmos.* The root evil in the *cosmos* is that in it there is an all-comprehensive order or system which is methodized on a basis of complete independence of God. It is a manifestation of all that Satan can produce as a complete exhibition of that which enters into the original lie. It is the consummating display of that which the creature—both angelic and human—can produce, having embarked on an autonomous career. The *cosmos* is not a battleground whereon God is contending with Satan for supremacy; it is a thing which God has permitted, that the lie may have its fullest unveiling. It is reasonable to suppose that the *cosmos* represents the supreme effort of the supreme creature, and that as it began with the repudiation of God, it has maintained its intended segregation from the will and purpose of God. That things good in themselves are included in this great system is doubtless the occasion for many deceptions. The fundamental truth that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23; cf. Heb. 11:6) is not recognized or believed in the *cosmos. The lie* must run its course that it may be judged, not as a mere hypothesis or incipient venture, but in the complete and final exhibition of its antigod character. It began with the repudiation of God by angel and man and maintains that distinctive trait until Antichrist appears and is destroyed. The humanitarian enterprises, the culture, the laws, and religious forms of the *cosmos* constitute no evidence that God is recognized in His true position or honored. This is a Christ-rejecting *cosmos.* Its princes "crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. 2:8), and apart from the restraining power of God they would crucify Him again and destroy His witnesses. They evince no penitence for their climactic racial crime—the Savior, as such, is still disowned and rejected. Social ideals are borrowed from His teachings. His purity and grace are held forth as a pattern of life, but salvation through His blood is spurned. The independent, self-centered, self-satisfied, autonomous *cosmos* asks for no redemption since it recognizes no need. It is the embodiment of the philosophy of which Cain is the archetype. What God sees on the human side of the *cosmos* is described in Romans 3:9–18. Here the divine charge against fallen men is infinitely accurate and decisive: "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not

one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (3:10–12). Certainly God is not deceived as to Satan's purposes. Did He not uncover those secrets at the beginning (Isa. 14:13; Ezek. 28:15)? A *cosmos* which crucifies its Redeemer, hates those who are redeemed as it hates the Savior (John 15:18–19), and loves darkness rather than light, will hardly delude or outwit the Almighty. It is to be judged and destroyed completely. No attempt will be made to salvage anything out of it when its day of demolition arrives. The following passages are a sufficient testimony to the evil character of the *cosmos:* "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world [*cosmos*]" (2 Pet. 1:4); "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world [*cosmos*] through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning" (2 Pet. 2:20); "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (*cosmos*—James 1:27); "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world [*cosmos*] is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world[*cosmos*] is the enemy of God" (James 4:4); "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 5:4); "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world [*cosmos*] cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30); "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 4:3). In like manner, the believer is said to have been delivered from the present evil age (Gal. 1:4) and "delivered … from the power of darkness" (Col. 1:13), and is not to be conformed to this age (Rom. 12:2).

III. Satan's Undertakings in the *Cosmos*

This extensive theme reappears in a later division of satanology and therefore is curtailed here. He who began with the purpose to be "like the

most High," has never abandoned that ideal. That in some respects Satan attempts the works of God becomes butone more feature of his great deception. The works of the satanic order are clearly outlined in several descriptive passages, which also present that which is highest in ideal, and deepest in motive in the Satan-energized mass of humanity. One passage, alone, contains the entire revelation: "For all that is in the world [*cosmos*], the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 2:16). The satisfaction of these same cravings was the temptation placed before Eve in the Garden: "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat" (Gen. 3:6). The real nature of these cravings is easily recognized as being wholly self-centered and without thought of God.

All "wars and fightings" (James 4:1) among men are only a natural result of the evil qualities of this great federation. Jesus said to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world [*cosmos*]: if my kingdom were of this world [*cosmos*], then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence" (John 18:36). It is a noticeable fact that the governments of the world depend upon physical power and a display of armament to maintain their position and authority, and the superior law of love is not adapted to, or understood by, the elements that make up the *cosmos*.

IV. The Things of the *Cosmos*

All earthly property is of the satanic order, which property the believer may use, but must not abuse: "But whoso hath this world's good [*cosmos*] and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John 3:17). "And the cares of this world [lit., 'age'], and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful" (Mark 4:19). "But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world

[*cosmos*], as not abusing it" (1 Cor. 7:29–31). James writes: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world [*cosmos*] rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" (James 2:5). Here a needed change in translation reveals much. James did not say *the poor of this cosmos,* but rather *the poor as regards the cosmos*—all and whatever constitutes the *cosmos,* or that which it has to offer. This poverty is most honorable and should be the estate of every Christian.

V. Though Detained Here, Christians are Not of the *Cosmos*

Twice in His priestly prayer, Christ asserts of His redeemed ones, "They are not of the world [*cosmos*], even as I am not of the world" (*cosmos*—John 17:14, 16). Thus He declares again, "If the world [*cosmos*] hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world [*cosmos*], the world [*cosmos*] would love his own: but because ye are not of the world [*cosmos*], but I have chosen you out of the world [*cosmos*], therefore the world [*cosmos*] hateth you" (John 15:18–19). And the Apostle John states: "Marvel not, my brethren, if the world [*cosmos*] hate you" (1 John 3:13). Christians are sent into the *cosmos* (John 17:18) as those who have no relation to it other than to be His witnesses to it. They are *ambassadors* (2 Cor. 5:20), *strangers and pilgrims* (1 Pet. 2:11), and *citizens of heaven* (Phil. 3:20) with respect to this world system. Thus it is that God sees the Christian in relation to the *cosmos.*

Though Job belonged to a remote age, his experience presents a vivid illustration of Jehovah's care over His own in respect to the attacks of Satan. In this narrative, Job is represented, not as one who needs to be punished for evil—that conception constituted the error of Job's three friends, which error Jehovah so severely condemned at the end of Job's trial—but as one who three times is declared by Jehovah to be "perfect" and "upright" (1:1, 8; 2:3). Satan's complaint regarding Job is twofold: (a) Job is so completely protected that Satan cannot reach him, and (b) Job does not really love Jehovah. A salary is paid Job by Jehovah, Satan asserts, to hire Job to pretend that he loves Jehovah. Putting this challenge to an experimental test, Jehovah releases Job to the power of Satan. Until that

time, as pointed out by Satan, Job is safe in Jehovah's hand. The transfer from Jehovah's hand to Satan's hand is not without drastic limitation which Satan can in no wise overstep. To Job was given the privilege and honor of proving that Jehovah is worthy of all adoration, apart from His benefits. The lie of Satanwas completely exposed, to the glory of God.

VI. The Impotency of the *Cosmos*

The impotency and limitations of the world-order are most evident. Its leader, though mighty, is inferior to Christ: "Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 4:4). Its knowledge and understanding are limited: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are. For this cause the world [*cosmos*] knoweth us not, because it knew him not" (1 John 3:1, R.V.). "Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man" (1 Cor. 2:14–15, R.V.). "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God" (Rom. 3:11). "And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that perish: in whom the god of this world [marg., 'age'] hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them" (2 Cor. 4:3–4, R.V.). "They are of the world [*cosmos*]: therefore speak they as of the world [*cosmos*], and the world [*cosmos*] heareth them" (1 John 4:5, R.V.).

VII. The End of the *Cosmos*

This specific theme pertains to Eschatology and will be attended more fully under that division of Systematic Theology. The fact that the *cosmos* comes to a complete termination and destruction is the testimony of both Testaments.

Psalm 2. In the prediction which this Psalm presents, the nations are seen in their last and diabolical rejection of Jehovah and His Messiah (cf. Rev. 16:13–14); yet, in spite of their combined resistance, Jehovah places His

King upon David's throne in Jerusalem, for such is the "holy hill of Zion." The Son takes the government from the Father's hand and dashes the nations in pieces like a potter's vessel and with a rod of iron. Kings and rulers are admonished to secure right relations with the Christ before His awful judgments begin.

Daniel, chapters 2 and 7. In these prophecies concerning the course and end of the Gentile nations, God reveals the truth that they will be crushed and blown away as "the chaff of the summer threshingfloors,"and the King of kings will then reign over all the earth.

Matthew 25:31–46. The nations, wholly unable to resist the sovereign power of the King, are seen to assemble before Him, at which time He determines their destiny—one part to enter His earthly kingdom and the other consigned to the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

2 Thessalonians 1:7–10. The distinctive message of this passage is the utter destruction of all that enters into the *cosmos.*

Revelation, chapters 14–22. A right understanding of this extensive Scripture is imperative. Nothing here recorded could have been fulfilled in past history. The description enters more into detail as it sets forth, not a new theme, but that previously introduced in the Word of God. False religious pretense and apostasy from the truth of God along with the *cosmos* itself must come into final judgment, before the King takes His throne to reign in righteousness over the whole earth. Revelation 18:24 alone serves to identify this final destruction as the judgment of God on the whole *cosmos* and all it has ever wrought.

Most assuredly, then, that which God now tolerates for wise purposes is doomed to complete destruction. This is directly asserted: "For the fashion of this world [*cosmos*] passeth away" (1 Cor. 7:31); "And the world [*cosmos*] passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever" (1 John 2:17); "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up" (2 Pet. 3:10).

Chapter VIII

SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S MOTIVE

WHATEVER MAY have been the motive which has actuated Satan from the beginning of his career, there is a more fundamental problem which lies back of all the evil in the universe. It is the motive that has actuated God in permitting evil to be present at all. That He could have hindered it needs no defense, being, as He is, the Absolute One—Creator and Promoter of all that the universe comprises. Various suggestions have been advanced as solutions to this problem. Doubtless there is truth in all of them, and when all are assembled and accepted it is even more probable that the aggregation is no more than a fraction of all that actuates God. One of the obvious motives of God which has been advanced has immediate application to the theme in hand, namely, that, as seen in the various dispensations and in instances of personal relation to God, He evidently, and as a general rule of procedure, puts the propositions which the creature proposes to an experimental test. This Jehovah did in the case of Satan's assertion that Job, under sufficient stress, would repudiate Jehovah. This claim could have been denied, for Jehovah knew it to be untrue of Job. However, Satan was given authority to put the untruth to an experimental test. This method cost much indeed, but none will doubt that the victory gained was abundantly worth the price that was paid. It is possible that Job serves as a type or representation of the larger issues now being brought to consummation in the entire *cosmos.* This theme is extensive and proffers much light to the one who will follow it through the entire Bible.

Granting the truthfulness of the claim that God does put the creature's assumptions to an experimental test, it becomes clear that Satan's determination—which constituted his initial sin—to build a vast structure of independent relationships around himself as the center and wholly autonomous with respect to the Creator to whom all allegiance and obedience rightfully belong, was permitted of God to be tested experimentally to its bitter end. As for the wisdom of such a stupendous procedure on the part of God, no creature could ever be placed in a position where he could possess a sufficient number of related facts, or attain to a

perspective, on the basis of which he could sit in judgment. The observable actualities point in but one direction: Satan did propose such a course; God could have hindered him, but He rather allowed Satan to take the course he desired to follow, and to allow that course to become, in the end, the ground of its own universal condemnation. When Satan and his theory come up for final judgment and execution, "every mouth will be stopped" and all will be guilty—not alone in the light of God's ideals, but as those who are absolutely guilty in the light of the colossal failure of the whole enterprise. The lie will be conceded to be a lie. How could willful, deluded, free-moral agents be brought to such a recognition apart from a demonstration which left no room for as much as one voice to be heard which might claim that the lie would have been proved to be the truth had it been allowed to demonstrate its own philosophy? Even strong delusion must be imposed upon men, it is said, to the end that they will carry the lie to its final consummation (2 Thess. 2:9–12). Not only will every mouth be stopped, but the whole world (*cosmos*) will become guilty before God (Rom. 3:19). A *guilty cosmos*, proved to be such to the extent that every mouth is stopped —even that of Satan himself—is a stupendous achievement. What such a conclusion may contribute to the felicity of the universe in eternity to come, none would attempt to declare. The lie incorporates all forms of creature rebellion against God, and the complete disillusionment of all fallen creatures and their judgment cannot but be an achievement which will contribute much to the peace and blessedness of future ages. Of Christ it is said that "he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." Even *death*, the penalty of the first human sin, will be destroyed, and to the end that "God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:24–28). In one instance, at least, the end will justify the means, and no creature of time may wisely offer a judgment on the *means*, when he is, of necessity, wholly incapable of comprehending the *end.*

The presence of sin and suffering in the world is too often looked upon as though here were strange intrusions into God's perfect order, and God is often challenged for these intrusions. J. M. E. McTaggart says it is a "depressing and revolting belief that the destiny of the universe is at the mercy of a being who, with the resources of omnipotence at his disposal, decides to make the universe no better than this" (*Some Dogmas on Religion*, p. 220). Over against this is the revelation that all that is in the

cosmos is of satanic origin and that God intrudes only as a Restrainer until the day of His judgment arrives, to take out of the *cosmos diabolicus* those whom His sovereign elective purpose chooses to redeem. The presence of sin and suffering is not God's failure. They are the inevitable default and bankruptcy of the lie. Though its ramifications seem to reach out to infinity, there is but one lie. God either rules over His universe, or He does not. The lie declares that He does not; the *truth* declares that He does. Such a prodigious issue could not be treated with indifference. Its judgments are sure.

In tracing through this one reason for the presence of sin and suffering in the *cosmos,* it is recognized that other reasons exist, which present even greater evidential value with respect to the righteousness of God in permitting sin to intrude. These are due to be attended under hamartiology.

Both the motive and the method of Satan are reflected precisely in the attitude and action of the man of sin, whom Satan will inspire, and through whom Satan expresses his own designs. In 2 Thessalonians 2:4 it is stated of the man of sin that he "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." Satan's purpose is to thwart the divine undertakings—especially the divine purpose to save the lost—and to exalt himself above God. It is implied that in his ambition Satan would attempt to seize upon the authority which belongs to God alone and that he would seek to be worshiped as God is, and should be, worshiped.

The central passage bearing on Satan's motive is Isaiah 14:12–14. As has been observed, the five *I will's* of Satan, though each has a specific objective, all converge in the last of the five, namely, *I will be like the most High.* The other four assert Satan's intention to exalt himself in various ways, but only to the one end that he may be like the most High. As before demonstrated, there is but one way in which any creature—angel or man—may attempt to be like God, and that is to seek to be independent as God is independent. To do this, all divinely intended dependence of the creature on the Creator must be repudiated, and the one who thus acts must be committed to a career which self has devised and which self must maintain in complete separation from God until that course of action is ended. In all such enterprises, self-exaltation is paramount, and opposition to God is pursued only that the way may be clear for self to be glorified. Scripture distinctly states that it was self-esteem, or pride, which incited this greatest

of all angels to launch out upon an independent course of action (Ezek. 28:17; 1 Tim. 3:6). It would seem to be indicated that he does not lose faith in his enterprise until that yet future time when he is cast out of heaven. Of Satan at that time it is written, “Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time” (Rev. 12:12).

The enormous project which was born in Satan’s mind and inspired by his self-exalting pride was, of necessity, confined to heavenly spheres until the creation of man. In those previous ages, it may be believed, Satan “trafficked” (cf. Ezek. 28:18) among the lesser angels to secure their allegiance to his philosophy of freedom from, and independence of, the Creator. Upon the creation of man, there was opened to Satan the possibility of a vast demonstration in this new realm of his power to design and execute. The present *cosmos* is that which Satan proposed and which God is permitting him to execute to its tragic end.

Four milestones mark the way of Satan’s course in willfulness:

(a) He said, “I will be like the most High.” Of this, the origin of all wickedness, nothing further need be added at this point.

(b) He said to Adam and Eve, *Be as gods (Elohim*, Gen. 3:5). How many angels had heard and heeded this suggestion none on earth may know. His advice was received and acted upon by the progenitors of the human race. By their own choice they incurred the penalty which the gracious warning of God had placed before them. He had said, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die (dying thou shalt die*). No word of God can ever fail. Thus every form of death came upon these sinful creatures. Death in any form was an unknown intruder into this universe. It was not the divine penalty upon the sinful angels, but it fell upon man. A grievous aspect of this penalty is spiritual death which means separation of the human soul and spirit from God. This estate of the first parents has become the inheritance of all their children in all their generations. They belong to the *cosmos diabolicus.* Until they are redeemed by infinite grace, they share not only the works of the *cosmos*, but its satanic spirit of independence of God. Should one of this degenerate race desire to be in right relation to God, the first step is not merely to evince a willingness to be obedient to God in a general way, but it is required of him that he *obey* the gospel of divine salvation (Acts 5:32; Rom. 2:8; 2 Thess. 1:8; Heb. 5:9; 1 Pet. 4:17).

Back of this requirement is the essential truth that a right relation to God is more than a repentance followed by divine forgiveness. Satisfaction to outraged holiness must be secured. This Christ has provided in His death, but it is not provided elsewhere and thus it is that Christ is the Way and the only Way to God from the hand of the evil one. The divinely provided cure is perfect beyond measure; for upon believing on Christ there is peace with God, forgiveness, regeneration with its imparted gift of eternal life, imputed righteousness, and justification. There is also the sure word of promise that the saved one will soon experience complete conformity to God the Son in glory. The satanic lie, "Ye shall be as gods (*Elohim*)," is proved to be a hideous deception, while the offers of divine grace present the assurance of final and lasting oneness with God and complete correspondence to all that God is and all that He desires. The lie becomes the antipode of the truth to the last degree of reckoning. The lie ends in eternal ruin for those who pursue it; the truth ends in eternal felicity and rightness with God for the one who rests his all in Christ. It is a marvel of infinite grace that even one soul is translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. 1:13). How tragic, indeed, is the present life and destiny of any human being who, though born into the lost estate, refuses divine grace and willfully continues to cast in his lot with the *antigod cosmos—cosmos diabolicus*—and goes on to share the doom of the enemy of God in the lake of fire!

But the plan of becoming as *Elohim* by merely assuming independence of God originated with Satan, and its proposal to Adam marks the course of Satan's unchanging purpose.

(c) When meeting the last Adam in the wilderness, Satan did not say, as he did to the first Adam, *Ye shall be as Elohim;* for Satan knows with no uncertainty that Jesus Christ is *God.* However, his master passion to be himself *like the most High* was expressed in the words, "Worship me." The wicked and presumptuous character of that request cannot be duplicated in the history of the universe, nor will it ever be duplicated in future ages. It is probable that at no place does the lie come into such manifestation of its false and wicked character as here, where it addresses itself directly to the One who is Truth. It was audacious beyond measure for Satan to solicit the cooperation of angels and man; but who will estimate the wickedness of the one who suggests that God the Creator become a suppliant at the feet of a

creature of His own hand? Pride had evidently befogged the mind of this being to the point of angelic insanity, yet not an insanity which bespeaks irresponsibility. Out of and above all the experiences of the threefold temptation in the wilderness, the one truth is disclosed, namely, that Satan purposes to be *like the most High.*

(d) It is far from accidental that the last manifestation of Satan's lie is the man of sin—who is said to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, and who comes according to the energizing of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness—who is ever distinguished by the blasphemous assumption that he is God. In the first or earliest record of him he is described by these words: "Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God: … Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD: Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God; Behold, therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness. They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the midst of the seas. Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? but thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that slayeth thee" (Ezek. 28:2, 6–9). Twice this incarnation of Satan is referred to in Daniel (Dan. 7:8; 9:27). In the former passage he is characterized as the one with "a mouth speaking great things," and in the latter passage he is said to be the one who causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease. This is precisely the testimony of the Apostle, who states of this one that he "sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2:4). Evidently the worship of Jehovah is terminated by this man of sin in order that he himself may be worshiped. Of this same person John writes: "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he

opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:3–8). It is, therefore, to be expected that the blasphemous claim to be God and the demand that he be worshiped as God shall constitute the last chapter in the drama of iniquity; and it is that, according to the Apostle's account recorded in 2 Thessalonians, chapter 2. It is equally as reasonable that Christ should indicate to the Jews that the appearance of this one "in the holy place" constitutes the sign of the end of their age and a signal to the Jews to flee for their safety (Matt. 24:15–22).

It is no greater mystery that God allows Satan to pursue his lie to its full consummation with his man of sin—the federator of nations— blaspheming to the extent that he claims to be God and requires, on the penalty of death, the worship of himself, which worship belongs to God alone, than that He allows the lie to have its beginning at all.

In pursuing the deeper aspects of all that may enter into Satan's motive, it is suggested that, as has been presented, he is moved, first, by pride which is the impelling cause of his unholy ambition. Second, Satan may be offended that a plan of salvation has been put into action by which his victims can be rescued and lifted to heights of glory to which no angel will ever attain. Dr. William Cooke quotes the following from Plutarch: "'It was a very ancient opinion, that there are certain wicked and malignant demons, who envy good men, and endeavour to hinder them in the pursuit of virtue, lest they should be partakers at least of greater happiness than they enjoy'" (*Christian Theology*, 5th ed., p. 628). That there is no redemption for himself or any other fallen angel, cannot but create jealousy and offense, and engender hatred on Satan's part toward God and His saints. And, third, Satan apparently cannot recognize any other basis of relationship on the part of the creature to God than that of personal merit, which basis was that upon which all creatures stood at the beginning. The issue of personal merit formed the very ground of Satan's authority in his defense of the throne of God. The whole operation of divine grace became an intrusion into, if not an encroachment upon, that principle upon which Satan was originally

appointed to act. That otherwise doomed creatures may, by faith in a crucified and risen Savior, be constituted righteous to the degree of the perfect righteousness of God, which Christ is, must be most disconcerting and obnoxious to Satan. His ideal is ever reflected in his ministers who are said to be "ministers of [personal] righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:13–15). It is concerning this gospel of grace by which lost men may be saved, that Satan has cast a veil over the minds of all unregenerate human beings "lest the light of the glorious gospel … should shine unto them" (2 Cor. 4:4). Every observing soul-winner is sooner or later impressed with the more than natural inability of the unsaved to comprehend the offer of salvation apart from human merit and by faith alone. Writing specifically of the veil which Satan casts over the minds of men, F. C. Jennings states: "He so weaves the course of this age: its religious forms, ceremonies, external decencies, respectabilities, and conventionalities as to form a thick veil, that entirely hides '*the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus,* ' which consists in righteous mercy to penitent sinners only. This veil is not formed by evil-living, depravity, or any form of what passes as evil amongst men; but by cold formality, heartless decency, proud self-complacency, highly esteemed external respectability, and we must add, church-membership—all without *Christ.* It is the most fatal of all delusions, the thickest of all veils, and the most common. It is the way that because it *is* religious, respectable, decent '*seems right unto a man but the end thereof is death*'; for there is no Christ, no Lamb of God, no Blood of Atonement in it" (*Satan*, pp. 29–30).

It yet remains to be seen more fully that, in his opposition to God, Satan enters into things religious.

Chapter IX

SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S METHOD

AT THE BEGINNING of this division of satanology it should be restated with emphasis that Satan's dominant purpose is not, as the popular impression supposes, one of attempting to be *unlike* God. Satan has explicitly asserted concerning himself, as recorded in Isaiah 14:14, that his transcendent objective is to be *like* the Most High. In a previous phase of this discussion Satan's design has been traced through history and prophecy and the conclusion of this record is that there can be no reasonable question but that, from his earliest intention to its last manifestation—when the man of sin, the son of perdition asserts that he is God—Satan is impelled by but one intention. How essential in Satan's estimation the worship of the man of sin will be, may be seen from the revelation that the man of sin will demand the worship of the people of the earth on the penalty of death (Rev. 13:15).

The unregenerate masses of humanity are said to be deceived by Satan. Their delusion is both tragic and pitiable. They are imposed upon by Satan's subterfuge, treachery, and fraud. There is no abiding substance in any objective upon which they set their hopes. With discriminating recognition the Scriptures declare that Satan's deceptions affect merely the human element in the *cosmos*, and not the entire system of things which the *cosmos* embraces. Thus the word *cosmos* is not employed in connection with these deceptions. The term οἰκουμένη, meaning the inhabitants of the earth, or the designation, *the nations*, is used. It is written of the inhabited earth in Revelation 12:9, "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world ['inhabited earth']: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." Likewise, in Revelation 13:14 the deceptions are said to reach "them that dwell on the earth." Then, also, in Revelation 20:3, 8, 10, Satan's deceptions are said to reach to all nations—including all people of the earth—excepting such individuals as are saved. To the same end it is written again of Satan's power as exercised by the man of sin, that it will be "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them [all of them] that perish" (2 Thess. 2:10). In this dark picture there is no hope, within themselves, of a

fallen, Christ-rejecting race. Speaking of the future of fallen men, it is written: “Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived” (2 Tim. 3:13). In the light of all this disclosure, the dreams of religious guides who predict a transformed, regenerated *cosmos* as a result of human effort in Christian service are seen to be without foundation. Satan’s deceptions continue until he is bound and consigned to the abyss. But who will bind Satan and place him in that prison? In the interest of divine righteousness, the dissolution of the *cosmos* and the disillusion of the lie must reach the ends predicted when all will be destroyed in the zenith of its wickedness. It is only then that the King shall reign and prosper. It is then, and only then, that righteousness and peace shall cover the earth as waters cover the face of the deep. What form of deception has seized good men that they should fail to see the uncomplicated teaching of the Bible with respect to the course and end of evil? The stupendous realities represented in the *cosmos diabolicus* are not said to be transformable. When God declares, as He does, that the *cosmos diabolicus* is to continue with increasing deception and to continue to the embodiment of the lie until it is crushed by the infinite power of the returning King, there is little ground for any attempts to save it or to transform it. Indeed, Christians are exhorted to be instant in season and out of season in the saving of *individuals;* but that is far removed as an objective from the attempted rescue of that which God has doomed to destruction and that which by its very nature is antigod.

Next to the lie itself, the greatest delusion Satan imposes—reaching to all unsaved and to a large proportion of Christians—is the supposition that only such things as society considers evil could originate with the devil—if, indeed, there be any devil to originate anything. It is not the reason of man, but the revelation of God, which points out that governments, morals, education, art, commercialism, vast enterprises and organizations, and much of religious activity are included in the *cosmos diabolicus.* That is, the system which Satan has constructed includes all the good which he can incorporate into it and be consistent in the thing he aims to accomplish. A serious question arises whether the presence of gross evil in the world is due to Satan’s intention to have it so, or whether it indicates Satan’s inability to execute all he has designed. The probability is great that Satan’s ambition has led him to undertake more than any creature could ever

administer. Revelation declares that the whole *cosmos-system* must be annihilated—not its evil alone, but *all* that is in it, both good and bad. God will incorporate nothing of Satan's failure into that kingdom which He will set up in the earth. The *cosmos diabolicus* must be "broken in pieces" and become like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors which the wind carries away, and all this *before* the Smiting Stone—Christ in His return to earth—will set up a kingdom which shall fill the whole earth (Dan. 2:34–35, 44–45). The New Testament predicts the same consummation, saying, "And the world [*cosmos*] passeth away, and the lust ['desire,' or 'purpose'] thereof" (1 John 2:17). The one and only thing that will survive this great cataclysm, this text goes on to state, is "he that doeth the will of God"; he "abideth for ever." *The lie* is expanded to the point where its manifestation embraces all that is in the *cosmos*, and is built on the one original idea which characterizes it all, namely, *independence of God.* To do the will of God is to *do* the truth; to act apart from God is to *do* the lie. *The truth*, which is the will of God, and those who do the truth, abide forever. There should be no surprise at this termination of the entire fabric of Satan's weaving; yet those of the *cosmos* are influenced not at all by God's Word, nor are *cosmos-Christians* much impressed with the solemn truth God has spoken. Such is the far-reaching effect of the satanic deception. Satan's original independence of God which permeates the whole order, his deceptions about himself, about his purpose, and about the extent of his enterprise, constitute the primary aspects of Satan's *method* in the *cosmos.*

Since in pursuing his determination to exalt himself above God Satan must oppose the divine undertakings, his opposition naturally will be exerted where God is acting at a given time. Since God has no present program which He is following along lines of reformation, education, or civilization (and any record that such undertakings are in God's present purpose will be sought in vain), there is no conflict or satanic resistance in those spheres. The present relation of God to the *cosmos*, beyond His sovereign permission and restraint of it, is to save out of it an elect people for His heavenly glory. On the other hand, Satan's twofold objective —to exalt self, and to oppose God—is the key by which much may be known that otherwise would be unknown. It is still further disclosed that the enmity of Satan is not only toward the Person of God from whom he has everything to fear, but also toward every true child of God. Too much emphasis cannot

be placed on this fact. Satan has no controversy or warfare with his own, unregenerate people, but there is abundant Scripture to prove that he makes unceasing effort to mar the life and service of the Christian. The motive for this effort is all-sufficient: they have partaken "of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4), and afford, therefore, a possible opportunity for Satan to thrust his fiery darts at the divine Person who indwells them. Thus the believer becomes a medium of connection between the divine Person and the satanic order, for it is also true that God literally loves the unsaved through the believer (Rom. 5:5). On the other hand, the prince of the satanic system is seeking an opportunity for a thrust through the believer at the Person of God. Several important passages on the latter point may here be noted: "These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33); "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution" (2 Tim. 3:12); "Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you" (1 John 3:13); "Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you. Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist stedfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world" (1 Pet. 5:7–9); "Finally, be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles ['artifices'] of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:10–12, R.V.). The teaching of these passages clearly indicates the satanic enmity toward the believer, and the believer's utter helplessness apart from the divine sufficiency. They also reveal a degree of enmity which would result in the believer's life being crushed out, were it not for the evident answer to the prayer of Christ: "I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world [*cosmos*], but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one" (John 17:15, R.V.). Certainly there is abundant reason for the believer to expect the fiercest opposition from Satan and Satan's host in all his life and service, and faith alone insures his victory over the world (*cosmos*).

The believer is also the object of the satanic attack because of the fact that unto the child of God is committed the great ministry of reconciliation,

that by his testimony both in life and word, and by his prayers, the truths of redemption may be given to the world. If Satan can cripple the believer's service he accomplishes much in resisting the present purpose of God. No other explanation is adequate for the dark pages of church history, the appalling failure of the church in world-wide evangelism, her present sectarian divisions and selfish indifference, or her final estate as pictured in Revelation 3:15–17. This blighting, satanic opposition may be detected in every effort for the salvation of the lost. It may be seen in the fact that no personal appeal is ever made to the vast majority even in this favored land; moreover, when an appeal is made, it is easily distracted or diverted into the discussion of unimportant themes. The faithful pastor or evangelist is most sorely assailed, every device of Satan being used to distort the one all-important message of grace into something which is not vital. The evangelist's call for decisions is often cumbered with that which is misleading or is a positive misstatement of the terms of salvation; thus the appeal is lost and the whole effort fails. Again, the opposing power of Satan may be seen in the matter of Christian giving. Millions are given without solicitation for education, culture, and humanity's physical comfort, but real worldwide evangelization must ever drag on with its shameful limitations and debts. This warfare of Satan is even more noticeable in the believer's prayer life. This, being his place of greatest usefulness and power, is subject to the severest conflict. In this connection it may be stated safely that there is comparatively little prevailing prayer today, yet the way is open and the promises are sure. If the believer cannot be beguiled into indifference or a denial of Christ, he is often tempted to place an undue emphasis upon some minor truth, and, in partial blindness, to sacrifice his whole influence for good through the apparent unbalance of his testimony.

Satan's warfare against the purpose of God is still more evident in his direct hindering of the unsaved. Not only are they constantly blinded to the gospel, but, when the Spirit would draw them, their minds are often filled with strange fears and distorted visions. Their inability to cast themselves upon Christ is a mystery to themselves, and nothing but the direct illuminating power of the Spirit in conviction can open their eyes and deliver them from their gross darkness.

Satan has always adapted his methods to the times and conditions. If attention has been gained, a complete denial of the truth has been made, or,

when some recognition of the truth is demanded, it has been granted on the condition that that which is vital in redemption should be omitted. This partial recognition of the truth is required by the world today. For, while the direct result of the believer's testimony to the *cosmos* has been toward the gathering out of the Bride, there has been an indirect influence of this testimony upon the world, which has led them to see that all that is good in their own ideals has been already stated in the Bible and exemplified in the life of Christ. Moreover, they have heard that every principle of humanitarian sympathy or righteous government has been revealed in the Scriptures of Truth. Thus there has grown a more or less popular appreciation of the value of these moral precepts of the Scriptures and of the example which Christ presents. This condition has prevailed to such a degree that any new system or doctrine which secures a hearing today must base its claim upon the Bible, and include, to some extent, the Person and teachings of Christ. The fact that the world has thus partly acknowledged the value of the Scriptures is taken by many to be a glorious victory for God, while, on the contrary, fallen humanity is less inclined to accept God's terms of salvation than in the generations past. It is evident that this partial concession of the world to the testimony of God has opened the way for counterfeit systems of truth, which, according to prophecy, are the last and most-to-be-dreaded methods in the satanic warfare. In this connection it must be conceded that Satan has really granted nothing from his own position, even though he be forced to acknowledge every principle of truth save that upon which salvation depends. Rather is he advantaged by such a concession; for the value and delusion of a counterfeit are increased by the nearness of its likeness to the real. By advocating much truth, in the form of a counterfeit system of truth, Satan can satisfy all the external religious cravings of the world, and yet accomplish his own end by withholding that on which man's only hope depends. It is, therefore, no longer safe to subscribe blindly to that which promises general good, simply because it is good and is garnished with the teachings of the Bible; for good has ceased to be all on the one side and evil all on the other. In fact, that which is evil in purpose has gradually appropriated the good until but one issue distinguishes them. Part-truth-ism has come into final conflict with whole-truth-ism, and woe to the soul that does not discern between them! The first, though externally religious, is of Satan, and leaves its followers in the doom

of everlasting banishment from the presence of God, while the latter is of God, “having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

It is also noticeable that the term “infidel” has, within a generation, disappeared from common usage, and that that manner of open denial of the truth has been almost wholly abandoned. Yet the real Church has by no means lost her foes, for they are now even more numerous, subtle, and terrible than ever before. These present enemies, however, like the unclean birds in the mustard tree, have taken shelter under her branches. They are officiating at her most sacred altars and conducting her institutions. These vultures are fed by a multitude, both in the church and out, who, in satanic blindness, are committed to the furtherance of any project or the acceptance of any theory that promises good to the world if it is apparently based upon Scripture, little realizing that they are often really supporting the enemy of God.

A counterfeit is Satan’s most natural method of resisting the purpose of God, since by it he can realize to that extent his desire to be *like* the Most High. Every material is now at hand, as never before, for the setting up of those conditions which are predicted to appear only in the very end of the age. In 2 Timothy 3:1–5 one of these predictions may be found: “This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.” Every word of this prophecy is worthy of most careful study in the light of the present tendency of society. The fifth verse is especially important in connection with the subject of counterfeits of the truth: “Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.” Here it is stated that in these last days forms of godliness shall appear which, however, deny the power of God, and from such the believer is warned to turn away. The important element in the true faith which is to be omitted in this “form” is defined elsewhere in the Scriptures: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek” (Rom. 1:16); “But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the

Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:23–24). Therefore, that which is omitted so carefully from these forms is the salvation which is in Christ. This is most suggestive, for "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," and it is by salvation alone that any deliverance can be had from the power of darkness. Without this salvation Satan can still claim all his own. It is perhaps necessary to add that, judging from all his writings, this salvation of which Paul confesses he was not ashamed was no less an undertaking than regeneration by the Spirit; and whatever other theories may be advanced, this is the teaching of the Spirit through the Apostle Paul. This prophecy concerning conditions in the "last days" ends with an injunction which is addressed only to the believers who are called upon to live and witness during those days. To them it is said: "from such [a form of godliness which denies the power thereof] turn away." As certainly as the "last days" are now present, so certainly this injunction is now to be heeded, and the Lord's people are called upon to separate from churches and institutions which deny the gospel of God's saving grace through the substitutionary blood-redemption of the cross. To support institutions or ministries which "deny the power thereof," is to lend aid to Satan—the enemy of God. With no less force it is stated in 2 Peter 2:1, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction." In the same manner, according to this passage, the denial falls not on the *Person* of Christ, but rather on His redeeming *work*—"the Lord that bought them." It therefore follows that one feature of the last days will be a form of godliness which carefully denies the power of God in salvation.

Again, Satan is "in the latter times" to be the promoter of a system of truth or doctrine: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron" (1 Tim. 4:1–2). These predicted satanic systems are here accurately described. Their offers will be so attractive and externally so religious that into them will be drawn some who "shall depart from the faith," they being enticed by seducing spirits. No reference is made here to

personal faith by which one may be saved. It is “the faith”—a body of truth (cf. Jude 1:3) which is first seen to some extent, and then rejected. This a regenerate person will never do. These attractive systems are not only from Satan, but are themselves “lies in hypocrisy,” being presented by those whose conscience has been seared with a hot iron. No more illuminating terms could be used than these. A lie covered by hypocrisy means, evidently, that they are still attempting to be counted among the faithful; and the conscience seared would indicate that they can distort the testimony of God and blindly point other souls to perdition, without present remorse or regret. The doctrines of devils are again referred to in Revelation 2:24, R.V. as “the deep things of Satan,” and this is Satan’s counterfeit of “the deep things of God” which the Spirit reveals to them that love Him (1 Cor. 2:10). Thus there are predicted for the last days of this age both a form of godliness which denies the power of salvation that is in Christ, and a system known as “the deep things of Satan” or “doctrines of devils,” speaking lies in hypocrisy. Can there be any doubt that these two Scriptures describe the same thing, since they also refer to the same time? The lies of one can be but the covered denial of salvation in the other.

Again, Satan has his assembly, or congregational meeting, which is his counterfeit of the visible church. This assembly is referred to, both in Revelation 2:9 and 3:9, as the “synagogue of Satan,” an organized assembly being relatively as important for testimony in the deep things of Satan as it has been in the things of God. In Matthew 13 the tares appear *among* the wheat and their appearance is said to be after the sowing of the wheat. So, also, the “children of the wicked one” appear and are often included and even organized within the forms of the visible church. The assembly of Satan, calling itself a part of the visible church, is to have its ministers and teachers. This is stated in 2 Corinthians 11:13–15: “For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.” Here is a remarkable revelation of the possible extent of the satanic counterfeit— “false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ” and “ministers of righteousness”; yet these are shown to be only agents of the great deceiver, Satan, who is himself

transformed into an angel of light. It is evident that the method of this deception is to imitate the real ministers of Christ. Certainly these false apostles cannot so appear unless they gather into their message every available "form of godliness" and cover their lies with the most subtle hypocrisy. Evil will not appear on the outside of these systems; but they will be announced as "another gospel" or as a larger understanding of the previously accepted truth, and will be all the more attractive and delusive since they are heralded by those who claim to be ministers of Christ, who reflect the beauty of an "angel of light," and whose lives are undoubtedly free from great temptation. It should be noted, however, that these false ministers do not necessarily know the real mission they have. Being unregenerate persons of the *cosmos*, and thus blinded to the real gospel, they are sincere, preaching and teaching the best things the angel of light, their energizing power, is pleased to reveal unto them. Their gospel is one of human reason, and appeals to human resources. There can be no appreciation of divine revelation in them, for they have not come really to know God or His Son, Jesus Christ. They are ministers of righteousness, which message should never be confused with the gospel of grace. One is directed only at the reformation of the natural man, while the other aims at regeneration through the power of God. As all this is true, how perilous is the attitude of many who follow attractive ministers and religious guides only because they claim to be such and are sincere, and who are not awake to the one final test of doctrine by which alone the whole covert system of satanic lies may be distinguished from the truth of God! In this connection John writes the following warning: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed" (2 John 1:10).

False teachers are usually sincere and full of humanitarian zeal; but they are *unregenerate.* This judgment necessarily follows when it is understood that they deny the only ground of redemption. Being unregenerate, it is said of them: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14). Such religious leaders may be highly educated and able to speak with authority on every aspect of human knowledge; but if they are not born again, their judgment in spiritual matters is worthless and misleading. All teachers are to be judged by their

attitude toward the doctrine of the blood redemption of Christ, rather than by their winsome personalities, their education, or their sincerity.

Since the blood redemption of the cross is the central truth and value of the true faith, it being the “power of God unto salvation” (Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 1:23–24), any counterfeit system of doctrine which would omit this essential, must force some secondary truth into the place of prominence. Any of the great Scriptural subjects which are of universal interest to humanity, such as physical health, life after death, morality, unfulfilled prophecy, or religious forms, may be substituted in the false systems for that which is vital. And while those subjects are all found in their proper relations and importance in the true faith, the fact that people are universally inclined to give attention to them furnishes an opportunity for Satan to make a strong appeal to humanity through them, using these subjects as central truths in his false and counterfeit systems. Many are easily led to fix their attention upon the secondary things, and to neglect wholly the one primary thing. Especially is this true since the secondary things are tangible and seen, while the one essential thing is spiritual and unseen; and Satan has blinded their eyes toward that which is of eternal value. A system of doctrine may be formed, then, which includes every truth of the Scriptures save one: exalting the *Person* of Christ, but not His *work*, and thereby emphasizing some secondary truth as its central value. This system will be readily accepted by blinded humanity, though the real power of God unto salvation has been carefully withdrawn. Naturally it would be supposed that such Satan-inspired systems would have no value or power, since there could be no divine favor upon them. Such a supposition would be possible only because of the prevailing misunderstanding with respect to the real power of Satan. If the description given of him in the Scriptures is accepted, he will be seen to be possessed with miraculous power, able to perform such marvels that the whole world is led to wonder and then to worship. He is free also to bestow this miraculous power upon others (Rev. 13:2). So it is no marvel if his ministers, who appear as the ministers of righteousness, are able to exert superhuman power when it is directly in the interest of the satanic projects. The great power of Satan has doubtless been active along these lines during all the ages past; for it is impossible that humanity should have worshiped

other gods blindly without some recompense, and it is Satan himself who has been thus worshiped (Lev. 17:7; 2 Chron. 11:15; Rev. 9:20).

It is not final evidence, therefore, that a system of doctrine is of God simply because there are accompanying manifestations of superhuman power, nor is it final evidence that the Almighty has responded simply because any form of supplication has been answered. The divine movements are, of necessity, limited by the laws of His own holiness; and access into His presence is by the blood of Christ alone, by a new and living Way which was consecrated for us through His flesh (Heb. 10:19–20). Assuming to come before God in prayer but ignoring this truth is but to insult with pollution Him who is infinitely holy and pure. Surely the Satan-ruled world does not come before God by the blood of Christ.

Churches sometimes fall an easy prey to forms of doctrine —"deceivableness of unrighteousness"—which Satan originates. Sad is the spectacle of churches meeting week after week to be beguiled by the philosophy of men, and raising no voice in protest against the denial of their only foundation as a church, and the individual's only hope for time and eternity! Far more honorable were the infidels of the past generation than those who minister in these churches. They were wholly outside the church. But now, behold the inconsistency! Men who are covered by the vesture of the church, ministering its sacraments, and supported by its benevolence, are making an open attack upon that wisdom of God which made Christ Jesus the only ground for all righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. The predictions for the last days are thus not only being fulfilled by false systems and doctrines, but they are found in the visible church itself. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (2 Tim. 4:3–4). Great religious activities are possible without coming into complication with saving faith. It is possible to fight against sin and not present the Savior, or to urge the highest Scriptural ideals and yet offer no reasonable way of attainment. There is a strange fascination about these undertakings which are humanitarian, and are religious only in form and title. And there is a strange attractiveness in the leader who announces that he is not concerned with the doctrines of the Bible, because the helping of humanity is his one passion and care; yet all his passion is lost and his

care is to no real end unless coupled with a very positive message of a particular way of salvation, the true understanding of which demands a series of most careful distinctions.

Who can be the god of these systems? the energizing power in these people? and the answerer of their prayers? Surely not the God of the Scriptures who cannot deny Himself, and whose Word cannot be made to pass away! Revelation sets forth but one other being who is capable of these undertakings; and it not only assigns to this being a great and sufficient motive for all such activity, but clearly predicts that he will thus “oppose” and “exalt himself” in this very day and age. Much of the secondary truth is the present inheritance of the child of God. However, if there is a choice to be made, the deepest wisdom will perceive that all the combined secondary values which Satan can offer are but for a fleeting time, and are not worthy to be compared with the eternal riches of grace in Christ Jesus.

Certain religious systems which are in no way related to the Bible and have continued for millenniums—including the ancient pagan systems and spiritism—have held the devotion of uncounted millions and bear every evidence of being inspired by Satan. The moral problem, which is felt to some degree by every human being, is seized upon by almost every unscriptural system. The idea that man will stand on a basis of personal worthiness has been the chief heresy, opposing the central doctrine of grace, from the time of Christ’s death to the present hour. It so permeates the church that few who preach are able to exclude it from their attempts at gospel preaching. It is safe to say that wherever the element of human merit is allowed to intrude into the presentation of the plan of salvation, the message is satanic to that extent. The ministers of Satan proclaim personal righteousness as the ground of the individual’s right relations to God (2 Cor. 11:13–15). No sphere of profession has been more confused and befogged by the intrusion of human merit than has the Church of Rome.

As has been observed, cults are now multiplying and their appearance is restricted to very recent times. These cults cover a variety of ideas all the way from Christian Science to Buchmanism. The latter as completely ignores the blood redemption of Christ as the former. While the former substitutes bodily health for the salvation of the soul, the latter substitutes consecration to God for a new birth by the Spirit. No less misleading is the modern doctrine that salvation is through faith plus consecration. Probably

no religious movement is more bold than the *I AM* cult of recent months. It unblushingly announces by its blasphemous name that it freely embraces all that belongs to the original *lie.* Its title would have been equally appropriate had it been, *I will be like the most High.* Space cannot be claimed for an enumeration and analysis of all these systems, ancient and modern. No one can anticipate the number that will yet appear or the confusion of doctrine they will engender; but for each and all there is but one acid test, namely, What place does it give to the redeeming grace of God made possible only through the death and shed blood of Christ?

Conclusion to Satanology

In the light of that which has been written in preceding divisions of satanology, it may be concluded that, by creation, Satan is the highest of all angels and that he fell into sin, being befogged by the distortion of sanity which pride engenders. His sin took the form of an assumption to act in independence of the Creator—an undertaking which, of necessity, became a concrete embodiment of *untruth* as certainly as God is *Truth.* According to the divine method of dealing with creature assumption, as seen in all past history, Satan is allowed—if not required—to put his scheme of independent action to an experimental test, and its present development, though manifesting even now its corrupt nature, is yet incomplete. The inerrant, prophetic Scriptures carry the stupendous enterprise on to the unavoidable, irrational, incomprehensible spiritual bankruptcy which characterizes the consummation of this gigantic experiment. During these terrible ages of trial, Light is pitted against darkness, and Truth against falsehood. Little attention can have been given to Scripture on the part of men who propose to account for the evil one as a mere influence in the world. Of such wicked inattention to revelation, Dr. Gerhart writes: “In the history of Jesus the fact of the deadly hatred of Evil to the ideal Good, of fiendlike wickedness toward spotless Virtue, no one can deny. Those who choose to ascribe such appalling inhumanity and diabolism exclusively to Jews and Gentiles, (instead of referring it to a mighty personal evil spirit, as its background,) do not get rid, as they suppose, of a devil. Then man is himself resolved into a *devil;* for he is invested with a kind and degree of *malice* which dehumanizes human nature, turns earth into pandemonium,

and history into an interminable war of incarnated fiends" (*Institutes of the Christian Religion,* I, 697). Perhaps both things here stated are true. Not only are Satan and his angels to be seen in their true light as fiends of darkness, but humanity as allied with them is evidently seen by God to be wholly evil, if not diabolical. It is such who, having cast in their lot with the satanic lie, must, if not saved out of it, share the lake of fire which originally was prepared only for "the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10). It is to these fallen, God-repudiating human beings that the gospel of eternal redemption and heavenly glory is to be preached. How matchless is the grace of God toward these enemies (Rom. 5:10)! And how incomprehensibly blessed are the words of Christ, "… should not perish, but have everlasting life"!

Chapter X

DEMONOLOGY

UNAVOIDABLY, MUCH that enters into this great theme has been anticipated in preceding pages. It remains, however, to contemplate more specifically the truth disclosed concerning the fallen angels who are properly styled *demons*. Some evidence has been advanced to demonstrate that these beings are angels who followed Satan in his rebellion against God. It is not without significance that these beings are called Satan's own angels (cf. Matt. 25:41; Rev. 12:9), not, indeed, to imply that Satan created them, but rather that he is responsible—so far as influence could go—for their demonic character. The voice of God in the garden tracing the sin of the man to the woman and the sin of the woman to the serpent (Gen. 3:12–13), could be extended on from a fallen race of the earth to a host of fallen spirits in heavenly spheres, and to the end that all original responsibility for sin in the universe belongs to the first of all sinners—Satan. In like manner, it is not without significance that more Scripture is employed to elucidate the truth concerning Satan than is employed to elucidate the truth concerning all the fallen angels together. Mighty indeed is the archangel who is over all fallen angels! He is the *strong man* of Matthew 12:29 who is yet to be bound, and whose "house" will yet be destroyed.

The Scriptures declare that Satan is king over two realms: that of fallen spirits whose number is legion (Mark 5:9, 15; Luke 8:30), and that of the *cosmos*. The authority which Satan exercises over the hosts of demons is asserted or implied in many portions of the Bible and in none more clearly than Matthew 12:22–30, which reads: "Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw. And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; self; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by

Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scatterest abroad." The titles *principalities* and *powers*, when referring to fallen spirits, indicate these mighty angels over whom Satan rules supreme.

With reference to Satan's authority over the *cosmos*, the statement is direct and final. He is said to be the *god of this age* (2 Cor. 4:4), "the prince of this world" (*cosmos*), the one who energizes the children of disobedience, the one rightly styled *the power of darkness*, and *the wicked one* in whose authority the whole *cosmos* resides. In like manner, it is said of Satan's throne—the throne of the earthly sphere—that it is on the earth (cf. Rev. 2:13). The same satanic authority is declared in Ephesians 6:12. Thus it is written: "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (R.V.).

That the demons do the will of their king is everywhere assured in the Scriptures. It is also revealed that they render wholehearted and willing cooperation in the satanic project. To this they were evidently committed when they left their first estate as unfallen angels (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6). This service apparently reaches out to the universe wherever Satan's authority extends. Satan, though proposing to supersede the Almighty, is not omnipotent; but his power and the extent of his activity are immeasurably increased by the cooperation of his host of demons. Satan is not omniscient; yet his knowledge is greatly extended by the combined wisdom and observation of his sympathetic subjects. Satan is not omnipresent; but he is able to maintain an unceasing activity in every locality by the loyal obedience of the satanic host.

In his book, *The Spirit World* (p. 23), Clarence Larkin distinguishes between the fallen angels that are bound and those that are free. Quoting Jude 1:6–7, which reads: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrha,

and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," and relating this with Genesis 6:1–4, which reads, "And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown," Mr. Larkin draws the conclusion that the fallen angels that are in chains are under sentence because of immoral relations with women of the human race. The "strange flesh" and "fornication" of Sodom and Gomorrha suggest to Mr. Larkin that the text (Jude 1:6–7) aims to reveal that this is the sin of these angels that are bound.

The whole discussion regarding the "sons of God" mentioned in Genesis 6:1–4 (cf. Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7), should be included rightfully in demonology. Whether, as many believe, the reference is to men of the line of Seth cohabiting with women of the line of Cain, or whether it asserts that angels cohabited with women of the earth, as Mr. Larkin and others believe, probably will never be determined to the satisfaction of all concerned. Mr. Larkin's argument, which contemplates much that is involved on both sides of the contention, is as follows: Who are these angels? They are not Satan's angels, for his angels are free, and like him roam about, but these angels are in "prison," "in darkness," and "reserved in chains" for judgment. The place of their confinement is not Hell, but Tartarus. What was their sin? It was "fornication," and fornication of an abnormal character, the unlawful sexual intercourse of angelic beings with "*strange flesh*," that is with beings of a different nature. When was this sin committed? The text says in the "days of Noah," and that it was the cause of the Flood. …

> Who were these *"sons of God"?* Some claim that they were the Sons of "*Seth*, " and that the "Daughters of *men*" were the daughters of "*Cain*, " and that what is meant is that the Sons of the supposedly godly line of Seth, intermarried with the godless daughters of Cain, the result being a godless race. That the "Sons of God" were the descendants of Seth is based on the assumption that the descendants of Seth lived apart from the descendants of Cain up to

a time shortly before the Flood, and that they were a pure and holy race, while the descendants of Cain were ungodly, and their women irreligious and carnal minded, and possessed of physical attractions that were foreign to the women of the tribe of Seth. Such an assumption has no foundation in Scripture. Be sure it says in Gen. 4:26, that after the birth of Enos, a son of Seth, that men began to call upon the Lord, but it does not follow that those men were limited to the descendants of Seth, nor that all the descendants of Seth from that time were righteous. As in the early days of the race it was necessary that brothers and sisters and near relatives should marry, it was very unlikely that the descendants of Seth and Cain did not intermarry until some time before the Flood, and stranger still that when they did marry their offspring would be a race of "giants" or "Mighty Men." It is worthy of note that nothing is said of giantesses, or "Mighty Women," which would have been the case if it were simply a union of the sons of Seth, and the daughters of Cain. As both the descendants of Seth (except 8 persons) and of Cain were destroyed in the Flood, it is evident that they were not separate tribes at that time and were equally sinners in the sight of God. If the sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain were meant why did not Moses, who wrote the Pentateuch, say so? It is not sufficient to say that the men of Moses' time knew what he meant. The Scriptures are supposed to mean what they say. When *men,* we are told, began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, the "Sons of God" saw the "daughters of *men.*" The use of the word *men* signifies the whole Adamic race, and not simply the descendants of Cain, thus distinguishing the "Sons of God" from the descendants of Adam. There is no suggestion of contrast if the "Sons of God" were also men.

Four names are used in Gen. 6:1–4. "*Bne-Ha-Elohim, "* rendered "Sons of God"; "*Bnoth-Ha-Adam, "* "daughters of men"; "*Hans-Nephilim, "* "giants"; "*Hog-Gibborim, "* "Mighty Men." The title "Bne-Ha-Elohim," "Sons of God," has not the same meaning in the Old Testament that it has in the New. In the New Testament it applies to those who have become the "Sons of God" by the New Birth (John 1:12; Rom. 8:14–16; Gal. 4:6; 1 John 3:1–2). In the Old Testament it applies exclusively to the angels, and is so used five times. Twice in Genesis (Gen. 6:2–4) and three times in Job, where Satan, an angelic being, is classed with the "Sons of God" (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). A "Son of God" denotes a being brought into existence by a creative act of God. Such were the angels, and such was Adam, and he is so called in Luke 3:38. Adam's natural descendants are not the special creation of God. Adam was created in the "likeness of God" (Gen. 5:1), but his descendants were born in his likeness, for we read in Gen. 5:3, that Adam "begat a son in *his own likeness, after his image.*" Therefore all men born of Adam and his descendants by natural generation are the "*sons of men, "* and it is only by being "*born again*" (John 3:3–7), which is a "*new creation, "* that they can become the "*sons of God*" in the New Testament sense. That the "Sons of God" of Gen. 6:1–4 were *angels* was maintained by the ancient Jewish Synagogue, by Hellenistic Jews at, and before, the time of Christ, and by the Christian Church up until the Fourth Century, when the interpretation was changed to "sons of Seth" for two reasons. First, because the worship of angels had been set up, and if the "Sons of God" of Gen. 6:1–4 were angels and fell, then angels might fall again, and that possibility would affect the worship of angels. The second reason was, that Celibacy had become an institution of the Church, and if it was taught that the angels in heaven did not marry, and yet that some of them seduced by the beauty of womanhood came down from heaven to gratify their amorous propensities, a weakness of a similar kind in one of the "earthly angels" (Celibates) might be the more readily excused. In the Eighteenth Century the "Angelic Interpretation" was revived, and is now largely held by Biblical scholars.—Pp. 23–27

Mr. Larkin also claims that Satan is to have an actual seed in the person of the man of sin. This argument is based on an arbitrary interpretation of Genesis 3:15, which assumes that the man of sin is the seed of Satan in an actual sense. If followed to its reasonable conclusion, all unsaved persons must be deemed to be actual offspring of Satan since Christ refers to them as children "of your father, the devil" (John 8:44). This theory also places the mortal combat between the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 at the time when the man of sin is destroyed at Christ's second coming. According to 2 Thessalonians 2:8, the man of sin is vanquished indeed, which might correspond to the bruising of Satan's head; but there is nothing in that event which corresponds to the bruising of Christ's heel.

Evidently, demons have always been active in the world from the dawn of human history; but, as occasion may arise, they become more active at one time than at another. The presence in the world of the Lord of glory, their Creator and the One against whom they are in rebellion, seems to draw out a manifestation of opposition hitherto unknown. Even Satan himself, after having three times tempted the Son of God into action which would be independent of His Father, whose will He came to do, hoping thus to cause Him to share in the lie, left the Savior only for a season. The final combat took place at the cross where his head was bruised, he who, according to prediction, was permitted to bruise the Savior's heel (Gen. 3:15).

A similar increase in the activity of demons is predicted for the close of this age and in the great tribulation. All of this will reach its consummation when Satan and his angels are cast out of heaven and confined to the earth. It is then that *woe* is pronounced upon the earth and a new joy is released in heaven. One line of demon activity is seen in the oldest *ism* of the race, which the Bible terms possession of "familiar spirits"; it is also properly called *spiritism*. This is demonism (cf. Lev. 20:6, 27; Deut. 18:10–11; Isa. 8:19, R.V.). The unqualified condemnation of God rests upon spiritism. Its bait, by which it lures those so disposed, is the natural interest of the human mind in that which is beyond the present sphere of life; especially is this interest awakened in those who are bereaved. In these latter times this ancient system has revived under the guise of *investigation* and under the patronage of scientific men. A special departure from the faith is forecast for the last days of the Church on the earth. It is recorded in 1 Timothy 4:1–3: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall

depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." The deviation from the revealed truth will, no doubt, be in manifold ways. The doctrines of demons with their seductions are also determined for the same time. The abrogation of marriage that is mentioned is none other than the breaking down of that which God has so solemnly ordained. In addition to all this, the truth of what is back of idol worship is stated in 1 Corinthians 10:20–21: "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils."

Perhaps no Scripture bearing on the spirit world is more misunderstood than that concerning King Saul and the witch of En-dor. Spiritism has turned to this incident to justify its claims, and that without recognition of the truth that the Bible everywhere condemns all that spiritists practice and teach. There is a slight distinction to be seen between the supposed contact with the spirits of departed persons and contact with fallen angels, or demons. Apart from the one instance in the experience of King Saul, there is no evidence that any contact has ever been set up between the departed and those who remain in this life. A demon can easily impersonate a human spirit, and that, if any contact is ever formed, must account for the phenomenon. The case of the Witch of En-dor is apparently an exceptional incident intended of God to bring King Saul into judgment. The entire procedure was different than the woman expected and evidently quite foreign to any former experience on her part. She was used to the cooperation of an evil spirit, but she saw what no one else saw and it wrought terror in her whole being. It was Saul's last act of rejection of God. He had turned to the demons to gain information, which information, had he been right with God, would have been granted to him by God. Whatever is not fully explained in the account of this episode, it is essential to remember that is the only one of its kind recorded in the Bible. The experience conforms in no way to the practice of spiritism of that day, or now. The

woman, seized with terror, abandons her role as *medium* and the spirit of Samuel speaks directly to Saul.

In considering the service these beings render to Satan, it is important to distinguish between demon possession, or control, and demon influence. In the one case the body is entered and a dominating control is gained, while in the other case a warfare from without is carried on by suggestion, temptation, and influence. Investigation of the Scriptures in regard to demon possession reveals: First: that this host is made up of bodiless spirits only. The following Scriptures verify this statement: “When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first” (Matt. 12:43–45); “And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them” (Mark 5:12).

Second: They are, however, not only seeking to enter the bodies of either mortals or beasts, for their power seems to be in some measure dependent upon such embodiment, but they are constantly seen to be embodied thus, according to the New Testament. A few of these passages are given here: “When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick” (Matt. 8:16); “As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil. And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake” (Matt. 9:32–33); “And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed” (Acts 8:6–7); “And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying” (Acts 16:16); “And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes. And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked

asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion: for we are many. And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea" (Mark 5:1–13).

Third: They are wicked, unclean, and vicious. Many passages might be quoted in proof of this statement. "And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way" (Matt. 8:28); "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease" (Matt. 10:1). It might be added that there seem to be degrees of wickedness represented by these spirits; for it is stated in Matthew 12:43–45 that the demon, returning to his house, "taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself."

The question is often raised whether demon possession obtains at the present time. Although the authentic records of such control are almost wholly limited to the three years of the public ministry of Jesus, it is incredible that demon possession did not exist before that time, or has not existed since. In this connection it should be remembered not only that these beings are intelligent themselves, but that they are directly governed and ordered by Satan, whose wisdom and cunning are so clearly set forth in the Scriptures. It is reasonable to conclude that they, like their monarch, are adapting the manner of their activity to the enlightenment of the age and locality. It is evident that they are not now less inclined than before to enter

and dominate a body. Demon possession in the present time is probably often unsuspected because of the generally unrecognized fact that demons are capable of inspiring a moral and exemplary life, as well as of appearing as the dominating spirit of a spiritist medium, or through the grosser manifestations that are recorded by missionaries concerning conditions which they observe in heathen lands. These demons, too, like their king, will appear as "angels of light" as well as "roaring lions," when by the former impersonation they can more perfectly further the stupendous undertakings of Satan in his warfare against the work of God.

Demon influence, like the activity of Satan, is prompted by two motives: both to hinder the purpose of God for humanity, and to extend the authority of Satan. They, therefore, at the command of their king, willingly cooperate in all his God-dishonoring undertakings. Their influence is exercised both to mislead the unsaved and to wage an unceasing warfare against the believer (Eph. 6:12).

Their motive is suggested in what is revealed by their knowledge of the authority and deity of Christ, as well as by what they know of their eternal doom. The following passages are important in this connection: "And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8:29); "And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him" (Mark 1:23–25); "And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" (Acts 19:15); "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the devils also believe, and tremble" (James 2:19).

It is in the power of demons to cause dumbness (Matt. 9:32–33), blindness (Matt. 12:22), insanity (Luke 8:26–35), personal injuries (Mark 9:18), great physical strength (Luke 8:29), and to inflict suffering and deformities (Luke 13:11–17).

There is a solemn reality in this great body of Scripture. It represents the intrusion of fallen spirits into the *cosmos.* Such an intrusion is natural since Satan is the one who has brought the *cosmos* into its present form. No one can anticipate the relief that will come to the universe when Christ will have

“put down all rule and all authority and power” (1 Cor. 15:24), and “the kingdoms of this world [*cosmos*] are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever” (Rev. 11:15).

Anthropology

Chapter XI

INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY

ANTHROPOLOGY—the science of man—is approached from two widely different angles, namely, that of human philosophy and that of the Bible. The former is extra-Biblical and avoids every feature of Scripture revelation. The latter is intra-Biblical and confines itself to the Word of God and such corroborating human experience as may give confirming witness to the truth disclosed. The one is conceived by man and, reflecting his philosophy of human life, is offered as educational discipline in secular schools of learning. The other is a revelation from God in that sense in which all Scripture originates with Him and presents a record which proud man is loathe to accept. It is indeed suggestive with respect to the attitude of modern education generally toward divine revelation that no place is accorded to revelation in its philosophies. Over against this, the Anthropology of theology, while giving due attention to that which man has asserted, embodies only such truth as God has declared in His Word. In the Bible, it will be discovered that abundant material of a positive and dependable nature is available. The Word of God presents final information on this complex theme. A still more vital distinction obtains between these widely separated anthropological disciplines. With reference to the immaterial part of man, extra-Biblical anthropology is only a penetration into the emotional and intellectual aspects of human life, or that which is psychological, while intra-Biblical anthropology enters into the deeper realms of things moral, spiritual, and eternal. Extra-Biblical anthropology assigns no place for God in matters of man's origin, career, or destiny, while intra-Biblical anthropology, being an induction of divine revelation, asserts far-reaching truths in all these fields. As a subject in modern education, anthropology, though but recently developed, claims the same importance as the kindred sciences—biology and psychology. It incorporates the theories of evolution and is materialistic in character. Aside from the underlying fact that these two anthropological disciplines deal with the study of man, there is little in common between them.

The definition of anthropology as given by *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th edition) is: “that branch of natural history which deals with the human species. … It is thus part of biology, the science of living things in general. Indeed, it was the development of biological studies during the 19th century, chiefly due to the stimulus afforded by research into the origin of species, that brought anthropology into being in its modern form.” This “modern form” of the doctrine of man, moves along two lines: (a) what man is—his natural evolution—and (b) what man does—his cultural history, his relation to material things, to himself, and to others.

The New Standard Dictionary defines the anthropology which is theological as “that branch of theological science which treats of man, both in his original and in his fallen condition. It embraces the consideration of man’s creation, primitive condition, probation and apostasy, original sin, and actual transgressions” (1913 Edition).

As Systematic Theology incorporates logically every other science, so Anthropology incorporates all that enters into man’s being—that which is material and that which is immaterial, and, were it wise so to extend it, various disciplines which are important branches of science would be included, among these much of biology and more of psychology. Because of the intricacies of the latter and its likeness to the realm of spirit existence, that which enters into psychology naturally receives the greater emphasis. At this point a crucial question arises, whether the Bible purports to teach the sciences as such. In spite of the fact that some earnest men have felt that an extended psychology can be constructed on the text of the Bible, the more conservative teachers are convinced that on the truth concerning God—His creation, and man in his relation to God—the Bible speaks with completeness and finality, but that on related themes it is accurate so far as it may have occasion to go. This is well illustrated by the science of history. Whatever appears in the Word of God of a historical nature is a true record, but it does not profess to be an exhaustive treatise on the history of the universe or world. The study of man must incorporate some important features of truth relative to what man was, what he is now, and what he may yet be. In all, a clear understanding of human realities is most essential. Concerning this field of investigation, the Bible is not wanting. In the field of nature, man occupies the central position according to the Bible.

Bearing on the claims of some men that a complete psychology can be drawn from the Bible, J. I. Marais writes:

> The extravagant claims made by some writers for a fully developed system of Biblical psychology has brought the whole subject into disrepute. So much so, that Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*) has boldly asserted that "a system of Biblical psychology has been got together without any justification for it in Scripture." At the outset, therefore, it must be borne in mind that the Bible does not present us with a systematized philosophy of man, but gives in popular form an account of human nature in all its various relationships. A reverent study of Scripture will undoubtedly lead to the recognition of a well-defined system of psychology, on which the whole scheme of redemption is based. Great truths regarding human nature are presupposed in and accepted by the Old Testament and the New Testament; stress is there laid on other aspects of truth, unknown to writers outside of revelation, and presented to us, not in the language of the schools, but in that of practical life. Man is there described as fallen and degraded, but intended by God to be raised, redeemed, renewed. From this point of view Biblical psychology must be studied, and our aim should be "to bring out the views of Scripture regarding the nature, the life and life-destinies of the soul, as they are determined in the history of salvation (Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych., 15*).—*The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, IV, 2494–95

Some have stated that the Bible presents what is no more than the psychology of ancient Jews, and others declare that in matters of nature the sacred writers were left to such human knowledge as men possessed in the day in which the Scriptures were written. Reasonably, the conception of inspiration must be adjusted to such views. C. A. Row in his Bampton Lecture, 1877, states "that inspiration was not a general but a functional endowment, and consequently limited to subjects in which religion is directly involved; and that in those which stand outside it, the writers of the different books in the Bible were left to the free use of their ordinary faculties" (cited by Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 18). It would seem that some men feel that a writer is more free to exercise his faculties when uninspired. Such suggestions imply that the Bible is not inspired in all its parts. There is no occasion to revert to these problems. This work has offered previously conclusive proof of the infallibility of the Scriptures, and the subject under consideration is no exception. *Completeness* of statement and *accuracy* of statement are two widely different ideas. Matthew Fontaine Maury—a scientist whom the world honors as "the pathfinder of the seas"—stated in an address at the laying of the corner stone of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee, in 1860 (as reported by Charles Lee Lewis in his biography of Maury):

> I have been blamed by men of science, both in this country and in England, for quoting the Bible in confirmation of the doctrines of physical geography The Bible, they say, was not written for scientific purposes, and is therefore of no authority in matters of science. I beg pardon! The Bible *is* authority for everything it touches. What would you think of the historian who should refuse to consult the historical records of the Bible, because the Bible was not written for the purposes of history? The Bible is true and science is true. The agents concerned in the physical economy of our planet are ministers of Him who made both it and the Bible. The records which He has chosen to make through the agency of these ministers of His upon the crust of the earth are as true as the records which, by the hands of His prophets and servants, He has been pleased to make in the Book of Life. They are both true; and when your men of science, with vain and hasty conceit, announce the discovery of disagreement between them, rely upon it the fault is not with the Witness or His records, but with the "worm" who essays to interpret evidence which he does not understand. When I, a pioneer in one department of this beautiful science, discover the truths of revelation and the truths of science reflecting light one upon the other and each sustaining the other, how can I, as a truth-loving, knowledge-seeking man, fail to point out the beauty and to rejoice in its discovery? Reticence on such an occasion would be sin, and were I to suppress the emotion with which such discoveries ought to stir the soul, the waves of the sea would lift up their voice, and the very stones of the earth cry out against me.—Pp. 98–99

Over against all this, the revelation regarding man as found in the Word of God extends into many fields where a man-conceived anthropology could not enter: the true manner of creation, the original estate of man, his fall, the real cause of death in the world, the new birth, the ground of a right morality, and the resurrection of the body. Extra-Biblical anthropology will be searched in vain for any reference to these themes, yet these are realities in human life and as such become determining factors in a worthy psychology.

There is, therefore, a fine discrimination to be exercised. On the one hand, the truths taught in the Bible regarding man are not guesswork and subject to the errors of men of primitive times; nor, on the other hand, are they with respect to completeness a perfect supernatural science. It is true that the Biblical account of the origin of man is described in terms employed by men of ancient days and was immediately addressed to people of that age. It is also true that expansion of doctrine follows in the train of divine revelation, but a supernatural quality obtains from first to last which harmonizes all that is said in many centuries into one consistent narrative. Men of primitive times spoke their own language to people of primitive times. The truth revealed is elevated above the level of natural facts and discloses a tact which is divine. Science of each and every age has found these sublime Biblical teachings to be outside the range of their own

restricted field of observations. The Biblical expressions of truth concerning the origin of man and his place on the earth, though formed in the age in which they were written, have served perfectly as vehicles of thought in all human history. In each age, the science of its time has imposed its ever-shifting notions relative to origin upon theology, and it has been the burden of theology in each age to rid itself of the ghosts of defunct philosophical and scientific opinions of a preceding age. It is indicated clearly that the objective before the writers of the Scriptures was not science, but it was theology. The early church was soon dragged down with Platonic philosophy and with Aristotle's doctrine of the soul. Such a situation characterized medieval centuries. It is the conceit of man which contends that the divine account of the origin of things is true only so far as it conforms to the science of his own day. If the science of today runs true to the course set for it by earlier generations—and why should it fail to do so?—it will be discarded by the scientists themselves; yet the Word of God will abide unchanged. The future of human opinion will modify the Word of God with no more success than has the past. Literally, science may come and science may go, but the Word of God goes on forever.

Chapter XII

The Origin of Man

The answer to the problem of the origin of man is of immeasurable importance, for upon its answer depends the whole structure of Anthropology. Of necessity, man's nature, responsibility, and destiny are determined by the fundamental fact of his essential being as created. Two systems of thought—one a pure supposition, the other a revelation—purport to answer the question of man's origin. The supposition—the evolutionary theory—is a speculation, conjecture, and assumption, which is the best solution the unregenerate or spiritually unenlightened, finite mind can construct. The revelation embodies a series of truths which are harmonious and reasonable, if the Person, purpose, and power of the Creator are recognized. These two systems of thought should be weighed separately.

I. The Evolutionary Theory

Analysis of this hypothesis has been included in the preceding volume of this work under naturalistic theism; therefore, an extended discourse on this theme may be eliminated at this point. Had they anything which they were willing to put in its place, thinking men would not tolerate a system which offers not one proof for any claim which it advances. The act of bringing man into being is an achievement of stupendous proportions. To make man to be the result of an accidental evolutionary process springing from some supposed primordial germ—which germ itself cannot be accounted for apart from a Creator—and all this as a pure imaginative fancy without so much as a shadow of substance on which it may rest for proof, bears all the marks of mental desperation and bankruptcy of ideas. Yet these undemonstrable notions are passed over upon the world under the patronage of education and science. To the unregenerate mind, to which God is wholly lacking in reality, the problem of origin is not solved by the statement that God created man. How desperately unreal that revelation is to all such may be measured by the farcical dogma which men substitute in its place. It would be revealing to such teachers if, having aroused all the humility and

sincerity that is latent in their beings, they would inquire *why* they reject God as Creator.

Evolution, considered abstractly, is presented in two different forms. It may be *naturalistic*, contending that by "natural selection" and the "survival of the fittest" the varied forms of animate things came to be what they are as a result of fortuitous arrangement. On the other hand, theistic evolution —that system which seeks to retain some recognition of God by making Him the original cause, while embracing a supposed evolutionary process as the *method* by which God developed man from the original cell He had created—is not only unproved and unreasonable, but is a dishonor to God. God states in the Book, in which alone all conceptions of His Being have their source, the precise method He employed in the creation of man. To disregard this revelation and substitute a groundless human fiction in its place is to accuse God of untruth and to reject a plain Scripture with the liberty granted to others to reject every other page of the Bible if their unbelief so dictates. The divine method of creation is constantly reappearing in the text of the Bible and precisely in accord with that first disclosed in Genesis (cf. Matt. 19:4; Rom. 5:12–19; 1 Cor. 15:45–49; 1 Tim. 2:13). The efforts men make to explain away the works of God seem too often to be an attempt to hinder others from any belief in God. The record God has given is worthy of Him. Those who treat the record with contempt treat God with the same contempt, despising divine counsels and rejecting divine grace. The one who embraces the theory of animal ancestry dishonors both God and himself.

Beyond its insult to God and man and beyond its unpardonable and indefensible failure to offer scientific proof for its bold assertions, is the moral effect of this antigod hypothesis. It is not contended that evolution as a system teaches immorality directly; it is declared, however, that this pagan philosophy, being destitute of God who is the only source of moral ideals, cannot engender any moral impulse. As certainly as God created man, so certainly man sustains an inherent moral responsibility to be like God in conduct, as man is like God by creation. God has made a reasonable command to His human creatures: "Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Pet. 1:16; cf. Matt. 5:48). The human creature's welfare is not only designed by God but is to be executed to His glory. On this ground all moral conduct is based, for there is no other basis on which it could rest. Man's actions are

right when conformed to the character of God, and wrong when not conformed to the character of God. No other basis for a distinction between good and evil exists. On the other hand, if man is the product of natural forces, then he has as much responsibility along moral lines as natural forces demand and no more. If God and His Word are eliminated, as the evolutionary hypothesis eliminates them, then men may look to tadpoles for their moral ideals, and truth is without a foundation, the holiness of angels is a fiction, and the corruption of the devil is a libel, being an advertisement of that which does not exist. It is to be expected that animalism will creep into society and into schools where this antigod system is upheld. If society and schools retain some moral ideals in spite of their antigod philosophy, it is no more than the fast-waning moral momentum of a preceding, God-honoring generation. Off, indeed, to a poor start would the Bible with its heaven-high conceptions of conduct be, if the baseless assertions of the evolutionary hypothesis were substituted for the sublime account of creation.

Beyond the natural government of God which He exercises over material creation and over living things as parts of His orderly arrangement, there is an exercise of moral discipline which applies to rational beings, both angelic and human. These must consider the difference between good and evil. Such a difference and such a moral government are eliminated when God is eliminated.

That form of modernism which embraces human theories and rejects revelation is incapable of forming a theology, and its avowed abhorrence for things doctrinal is a witness against it. Often, indeed, must one turn to the Scripture which declares, “Let God be true, but every man a liar” (Rom. 3:4).

The certitude which now characterizes those who embrace the evolutionary theory is well reflected in the opening paragraph of the article on *evolution of man* found in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which reads:

> The late Sir E. B. Tylor, writing on the evolutionary theory of man’s origin, made the following statement: “In one form or another such a theory of human descent has, in our time, become part of an accepted framework of zoology, if not as a demonstrable truth, at any rate as a working hypothesis which has no effective rival.” When Sir Edward Tylor made this statement in 1910 he was in his 78th year; his memory could carry him back to a time when

> it was believed that man had come into the world as a special creation some 4,000 years before the birth of Christ and owed no kinship to other living things. He was 27 years of age when Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published in 1859; in 1865, two years after Huxley had issued his renowned treatise on *Man's Place in Nature*, he himself published a work which threw a new light on human history, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization.* When Darwin's *Descent of Man* came out in 1871, Tylor's *Primitive Culture; Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Custom*, kept it company. By the end of the 19th century he had seen chair after chair in the universities of the world filled by men who were convinced that evolution was true; at his death in 1917, at the age of 85, he had seen another generation of enquirers grow up who, after applying Darwin's teaching to all departments of man's world—to his body, mind and culture—remained convinced that, as a working hypothesis, the doctrine of evolution had no rival.—XIV, 758

Thus it is admitted by Sir E. B. Tylor that the evolutionary theory is at least a working hypothesis if it be not a demonstrable truth.

The likeness of man's physical constitution to that of the higher form of animals is fully asserted and included in the Genesis account, but those who hold the evolutionary theory seize upon these similarities as though they belonged exclusively to that theory. This is illustrated by the first paragraph of the "summary of the evidence" included in the same article quoted above: "No matter what aspect of man the student of to-day may select for study, the conviction that evolution (*q.v.*) is true is forced on him. If he investigates the development of the child in the womb he comes across a complicated series of appearances which can be explained only if Darwin's teaching is accepted."

In the matter of fossil forms, the most unprovable items are set forth with a prejudice in favor of the evolutionary theory, which is wholly detrimental to the theory advanced. Under *Palaeontology* and as *evidence*, this same article asserts: "In recently formed strata of the earth fossil forms of man are found; those from the older strata are more apelike than those from the newer. In still older strata are found fossil fragments of great anthropoids; in still more ancient, the remains of small anthropoids; deeper still in the earth's records no trace of anthropoid has yet been discovered. In these older strata occur fossil remains of small monkey-like primates. The geological records, so far as they are yet known, support Darwin's theory of man's origin; they are altogether against the belief that man appeared suddenly—by a special act of creation."

Here the writer, above quoted, admits a complete contradiction of the Genesis account. So far as fossil forms go, none more impressive have been found than those of the so-called *Pithecanthropus erectus*. Of this the same writer states:

> The discovery which throws most light on the evolutionary progress of man was made in Java during 1891–92 by Prof. Eugène Dubois, then a surgeon in the colonial military service, and later professor of geology in the University of Amsterdam. In a stratum which contained the fossil bones of many extinct species of animals he obtained five fragments of a strange kind of being, one of which he regarded as a transitional form between man and ape—a real missing link. He named it *Pithecanthropus erectus*, and assigned it to a separate family of primates—one lying on the borderline between anthropoids and man. … The five fossil fragments found were: a skull cap which outwardly had the form which might be expected in a giant form of gibbon, a left thigh bone and three teeth. The most distant of the fragments were 20 paces apart. Later he added a sixth fragment—part of a lower jaw found in another part of the island but in a stratum of the same geological age. The skull cap is flat, low and has great eyebrow ridges; its characters are more simian than human, yet when Prof. Dubois succeeded in obtaining a cast from the interior of the skull cap, that cast bore on it the convolutionary pattern of the brain of Pithecanthropus, and that pattern proved to be altogether human. Pithecanthropus, the fossil man of Java, had a brain which was smaller, simpler and infinitely more primitive than that of the lowest living men.

After a section enlarging on the probable size and capacity of the brain of this supposed human being, the writer concludes:

> Pithecanthropus was assigned by Prof. Dubois, on reliable evidence, to a date late in the Pliocene period; others on weighing the evidence suppose that he lived early in the Pleistocene period. If we accept the duration of the Pleistocene as 250,000 years, and regard Pithecanthropus as representing the evolutionary stage reached by mankind at the beginning of this period, then we have to conclude that man's body had become adapted to its peculiar posture and gait before the end of the Pliocene period, and that the higher development of the brain took place in the ensuing Pleistocene period. … Are we to regard Pithecanthropus as man or as ape? The answer is that he was human because of the following reasons. In point of size and conformation, his brain attained almost the lowest limit of modern or Neanthropic man; his posture and mode of progression were human; his hands and arms were freed from locomotion; his teeth fall within range of human variation. Pithecanthropus represents one of the dawn forms of humanity, and with his discovery it became possible to affirm that man's antiquity could be carried back with certainty to the close of the Pliocene period. It is not unlikely that higher forms than Pithecanthropus were evolved before the end of the Pliocene period; the stage reached by Pilt-down man early in the Pleistocene period supports such an inference. A consideration of all the evidence leads us to expect that the fossil remains of emerging primitive man have to be sought for in strata of the Pliocene period, and those of emerging Neanthropic man in deposits of the Pleistocene.

That credulity which grasps at five or six "fossil fragments" which expose no more than a skull cap, a thigh bone, and three teeth, and these

scattered apart by a distance of twenty paces, or sixty feet, and which declares this to be “the discovery which throws most light on the evolutionary progress of man” can hardly be taken seriously. Educated men would not try thus to stand on the shadow of a shadow were they able by any spiritual vision to enthrone God in His place as Creator. It still remains true in spite of five or six “fossil fragments” separated in their location by sixty feet (and would not that power be welcome which wrought before Ezekiel’s vision when “bones came together, bone to his bone”?), that God created man in His own image. Some men evidently prefer the *image* of the ape, but there are those still who prefer the *image* of God.

II. Revelation

Man is created in the “image” and “likeness” of God and God alone is equal to this stupendous task. In His Word, God does not impose puerile and absurd notions upon man’s credulity. He assigns a sufficient and reasonable Cause for all things when He declares that He is the Creator. A marvelous array of harmonious truth is compressed into the first two chapters of the Bible. Here is a record from God declaring the existing relationship between the Creator and the human creature. No other literature in the world is so replete with direct revelation which is calculated to inform the mind of man and to guide scientific research as are these first pages of the Bible. This portion of the Scriptures has drawn out an incomparable body of literature both constructive and critical, yet the text abides unchanged and is now as satisfying to the devout mind as ever it has been.

The fact that the creation of man is given in two narratives—one in each of the two opening chapters of Genesis—has caused much discussion. Again a strong emphasis is imposed by a second rehearsal and on a theme that, in the light of human unbelief, doubtless demands this pronounced amplification. Certain variations, however, are to be seen in these accounts, and, as so often in the Bible, both accounts are needed to complete the record. The first is general; the second introduces details which, had they been incorporated into the first, would have marred its majestic rhythm and symmetry. According to the first account, the man and the woman are alike the direct creation of God (1:26–27); but in the second account, it is stated

that the man was first brought into being, having been formed from the dust of the ground, and the woman is taken from the man by a special divine arrangement which resulted in the same completeness of being (2:7, 21–25). According to the first narrative, man in his creation is closely related to the animals which are of three classes—"the beast of the earth," "cattle," "and every thing that creepeth upon the earth"— but, in the second account, no more is said of these than that they are true to their kind. However, of man it is three times stated in one verse and as a part of the first account that God created man (1:27). This tremendous emphasis follows immediately upon the solemn and formal declaration that it was God's *purpose* to create man (1:26). The emphatic nature of repetition is to be seen again in the fact that man is three times said to be made in the *image* of God (1:26–27). Language, as employed in the Word of God, can be no more insistent than it is when it asserts three times that God created man directly, and three times that He created man in His own image. Any human philosophy which denies these determining averments is not choosing one of two doubtful opinions about what God has said; it cuts squarely through the most emphatic truth God has ever revealed to man and implies that God is untrue to that degree. Though such wickedness be sustained by all the pseudo-scholarship of the world, it is still false to the final degree and belongs to the bold antigod character of the one who first contradicted God by saying, "Ye shall not surely die" (cf. Gen. 2:17 with 3:4). The first record of man's creation chronicles with sublime simplicity a most difficult theme, namely, that man shares the animal existence and yet in a special sense is made in the likeness of God, and it is in every instance said to be the triune *Elohim* who thus creates. In the added detail which characterizes the second record, it is declared that man and woman are alike on the physical side, having been made either directly—as in the case of the man—or indirectly—as in the case of the woman—from the dust of the ground. At this point the science of chemistry as represented in the human body is introduced. Macdonald in his *Creation and the Fall*, p. 326, states: "It is well known that the animal body is composed, in the inscrutable manner called *organization*, of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, lime, iron, sulphur, and phosphorus, substances which in their various combinations form a large part of the solid ground" (cited by Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 280). It is probable, also, that this earthly origin of man's body

accounts for the fact that he is named *Adam*, which may be from *ʾădḥāmāh*, meaning ‘ground.’ A more distinguishing feature of man’s being, as recorded in connection with his creation, is the truth that God breathed into him the breath of lives (lit., plural). Of this F. Delitzsch writes: “It is not merely the general life principle imparted to the world which individualizes itself in man, but that God breathes directly into the nostrils of man the fulness of His personality, … that in a manner corresponding to the personality of God, man may become a living soul” (cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 283). Out of all these facts so simply stated in these two chapters, almost endless doctrinal truth has been developed.

The general comparison of the two creation narratives is summed up by John Laidlaw in *The Bible Doctrine of Man* (Cunningham Lectures, pp. 35–37) thus:

> At all events, the relation of the two accounts becomes very clear when we place them side by side. The first may be called cosmical, the second physiological. The former is the generic account of man’s creation—of man the race, the ideal; the latter is the production of the actual man, of the historic Adam. The former spoke of the creative *fiat* which called man into existence; this speaks of the plastic process through which the Creator formed both man and woman—him from the dust of the ground, her from the bone and flesh of man. The former spoke of them as to their type—in the image of God; this, of the element in which that type was realized—a material frame, informed by a divinely-inbreathed spirit. The former spoke of mankind at the head of the creatures, ruling over the earth and them; this speaks of the home provided for him, the work committed to him, the relationships formed for him, and, finally, of the moral law under which he was placed in his relation to God. And no unbiassed reader can see anything but unity in these two accounts—a real and reasonable harmony, as distinguished from literal or verbal dovetailing; nor can we doubt that the master hand which knit into that marvellous whole —the book of Genesis—various paragraphs of precious tradition, enshrining the highest spiritual truth, has placed these two accounts of the creation of man side by side for the mutual light which they shed on each other without absolute contact, and certainly without contradiction. The results of this twofold biblical account of man’s becoming are clear, definite, and intelligible. His origin is not emanation, but creation—formation out of existing materials on the one side of his nature, out of the blessed fulness of the divine life on the other. His becoming is in the line of the natural order of animated beings, but at its climax. His position among them is central and supreme, but his nature stands distinguished from them all in that it is formed after the divine image.

According to this and all other parts of the Bible, Adam is as real a person as any that ever lived on earth, and is in no way an inferior man. Huxley stated that the oldest human skeleton could easily be the remains of a philosopher, and Dana admitted human speculation was without evidence

for its foundation. Thus, also, Darwin said that the gap between the animal world and man was amazing.

The one and only "workable theory" for the origin of man is that advanced by the Creator Himself and this event in creation need not be restricted with respect to its date to the time which accepted chronology has fixed. The history of man on the earth may easily be more than the supposed six thousand years and with no violence to the testimony of the Sacred Text. Whether it be at one time or another, it remains true that God created man immediately and directly. On this premise all Scripture advances and apart from it the testimony of the Creator is abjured.

III. The Time of Man's Origin

Regarding the time of man's origin, various groups of scientists are properly challenged: the historian with his concern for facts relative to early peoples and nations, the distinction between races and the possibility of a common origin; the philologist with his problem of the origin of language in the light of its present varied forms; the archaeologist and the geologist with the evidence they offer for the antiquity of man. What these men assert about the age of the human family varies to such a degree that all claims to infallibility are shattered. Disagreement among authorities has no tendency to engender belief or to establish dependable data. A general contention arises which claims that man has lived much longer on the earth than the date 4004 B.C., estimated by Archbishop Usher. These imperative demands of modern scientists deserve candid consideration on the part of theologians. The question may be asked whether conservative theology is committed to the dates which are based on the Usher chronology. On this problem of chronology, Dr. Miley has written:

> It is well known that biblical chronology remains, as it ever has been, an open question. Individuals may have been very positive respecting the exact years of the great epochal events in the world's history, but there is no common concurrence in such a view. The profoundest students of the question find different measures of time, not varying so widely as between scientists, yet sufficiently to be of value in the adjustment of the seeming issue with facts of science. The leading views are well known and easily stated. The origin of man preceded the advent of our Lord by 4,004 years, as reckoned by Usher on the ground of the Hebrew Scriptures; by 5,411 years, as reckoned by Hales on the ground of the Septuagint Version. Here is a margin of 1,407 years, which might cover many facts of science respecting the presence of man in the world, and bring them into harmony with biblical chronology. The

acceptance of this reckoning requires no cunning device. While through the Vulgate Version the shorter period gained ascendency in the Western Church, in the Eastern the longer period prevailed. With the whole Church it has been quite as common; and, while a lower estimate than that of Usher has rarely been made, a longer reckoning than that of Hales has not been rare. The uncertainty of biblical chronology is of special value in its adjustment to the reasonable claims of science respecting the time of man's origin. That uncertainty is no recent assumption, no mere device which the exigency of an issue with science has forced upon biblical chronologists, but has long been felt and openly expressed. The many different and widely varying results of the most careful reckoning witness to the uncertainty of the data upon which that reckoning proceeds. The tables of genealogy are the chief data in the case, and their aim is to trace the lines of descent, not to mark the succession of years. Hence the line of connection is not always traced immediately from father to son, but often the transition is to a descendant several generations later—which answers just as well for the ruling purpose, however it may perplex the question of time. "Thus in Gen. 46:18, after recording the sons of Zilpa, her grandsons and her great-grandsons, the writer adds, 'These are the sons of Zilpa, … and these she bare unto Jacob, even sixteen souls.' The same thing recurs in the case of Bilha, verse 25, '*she* bare these unto Jacob: all the souls were seven.' Compare verses 15, 22. No one can pretend that the author of this register did not use the term understandingly of descendants beyond the first generation. In like manner, according to Matt. 1:11, Josias begat his grandson Jechonias, and verse 8, Joram begat his great-grandson Ozias. And in Gen. 10:15–18, Canaan, the grandson of Noah, is said to have begotten several whole nations, the Jebusite, the Amorite, the Girgasite, the Hivite, etc. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than that, in the usage of the Bible, 'to bear' and 'to beget' are used in a wide sense to indicate descent, without restricting this to the immediate offspring" (Green: *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso*, p. 132). It would be easy to give many other instances of a like presentation of facts. Such facts justify the prevalent uncertainty respecting biblical chronology. Indeed, the tables which furnish the chief data for its construction are purely genealogical, and in no proper sense chronological. With such uncertainty of data, no biblical chronology can have either fixed limits or doctrinal claim. It follows that the usual reckoning may be so extended as to meet any reasonable requirement of scientific facts respecting the time of man's origin, without the perversion of any part of Scripture or the violation of any law of hermeneutics. Such are the views of theologians thoroughly orthodox in creed and most loyal to the Scriptures.—*Systematic Theology,* I, 359–61

With respect to his beginning, man is the most recent of all creatures; and in spite of the fact that scientists are wont to talk in terms of vast ages when dealing with the problem of human life on the earth—especially the evolutionist whose assumption depends so completely on the whole matter of origin being buried in the oblivion of an incomprehensible past—the reasonable extension of human history back several thousand years beyond the dates proposed by Usher—which extension does not conflict, as before stated, with the Biblical record—allows sufficient time for all justified

contentions of the historian, the geologist, the archaeologist, and the philologist.

When considering the claims of the geologist and the archaeologist, Dr. Miley (*op. cit.*, I, 363–65) quotes at length from a scientist of his day to whose findings no material facts have been added in this generation. The quotation is reproduced here in full:

> The calculations of long time based on the gravels of the Somme, on the cone of the Tinière, on the peat-bogs of France and Denmark, on certain cavern deposits, have all been shown to be more or less at fault; and possibly none of these reach further back than six or seven thousand years which, according to Dr. Andrews, have elapsed since the close of the bowlder-clay deposits in America. … Let us look at a few facts. Much use has been made of the "cone" or delta of the Tinière, on the eastern side of the Lake of Geneva, as an illustration of the duration of the modern period. This little stream has deposited at its mouth a mass of *débris* carried down from the hills. This being cut through by a railway, is found to contain Roman remains to a depth of four feet, bronze implements to a depth of ten feet, stone implements to a depth of nineteen feet. The deposit ceased about three hundred years ago, and, calculating 1,300 to 1,500 years for the Roman period, we should have 7,000 to 10,000 years as the age of the cone. But before the formation of the present cone another had been formed twelve times as large. Thus for the two cones together a duration of more than 90,000 years is claimed. It appears, however, that this calculation has been made irrespective of two essential elements in the question. No allowance has been made for the fact that the inner layers of a cone are necessarily smaller than the outer; nor for the further fact that the older cone belongs to a distinct time (the pluvial age already referred to), when the rainfall was much larger, and the transporting power of the torrent greater in proportion. Making allowance for these conditions, the age of the newer cone, that holding human remains, falls between 4,000 and 5,000 years. The peat-bed of Abbeville, in the north of France, has grown at the rate of one and a half or two inches in a century. Being twenty-six feet in thickness, the time occupied in its growth must have amounted to 20,000 years; and yet it is probably newer than some of the gravels on the same river containing flint implements. But the composition of the Abbeville peat shows that it is a forest peat, and the erect stems preserved in it prove that in the first instance it must have grown at the rate of about three feet in a century, and after the destruction of the forest its rate of increase down to the present time diminished rapidly almost to nothing. Its age is thus reduced to perhaps less than 4,000 years. In 1865 I had an opportunity to examine the now celebrated gravels of St. Acheul, on the Somme, by some supposed to go back to a very ancient period. With the papers of Prestwick and other able observers in my hand, I could conclude merely that the undisturbed gravels were older than the Roman period, but how much older only detailed topographical surveys could prove; and that taking into account the probabilities of a different level of the land, a wooded condition of the country, a greater rainfall, and a glacial filling of the Somme valley with clay and stones subsequently cut out by running water, the gravels could scarcely be older than the Abbeville peat. … Taylor and Andrews have, however, I think, subsequently shown that my impressions were correct. In like manner, I fail to perceive—and I think all American geologists acquainted with the prehistoric monuments of the western continent must agree with me—any evidence of great antiquity in the caves of Belgium and England, the kitchen-middens of Denmark, the rock-shelters of France, the lake-habitations of

> Switzerland. At the same time, I would disclaim all attempt to resolve their dates into precise terms of years. I may merely add that the elaborate and careful observations of Dr. Andrews on the raised beaches of Lake Michigan—observations of a much more precise character than any which, in so far as I know, have been made of such deposits in Europe—enable him to calculate the time which has elapsed since North America rose out of the waters of the glacial period as between 5,500 and 7,500 years. This fixes at least the possible duration of the human period in North America, though I believe there are other lines of evidence which would reduce the residence of man in America to a much shorter time. Longer periods have, it is true, been deduced from the delta of the Mississippi and the gorge of Niagara; but the deposits of the former have been found by Hilgard to be in great part marine, and the excavation of the latter began at a period probably long anterior to the advent of man.— Dawson, *Story of the Earth and Man*, pp. 292–96

Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., in his book *The Pentateuch Vindicated*, page 128, says:

> It must not be forgotten that there is an element of uncertainty in a computation of time which rests upon genealogies as the sacred chronology so largely does. Who is to certify us that the antediluvian and ante-Abrahamic genealogies have not been condensed in the same manner as the post-Abrahamic. If Matthew omitted names from the ancestry of our Lord in order to equalize the three great periods over which he passes, may not Moses have done the same in order to bring out seven generations from Adam to Enoch, and ten from Adam to Noah? Our current chronology is based upon the *prima facie* impression of these genealogies. This we shall adhere to until we shall see good reason for giving it up. But if these recently discovered indications of the antiquity of man, over which scientific circles are now so excited, shall, when carefully inspected and thoroughly weighed, demonstrate all that any have imagined they might demonstrate, what then? They will simply show that the popular chronology is based upon a wrong interpretation, and that a select and partial register of ante-Abrahamic names has been mistaken for a complete one.— Cited by A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, p. 297

The philologist, beginning with the supposition that man originated his own language, contends that vast ages are required to accomplish this end and adds to this even more ages for the development of language into its present varied forms. This theory ignores the Biblical account. There is the best of reason for believing that man was created with the ability to speak and to understand speech. Adam was created as mature in mind as he was in body. That he employed language from the beginning of his consciousness is indicated in the Genesis account. The Genesis account also records that, after a period in which man had but one language on the earth, God directly and purposely confounded all language with its attending results to this day (Gen. 11:5–9). If these records are accepted, the claims of the philologist are unimportant.

Similarly, the argument of the historian concerning the extended time required for the development from one original stock of peoples and nations of widely different physical features, fails to consider the divine record. The variation in nations led Agassiz to contend that each division of the race was separately created. This theory held by Agassiz, though without a basis, does aim at the solution of a problem which science has never solved. The Biblical record asserts that, whatever may have been the drift of human characteristics before the flood, the race was reduced to one family and from that limited stock the present population of the earth sprang. The testimony of Genesis 10:32, which reads, “These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood,” is exceedingly clear about the origin of nations. God caused heads of nations to be born of Noah’s line. To what extent this may have gone, no information is given. It is enough to know that, according to the Word of God, the problem of different nations emerging from a common stock is accounted for in this passage. That God could found races from individual men is proved in the more recent case of Abraham and the Hebrew people. Originally Abraham was of the common stock of the citizens of Ur, yet from him God caused the most identified race of the earth to come forth, to say nothing of Ishmael and the distinctive people he engendered.

In addition to such racial features as it has pleased God to establish by direct control, is the truth that human types and characteristics are ever changing under the force of various influences; but above all this, the human family is unchangeable. It retains its unity and physical structure, exhibiting the same capacities, the same moral and religious nature. Parts of the race may sink into heathenism, or go the way of the highest revelation; yet the facts and forms of human reality cannot change. There are no hybrid restrictions between the most distant races. This alone asserts the unity of the human family. Neither *polygenism* —which contends that there have been separate creations for each of the distinct species—nor *pre-adamitism* —which asserts that humanity existed before Adam and that he was the head only of a specific stock— has any support in the Scriptures.

When men reject the Bible and seek to find their way through the problems of human life, their gropings are of little value, though they may

be sincere. The Bible discloses that which God would have man know. “Through faith we understand” (Heb. 11:3).

Chapter XIII

The Material Part of Man at Creation

Having given some consideration to the controversy between the two systems which essay to solve the problem of human origin, this work proceeds on the assured ground that man came from the hand of his Creator in precisely the manner that is set forth in the infallible Oracles of Truth. There is therefore another consideration to be attended, namely, man's estate at creation. Here no complications arise other than the right understanding of the Sacred Text. The evolutionary theory is unable to give any worthy record of man's first estate. In that system supposed interminable ages are depended upon to create an oblivion from which nothing definite could be expected. It is logical enough, having begun with nothing, to end with nothing. If the idea of man's endless existence be borrowed from the Bible, it must be asserted that it is only the man whom God has created that endures forever. The man of supposed natural origin has no more worthy destiny than his assumed beginning. Concerning him there is no dependable information. The system which by its arrogation brands God as a liar in matters of human origin, should find a logical destiny for its fictitious characters without drawing upon revelation. Systematic Theology is concerned only with the truth which the Bible records, and with respect to man the Bible presents a wide field of harmonious facts to be considered and from these, definite conclusions may be drawn.

The twofold nature of man's being—that which is material and that which is immaterial—is determined in the very way in which man was created. It is written: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils [*i.e.*, face] the breath of lives [lit., plural]; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). Thus the material part of man was formed in all its completeness from the dust of the ground, lacking only that from God which gave life. That breath from God was a rational soul and spirit, which was as far removed from other forms of life that are in the world as God is removed from His creation. This inbreathing was an endless life—a life not subject to death, even though, as a penalty for sin,

the body dies. Such is the character and duration of God-breathed human life. This inbreathed life is not to be confused with “the gift of God [which] is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 6:23). The latter is the inbreathing of regeneration and is freely bestowed upon all who believe to the saving of the soul. The Word of God records three divine inbreathings: (a) that by which man became a living soul with an eternal existence, whether it be in weal or woe; (b) the inbreathing into the disciples of the Holy Spirit by the resurrected Christ (John 20:22); and (c) the inbreathing of the Word of God, which is its inspiration (2 Tim. 3:16).

The truth respecting man’s being may be divided somewhat naturally into seven main divisions, namely, (a) the material part of man, (b) the immaterial part of man, (c) the environment of the first man, (d) the responsibility of the first man, (e) the moral qualities of the first man, (f) the tempter of the first man, and (g) the temptation of the first man.

Combining in himself that which is material—a physical body—and that which is immaterial—a soul and spirit—man is thus related in two directions—to substance and to spirit existence. Animals, it is true, partake of similar dual factors; but their immaterial part is but a form of created life, and in their material part, while similar in many respects to man—possessing flesh, bones, nerves, brain, blood, vital organs, and powers of procreation—the refinements of the human body are lacking. The body of a brute is adapted to the activities of the brute, while the body of man is adapted to his participation in art, science, literature, and mechanics. It is evident that the human body provides a medium for sensation, ecstasy, and pain corresponding to the exalted character of human nature, as in contrast to the less exalted requirements of animal life. Much that is germane to the present phase of this discussion has been considered earlier under the anthropological argument for the existence of God. The body of man and the body of the animal exhibit the thought and design of the Creator; but the body of man, being more delicate and refined, is an imposing and impressive manifestation of the divine purpose.

I. The Structural Character of the Human Body

With its incomparable, sublime simplicity, the Word of God declares that God formed man’s body from the dust of the ground. Chemically, this is

true. One scientific authority states that sixteen elements of the soil are represented in the human body. These he enumerates as follows: calcium, carbon, chlorine, fluorine, hydrogen, iodine, iron, magnesium, manganese, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, potassium, silicon, sodium, sulphur. The vital minerals are calcium, iron, potassium, magnesia, sodium, and silicon. All of these minerals are present in organic form and compose nearly six per cent of the body, the remainder being of water, carbon, and gases. Though no mineral in its inorganic form can be assimilated by the human body, when transformed from inorganic to organic form by their absorption into vegetation or being broken down by chemical action, they are then prepared to take their place in the human body. Thus it may be seen that the testimony of science reiterates the Biblical disclosure that the human body is “of the earth, earthy” (1 Cor. 15:47–49), and the spirit of man, like a “treasure,” is contained in “earthen vessels” (2 Cor. 4:7).

By a marvelous function of the human body, which belongs to the process of life, the body of a normal living person is constantly casting off and taking on its own elements. The child grows and the body of a mature person is sustained by unceasing appropriation of new materials which come directly or indirectly from the dust of the ground. To some degree, the growing and sustaining of the body is a continuation of the first creative undertaking when God formed the body from the dust of the ground.

Of solemn import are the words which assert that man’s body returns to the dust from which it was originally derived. Of this dissolution it is written: “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” (Gen. 3:19).

So adapted is the body to the purposes and functions of the immaterial man that he in no wise becomes conscious of any separation between the body and the soul. All ecstasy, pain, sensation, or ability which expresses itself in and through the body is identified as one’s own person and as belonging to one’s own self. In a most exceptional spiritual experience, the Apostle declares of himself, “Whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth” (2 Cor. 12:2).

Though material and immaterial parts of man are often set over against each other and reference is made to them as component parts of man’s being, man is, nevertheless, a unity—one being—and the material and

immaterial can be separated only by physical death. There is a psychology which treats man as an integer, a monad, and asserts that the immaterial part of man is not the man, nor is the material part the man; but that he is the *tertium quid* of both elements united. Naturally, there is a ground on which this thesis might rest, but the Bible definitely and constantly separates these two factors in man's being. The logical conclusion of this psychology is that death is the end of man's existence since the body so obviously ceases to function and decays, and that man's immaterial part, being, as supposed, inseparable from the body, must suffer the same fate. Over against this, the Scriptures teach with clearness that man, though a unity, is composed of separable parts. While the immaterial part of man resides in the body, the sense of unity is all that man experiences. At death these elements are separated for a season, only to be reunited in God's appointed time and way. It is thus demonstrated that those two parts are separable.

J. B. Heard in his book *Tripartite Nature of Man* (pp. 58–59) declares:

> We are advancing in the right direction when we maintain the separate existence of the mind and body, and yet regard the former as perfectly pervading the latter, nay, as being the formative principle by which it is constructed and adapted to our nature and use. The goal to which modern research is tending is the point where the old dualism between mind and body will not disappear, but combine instead under some higher law of unity which we have not as yet grasped. Physiology and psychology will not stand contrasted then as they do now, but rather appear as the two sides of the same thing seen in its outward and inward aspect. The resurrection of the body, which at present is a stumbling-block to the spiritualists and foolishness to materialists, will then be found to be the wisdom of God as well as the power of God, and so the Scripture intimations of the unity of man's true nature in one person will be abundantly vindicated. According to Scripture, the body is neither the slave of the soul nor its prison-house, as philosophy, with its dualistic views of body and mind, has constantly taught. The relation of the two may be described as sacramental; the body is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual mind. The mind is not seated in one part of the body, but in the whole; it does not employ one class of organs only, but all. Hence the well-known Hebraism, "All my bones shall praise Thee;" and the other expression, "Naphshi," which we render as "My soul," but which might be better expressed "Myself." The entire nature of the mind breathing through the entire body.—Cited by Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, pp. 303–4

In 1876 St. George Mivart wrote in *Lessons From Nature:*

> The lesson, then, concerning man, which we seem to gather from nature as revealed to us in our own consciousness and as externally observed, is that man differs fundamentally from every other creature which presents itself to our senses. That he differs absolutely, and therefore differs in origin also. Although a strict unity, one material whole with one form or force (not made of two parts mutually acting, according to the vulgar notion of soul and

> body), yet he is seen to be a compound unity in which two distinct orders of being unite. He is manifestly "animal," with the reflex functions, feelings, desires, and emotions of an animal. Yet equally manifest is it that he has a special nature "looking before and after," which constitutes him "rational." Ruling, comprehending, interpreting, and completing much in nature, we also see in him that which manifestly points above nature. We see this, since we know that he can conceive mind indefinitely augmented in power, and devoid of those limitations and imperfections it exhibits in him. Manifestly a contemplation of nature must be futile indeed which neglects to ponder over those ideas of power, wisdom, purpose, goodness, and will which are revealed to him in and by his own nature as he knows it to exist, and therefore as conceivably existing in a far higher form in that vast universe of being of which he is a self-conscious fragment.—Pp. 190–91, cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 305

The fact that the Old Testament contains no distinctive word for the body of man suggests the limitations in earlier revelations on that doctrine. This, however, is in harmony with the progress of doctrine observable along many specific lines. The Old Testament does refer to the soul as a particular part of man and to portions of the body as members in particular. James asserts that "the body without the spirit is dead" (2:26), but this implies that these features—body and spirit—are capable of being separated. So the Apostle states: "Whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: … We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:6–8). The Apostle also likens the body to that which is "outward" and the soul and spirit to that which is "inward." He writes: "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day" (2 Cor. 4:16). And Peter's personal testimony is as definite: "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance" (2 Pet. 1:13–15). Christ gave an arresting warning which incorporates the same truth: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). By these and many similar Scriptures the proof is offered that man is a unified *ego* while he is "at home" in the body; yet not so unified that his essential elements cannot be identified, or, under certain circumstances, be separated.

The human body was injured by the fall. To what extent it is now injured, none can fully estimate. It became a dying, death-doomed body.

The fact that, as it was originally created, it possessed vital organs and was self-sustained as the body is now sustained, indicates that, apart from such protection and support as God may have provided, the original or unfallen body was capable of death. Death was not then inevitable, though it was possible. God imposed the sentence of death—death in all its forms—upon the first man and through him upon the race (Rom. 5:12) as a penalty for sin. As first created man was not subject to death; yet, because of sin, man became a dying creature. Though life is ever constructing the body, death is ever destroying and with the certainty in view, apart from those who experience the rapture and thus do not die, that death will win the conflict. "It is appointed unto men once to die" (Heb. 9:27).

II. The Future of the Human Body

Though too often unobserved, the Word of God declares that in every instance, whether of the unsaved or of the saved, the human body will be raised from the dead. The following words by Christ are incapable of any other interpretation: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:26–29). The fact that Daniel 12:2–3 is somewhat restricted would indicate, as the context asserts, that it is only Daniel's people, or Israel, who are in view. Having made reference to the incomparable trial that is predicted for Israel, the prophet declares, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). The restriction is to be noted in the words "many of them," which is clearly not *all* that sleep in the dust of the earth. Doubtless those not raised at that time are the unregenerate Gentiles of whose resurrection there is specific revelation (cf. John 5:28; Rev. 20:12). Still another lucid passage states the universality of resurrection for all human bodies: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the

end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:22–26), the one exception mentioned in this context being of those saints who do not "sleep"; yet their bodies are to be changed. It is written: "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:51–53). And thus, also, in reference to universality the Apostle says: "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts 24:15).

A full description of the character of the believer's resurrection body is to be gained by an induction of all the disclosures which the New Testament affords of Christ's resurrection body: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:20–21). This, however, pertains only to the body of those who, being saved, are raised at the coming of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:23). With respect to the nature of the resurrection body of the unsaved in which they "stand" before the great white throne (Rev. 20:12), little may be determined. There can be no doubt about the *fact* of their resurrection at the time and place divinely appointed.

What is ever a question of engaging interest, namely, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" (1 Cor. 15:35), is answered by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 15:36–44. The problem of a literal or actual reappearance of the believer's body by resurrection after its dissolution in the grave, or after an immediate destruction of the elements, is one about which many theories have been propounded. Most determining is the truth that in His resurrection—the pattern of the Christian's resurrection—Christ left nothing of His material body in the tomb. Over against this disclosure is the statement of the Apostle that the resurrection body will be related to the present body as the harvest is related to the seed from which it germinates —which seed must always decay. Even in the existence of the present body

there is difficulty in identification of its parts over any period of time. The constant flux of its substance is such that the entire body is dissolved and rebuilt at least every seven years. It is, therefore, hardly a matter of identity of particles or of the resurrection of relics any more than the harvest is the reappearing of the actual matter which was contained in the decaying seed. In the case of Christ, the remaining of a vestige of His body in the tomb would have established the error that He did not rise from the dead. A very evident mystery is involved. There is no ground for doubt regarding the truth that the individual personality in its organic unity of spirit, soul, and body is not only redeemed with eternity in view, but that the body is raised and shares its own specific redemption along with the soul and spirit of man (Rom. 8:19–23), reuniting the body with the soul and spirit. It is the present body that is raised, but in the sense that its identity is utterly merged into, and deposited within, the new body. A complete identity is assumed—that which is sown is raised (cf. 1 Cor. 15:42–44). Human speculation is useless with respect to specific particles which identify any body in this life or the life to come.

Having declared the fact that there is variety in the flesh of creatures and having stated that the resurrection body is related to the present body as the harvest is related to the seed, the Apostle asserts that the present body is *sown.* Of this he writes: “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body” (1 Cor. 15:42–44). Here by four mighty transformations—corruption to incorruption; dishonor to glory; weakness to power; and the natural, or that adapted to the soul, to spiritual, or that adapted to the spirit—is displayed the extent of the change through which the believer’s body, having experienced death, will pass.

Two vital words are employed in this whole context and with softened effect—*sown* (vs. 42) and *sleep* (vs. 51). The former is used in place of the more familiar word *bury.* In the use of either word the thought of interment is indicated, but there is no resurrection hope implied in the word *bury* as is implied in the word *sown.* And while *sleep* is a New Testament term meaning *death* (John 11:11–14; 1 Cor. 11:30), it is that peculiar aspect of death belonging only to the Christian, from which his body will be

awakened by the trumpet of God at the coming of Christ (1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:52). The time of this resurrection is given only to the extent that it occurs in connection with the coming of Christ to receive His own—those who are saved in this age. Earlier in this chapter, this event is set forth. The passage states: “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming” (vss. 22–23). Thus, to the same end, it is written: “But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words” (1 Thess. 4:13–18; cf. Phil. 3:10–11, 20–21; Titus 2:11–13).

An exception to this clear teaching on the universality of the resurrection of bodies of Christians is the abrupt statement that “we shall not all sleep” (1 Cor. 15:51), that is, not all Christians are to experience death. By these arresting words a hitherto unrevealed purpose of God, here termed a *mystery*, is disclosed. As elsewhere declared, some will be alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord (1 Thess. 4:15–17); but these do not enter heaven in the present body of limitation. For these, this body will be changed, and that “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye” (vss. 51–52). The change here indicated is not with respect to residence, though such a change is determined (1 Thess. 4:17), but rather the change is one of the nature of the body itself. It has just been stated that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, “neither doth corruption inherit incorruption” (1 Cor. 15:50). “The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed” (vs. 52). Including himself as one who might not die, the Apostle draws the sharp contrast between those who are raised incorruptible and those who are changed from the living state to the body of glory and without death. “For this corruptible must put on

incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (vs. 53). Those to whom these promises are addressed have, when saved, "put off" the old man and "put on" the new man (Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 3:9–10), but now they are said to "put on" either *incorruption* or *immortality*; all of which implies that corruption and mortality will be put off. Incorruption is that estate of body which is attained through resurrection from the dead and is described in previous verses (vss. 35–50), and is the *usual* experience of believers; while immortality is that estate of body which is attained by an immediate change, apart from death, and is an exception since it is only for those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord. The final consequence is identical in either case, being, as it will be, a body like unto the glorious body of Christ (Phil. 3:20–21).

The theological usage of the word *immortality* as referring to the endless existence of the soul, must be called into question. *Mortality* is wholly a physical term and its opposite, *immortality*, is no less so. The phrase, "the immortality of the soul," cannot but mislead and is without the slightest Biblical warrant.

Christ is the one exception to the otherwise universal human program in which either incorruption or immortality is attained. Though He died, He did not see corruption and His present estate is not that of incorruption, but it is an immortal one. Psalm 16:10 predicts both Christ's death and the truth that He would not see corruption. This text reads: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." And the Apostle Peter brings forward the same truth in his Pentecostal sermon (cf. Acts 2:25–31). The reference, Peter asserts, cannot be to David since David had already seen corruption. It is therefore accurately declared of Christ in relation to His present bodily estate in heaven: "who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen" (1 Tim. 6:16). The specific fact that Christ alone hath immortality will be understood only in the light of the truth that all who "sleep in Jesus" await the hour of His return as the appointed time when their experience of change from corruption to incorruption will take place, and the mortal, or those yet living, await the same hour of their experience of change from mortal to immortal. Thus Christ only has entered into the glory of the

immortal body. He is the display of resurrection's story and the "firstfruits" of them that slept (1 Cor. 15:20, 23).

Death is consistently presented in the Bible as a thing which is abnormal, a judgment upon man because of sin. In all faithfulness the warning was given to Adam that, as a result of his disobedience, *dying thou shalt die* (lit., Gen. 2:17). As created, Adam was free from death. In the face of this warning, he disobeyed God and the impending penalty fell. The larger treatment of this event belongs to hamartiology and under that division will be taken up again. Suffice it to indicate here that all three forms of death—physical, spiritual, and the second death—became the portion of the head of the race through his sin. Physical death is universal for all of Adam's posterity and *immediate* on the ground that they, as present in Adam the federal head, partook in the death-imposing sin. They shared in the sin, being "in the loins" of their father Adam (cf. Heb. 7:9–10). No other interpretation of Romans 5:12 will carry through the explanatory verses which follow (13–21). The fact of man's physical death is accounted for in the Bible on no other basis than this share in Adam's sin. In Adam's case the experience of physical death was deferred for many years, though, as death worketh in all men, Adam began to die physically even on the day that he sinned. In the sphere of spiritual death, Adam died at the moment he transgressed and by a conversion downwards became a different kind of being than God had created. He became possessed with a fallen nature which is itself spiritual death, and this he transmitted *mediately* to his posterity by the laws of generation. Since Adam, being fallen, could propagate only after his kind, the race is as fallen as its federal head. The second death, being the unavoidable eternal character of spiritual death, is experienced by all who do not come by faith in Christ under the regenerating power of God (Rev. 20:12–15).

The promise with reference to physical death is twice asserted, with certainty that death shall be destroyed and be no more. Enumerating the mighty things Christ will accomplish during His kingdom reign, the Apostle declares, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:24–26). Thus, also, in Revelation 21:4, where the future estate of the redeemed on

earth is disclosed, it is written, “There shall be no more death.” The abrogating of death is no less than a repeal of the sentence that was given in Eden, except for the abiding spiritual aspects of death; and is brought about not only by a divine decree which determines its end, but by a universal resurrection or reversal of all that physical death hath wrought. This reference to the cessation of the reign of death, as presented in 1 Corinthians 15:26, is in connection with the *end* or final resurrection-event which closes the whole program of resurrection which began with Christ’s resurrection and includes the resurrection of those that are Christ’s at His coming and includes, also, this, the end resurrection when the remaining dead will “stand” before the great white throne (Rev. 20:12). No disposition of physical death could be more complete and effectual than that all who have ever lived on earth are raised out of death to live forever in conscious existence. From that time none can ever die, for death will not exist. It is clearly predicted that many, having no right relation to God, must abide in separation from God and from blessings which are the portion of the redeemed. “And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still” (Rev. 22:10–11).

The Word of God is uncomplicated in its testimony to the truth that the believer’s body is as eternal in character as the soul and spirit. As has been observed, the term *immortality* refers only to the future of the redeemed body and not at all to the soul, and whatever reality this great word asserts applies only to the body. Though structural changes are in store, since flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 15:50), the body that now is shall be raised from the estate of death, leaving naught behind, and shall experience those changes which are divinely determined. The last of the four physical transformations described in 1 Corinthians 15:42–44 is especially far-reaching and illuminating. The truth declared is that the present body is adapted to the soul, being σῶμα ψυχικόν, while the body that is yet to be is adapted to the spirit, being σῶμα πνευματικόν The measure of this distinction corresponds with the difference which obtains between the human soul and spirit—a difficult problem in metaphysics indeed! The implication that so extensive a difference obtains between the Christian’s soul and spirit as these two bodies represent should go far to

correct theories which contend that soul and spirit are identical. Since the resurrection body or changed body is to be like Christ's glorified body and since that body is adapted to the spirit, it follows that the spirit of man covets those indescribable refinements which characterize the glorified body of Christ. The present body is said to be one of humiliation or limitation (1 Cor. 15:43; Phil. 3:20–21), but the body that is to be will satisfy every desire of the spirit. On this engaging theme, Laidlaw has written as follows:

> It is not wise for us to attempt to say much as to when or how the spiritual body comes. We know that it shall be the fitting garb of a ransomed and glorified spirit. We know that it shall be itself a pledge and trophy that of all Christ got from the Father He has lost nothing. It shall represent the dust redeemed, the body ransomed from the grave. How it is woven in the hidden secret of the life after death, we may not venture to surmise. If we have watched how the body, even here, puts on a likeness and correspondence to the real man, to the life within, it will not be difficult to think that for the ripening Christian his future body is being prepared by the Spirit of Christ dwelling already in this mortal frame, and quickening within it that which is to live for ever. It will be open to us to believe that the process is being perfected for the spirits of the just in an unseen world, and that all these things shall be made plain when they shall appear with Christ at His coming, when the sons of God shall shine forth an exceeding great army, in the day of the adoption, that is, the redemption of their body. "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face." "Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known."—*Op. cit.*, pp. 260–61

Not a few have interpreted 2 Corinthians 5:1–8 as a special disclosure that there is an intermediate body to be occupied in the period between the believer's death and the coming of Christ. The passage states: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord."

The thought here expressed is that the redeemed do not desire a disembodied state, which state is inevitable if there be no intermediate body. The body described in this passage is said to be "from heaven," rather than from the grave. Being of heavenly origin, it belongs to those realities which are eternal. That it belongs to things eternal does not require that it be employed forever. Certainly, the final body of glory is secured only at the coming of Christ. And, as certainly, the body of 2 Corinthians 5:1–8 is provided that there may be no moment of disembodiment. These two facts seem to compel the conclusion that there is an intermediate body.

In the notes in his *Reference Bible*, Dr. C. I. Scofield has presented an exhaustive summary of the whole doctrine of resurrection. There it is written:

> (1) The resurrection of the dead was believed by the patriarchs (Gen. 22:5 with Heb. 11:19; Job 19:25–27), and revealed through the prophets (Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2, 13; Hos. 13:14), and miracles of the dead restored to life are recorded in the O.T. (2 Ki. 4:32–35; 13:21). (2) Jesus Christ restored life to the dead (Mt. 9:25; Lk. 7:12–15; John 11:43, 44), and predicted His own resurrection (John 10:18; Lk. 24:1–8). (3) A resurrection of bodies followed the resurrection of Christ (Mt. 27:52, 53); and the apostles raised the dead (Acts 9:36–41; 20:9, 10). (4) Two resurrections are yet future, which are inclusive of "all that are in the graves" (John 5:28). These are distinguished as "of life" (1 Cor. 15:22, 23; 1 Thes. 4:14–17; Rev. 20:4), and "of judgment" (John 5:28, 29; Rev. 20:11–13). They are separated by a period of one thousand years (Rev. 20:5). The "first resurrection," that "unto life," will occur at the second coming of Christ (1 Cor. 15:23), the saints of the O.T. and church ages meeting Him in the air (1 Thes. 4:16, 17); while the martyrs of the tribulation, who also have part in the first resurrection (Rev. 20:4), are raised at the end of the great tribulation. (5) The mortal body will be related to the resurrection body as grain sown is related to the harvest (1 Cor. 15:37, 38); that body will be incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and spiritual (1 Cor. 15:42–44, 49). (6) The bodies of living believers will, at the same time, be instantaneously changed (1 Cor. 15:50–53; Phil. 3:20, 21). This "change" of the living, and resurrection of the dead in Christ is called the "redemption of the body" (Rom. 8:23; Eph. 1:13, 14). (7) After the thousand years the "resurrection unto judgment" (John 5:29) occurs. The resurrection-body of the wicked dead is not described. They are judged according to their works, and cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:7–15).—P. 1228

III. Various Uses of the Word *Body*

Consideration should be given to various uses of the word *body* as employed in the New Testament.

Body of Sin (Rom. 6:6). This phrase, found in Romans 6:6, affords no warrant for the ancient philosophy which teaches that the body is the seat of evil and must therefore be weakened and despised. Such a view contradicts

all Biblical testimony concerning the human body. Sin did not begin with the body, but is rather a rebellion of the will against God, and it ever continues the same. The body of the Christian bears unmistakable marks of honor and dignity. It is for the Lord and the Lord is for the body (1 Cor. 6:13); it is a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:15, 19); its members are to be yielded properly unto God as instruments of righteousness (Rom. 6:13); and it is to be presented unto God a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1). If the body is the seat of sin, it should be abandoned rather than redeemed; but the Spirit is said to "quicken" these mortal bodies. In the midst of abnormal suffering a person may welcome liberation from this body, but the normal attitude is to nourish and cherish it (Eph. 5:29). Most conclusive is the fact that Christ possessed a normal human body, yet without sin. It is never intimated that His body was the source of any solicitation whatever. A distinction arises here between the *body*, σῶμα, and the *flesh*, σάρξ, to which consideration will be given in due time.

The phrase, *the body of sin*, is used in Romans 6:6 to describe the "old man," or the nature to sin. As the human body expresses the life of man, so the power of sin to express itself may be disannulled by the greater power of the Spirit. *The body of sin* is, therefore, none other than sin's power to express itself.

Body of This Death (Rom. 7:24). Again the nature to sin is in view, or that in the flesh, σάρξ, which is opposed to God. Paul's strife, as witnessed in this context (Rom. 7:15–25), is between the saved self— hypothetically considered—and his flesh—ethically considered. He cries out for deliverance from that which he likens to a dead body ever present with him. The same Apostle wrote of himself that he buffeted his body, that he might bring it into subjection (1 Cor. 9:27), but the physical body was only a means of reaching the lethargy of his soul.

Our Vile Body (Phil. 3:21). Here the translation is wholly at fault. Nothing God has made is *vile*. The Authorized text would favor the heathen notions regarding the human body. The Revised Version renders this "the body of our humiliation," which is sustained by all exegetes. Equally as misunderstood is the phrase "It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory" (1 Cor. 15:43), where the contrast is drawn between the present body—especially as it sees corruption—and the body that is to be. The word

dishonor implies no moral failure. It is a declaration that this body is not a body of glory as it yet will be.

IV. The Body of Christ

The phrase *the body of Christ* sustains a twofold meaning. It may refer to His own human body, or to the mystical Body composed of those who are saved over whom Christ is Head.

In view of the fact that as antitype of all Old Testament sacrifices and as Lamb of God actual blood must needs be shed as the ground of redemption, it became the Son of God when entering the world to speak a word of gratitude to His Father thus: “But a body hast thou prepared me” (Heb. 10:5). Though His was an actual human body uninjured by the fall, it became a body of priceless distinction, being the body of the Son of God. It is that body which, as no other has done, has put on immortality and become a body of surpassing glory. Its present unique distinction could not be estimated by any in this world.

As for the mystical Body which is the Church, no figure setting forth the relationship which exists between Christ and the Church is more often employed than that of the head and the body with its many members. Two underlying thoughts inhere in this figure, namely, that of manifestation and that of service. As the inner life is manifest through the body, so the Body of Christ serves to manifest Christ in this world, and is His medium of activity through the Spirit.

Conclusion

With reference to the human body, it may be concluded that it is by creation a product of the dust of the earth; it is sustained by the elements which are derived from the dust; and it returns to dust. It is death-doomed because of the fall. It is subject to resurrection or translation, and is as eternal as the soul and spirit of man.

Chapter XIV

The Immaterial Part of Man at Creation

I. The Origin of the Immaterial Part of the First Man

Having given some consideration to the doctrine of the material part of man and recognizing that the most important revelation concerning man as created is declared in the words which state that man is made in the *image* and *likeness* of God and that this resemblance is featured in the immaterial and not the material part of man, it is now in order to investigate the truth God has disclosed regarding the immaterial part of man. On his material side, man is said to be the direct and immediate creation of God and to have been made from existing matter. It is written: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7); but of the immaterial part of man it is not said that it is divinely created or made of any existing material, but that man became a living soul as a result of the divine inbreathing into the earthen vessel of the breath of lives (lit., plural). "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7); "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Gen. 1:26–27). These statements introduce facts and forces quite beyond the range of human understanding. It is clear, however, that the immaterial part of man originates not as a creation, but as a transmission. Some element of creation may have been present and active, but it is evident that the "living soul" which man became by the divine inbreathing is more uncreated than created. It is an impartation from the Eternal One. Angels are created beings (Col. 1:16), and, since they are immaterial, it follows that their beings, in all their features, are a direct creation quite apart from preexisting matter. Nor is any record given that they were constituted what they are by the breath of God. Man seems to be exalted to a place of surpassing dignity and honor. Being

by divine appointment the lord of the little part of the universe in which he lives and being the means of instruction to angelic beings, it is reasonable that man should be highly ennobled. In whatever spheres the angels may excel, it is essential that among the creatures of earth there shall be one who, being rational, may stand preeminently above all that is mundane.

Immeasurable, indeed, are the implications in the fact of a divine inbreathing with respect to prominence and permanence and with respect to lofty and solemn grandeur of the beings thus engendered. The human soul and spirit thus are originated and that, as before indicated, by *Elohim*, which title implies that all three Persons of the Godhead have shared—and each as sufficient in Himself—in securing this crowning work of *Elohim's* productive powers.

II. The Divine Image

Having thus noted the incomparable origin of the immaterial part of the first man, it is now pertinent to inquire what is declared when the Scriptures state that man was made in the *image* and *likeness* of God. These words are not only accurate representations of facts, but they convey all that language may impart about that which is paramount and supreme in the range of human understanding. No divine creation or production could be inaugurated on a higher plane than that the thing thus formed should be conformed to the *image* and *likeness* of God. These two words reappear in subsequent Scriptures and confirm the truth that the entire Bible is in harmony with the Genesis account of creation. Much has been written with a view to demonstrating some vital difference between the meaning of these two words. Such efforts have failed to establish any clear distinctions, though distinctions may exist. It is not the way of Bible writers to multiply words where no distinction exists. In what, then, does this *image* and *likeness* consist? Little space need be assigned at this point to refute unworthy notions. One of these is the effort some have made to connect the image and likeness with Ecclesiastes 7:29 where it is said that "God hath made man upright," and from this it is argued that the upright posture of the body of man reflects the posture of God and that *image* and *likeness* refer to that posture. But God, being incorporeal, is neither perpendicular nor horizontal in His posture. With the same attending inefficiency, it is claimed

by others that the idea of image and likeness is exhausted in the fact that man, like God, has a sphere of dominion. To this it may be replied that man must exist before dominion can be invested in him and that man has authority because of the truth that he is made in the image and likeness of God. The authority is not the cause of the image or likeness, but the image and likeness is the ground of the authority. It is probable that it is equally unavailing to attempt to restrict the idea of image and likeness to any one feature in God. The Apostle declared on the broadest of conceptions, "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God" (Acts 17:29), which conception would hardly consist in but one bond of similarity. That the resemblance reaches beyond material things and beyond specific things and involves realities in God which man may not comprehend is well stated by John Howe, when he says that "we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure, as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind or thinking power?" (cited by Watson, *Institutes*, II, 10).

Of His creation, God had said it was *very good*. It fulfilled not only His purpose completely, but was a supreme satisfaction to Him. Wherein moral issues were involved—as in the case of man—there could be no exception. Perfect holiness found no fault with that which He had wrought. This may not imply a dominant righteousness on the part of the first man, but it does signify a true and satisfying innocence of evil. Two New Testament passages serve to bring into view three features which belong to those who have "put on" Christ and these may have been lost in the fall. They are certainly gained under saving grace. It is written: "And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:24); "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3:10). The regeneration of the New Creation, with all that accompanies it, secures *righteousness, true holiness,* and *knowledge.* While these passages assert directly only that which is wrought in salvation, the language fairly implies that man was originally constituted in the divine image. No more than such implication is to be drawn from these notable texts. That which is best in the creature is evidently no more than a miniature of that which the Creator is to an infinite degree. The two ideas—that which is true of God and that

which is true of redeemed men—may be the same in nature though these could never be the same in extent. In any case that which is unlike God could never have been a part of a being who is made in the likeness of God.

With reference to the original *knowledge* which Adam possessed, Richard Watson writes:

> The *"knowledge"* in which the Apostle Paul, in the passage quoted above from Colossians 3:10, places "the image of God" after which man was created, does not merely imply the faculty of the understanding, which is a part of the natural image of God; but that which might be lost, because it is that in which the new man is *"renewed."* It is, therefore, to be understood of the faculty of knowledge in the right exercise of its original power; and of that willing reception, and firm retaining, and hearty approval of religious truth, in which knowledge, when spoken of morally, is always understood in the Scriptures. We may not be disposed to allow, with some, that he understood the deep philosophy of nature, and could comprehend and explain the sublime mysteries of religion. The circumstance of his giving names to the animals is certainly no sufficient proof of his having attained to a philosophical acquaintance with their qualities and distinguishing habits, though we should allow the names to be still retained in the Hebrew, and to be as expressive of their peculiarities as some expositors have stated. No sufficient time appears to have been afforded him for the study of their properties, as this event took place previous to the formation of Eve; and as for the notion of his acquiring knowledge by intuition, it is contradicted by the *revealed* fact, that angels themselves acquire their knowledge by observation and study, though, no doubt, with greater rapidity and certainty than we. The whole of the transaction was supernatural; the beasts were "brought" to Adam, and it is probable that he named them under a Divine impulse. He has been supposed to be the inventor of language, but the history shows that he was never without language. He was from the first able to converse with God; and we may, therefore, infer that language was in him a supernatural and miraculous endowment. That his understanding was, as to its capacity, deep and large beyond any of his posterity, must follow from the perfection in which he was created, and his acquisitions of knowledge would, therefore, be rapid and easy. It was, however, in moral and religious truth, as being of the first concern to him, that we are to suppose the excellency of his knowledge to have consisted. "His reason would be clear, his judgment uncorrupted, and his conscience upright and sensible" (Watts). The best knowledge would, in him, be placed first, and that of every other kind be made subservient to it, according to its relation to that. The apostle adds to knowledge, "righteousness and true holiness," terms which express not merely freedom from sin, but positive and active virtues.—*Theological Institutes,* II, 14–15

Concerning Adam's moral qualities, Dr. Isaac Watts has stated:

> A rational creature thus made, must not only be innocent and free, but must be formed holy. His will must have an inward bias to virtue: he must have an inclination to please that God who made him; a supreme love to his Creator, a zeal to serve him, and a tender fear of offending him. For either the new created man loved God supremely or not. If he did not he was not innocent, since the law of nature requires a supreme love to God. If he did he stood ready for every act of obedience: and this is *true holiness of heart.* And, indeed, without this, how could a God of holiness love the work of his own hands? There must be also in this

> creature a regular subjection of the inferior powers to the superior sense, and appetite and passion must be subject to reason. The mind must have a power to govern these lower faculties, that he might not offend against the law of his creation. He must also have his heart inlaid with love to the creatures, especially those of his own species, if he should be placed among them: and with a principle of honesty and truth in dealing with them. And if many of those creatures were made at once, there would be no pride, malice, or envy, no falsehood, no brawls or contentions among them, but all harmony and love.—Cited by Watson, *ibid.*, p. 15

Here the Socinians and their successors have imposed the opinion that holiness can exist only as a result of the individual's concurrence and cooperation. In other words, it is claimed, holiness is a product of living, an experience of life; but this confounds two different things, namely, the *habit* of holiness and the *principle* of holiness. The habit of holiness will not be formed until there is that principle within which may exercise itself to that end. Jonathan Edwards has written in his work on *Original Sin:*

> I think it a contradiction to the nature of things as judged of by the common sense of mankind. It is agreeable to the sense of men, in all nations and ages, not only that the fruit or effect of a good choice is virtuous, but that the good choice itself, from whence that effect proceeds, is so; yea, also the antecedent food, disposition, temper, or affection of mind, from whence proceeds that *good* choice is virtuous. This is the general notion—not that principles derive their goodness from actions, but—that actions derive their goodness from the principles whence they proceed; so that the act of choosing what is good, is no farther virtuous than it proceeds from a good principle or virtuous disposition of mind. Which supposes that a virtuous disposition of mind may be before a virtuous act of choice; and that, therefore, it is not necessary there should first be thought, reflection, and choice, before there can be any virtuous disposition. If the choice be first, before the existence of a good disposition of heart, what is the character of that choice? There can, according to our natural notions, be no virtue in a choice which proceeds from no virtuous principle, but from mere self love, ambition, or some animal appetites; therefore, a virtuous temper of mind may be before a good act of choice, as a tree may be before the fruit, and the fountain before the stream which proceeds from it.—Cited by Watson, *ibid.*, p. 17

A clear understanding relative to the early estate of man, engendered by observation and meditation, is manifest in the following quotation from Richard Watson:

> The *final cause* of man's creation was the display of the glory of God, and principally of his moral perfections. Among these, benevolence shone with eminent lustre. The creation of rational and holy creatures was the only means, as it appears to us, of accomplishing that most paternal and benevolent design, to impart to other beings a portion of the Divine felicity. The happiness of God is the result of his moral perfection, and it is complete and perfect. It is also specific; it is the felicity of knowledge, of conscious rectitude, of sufficiency, and independence. Of the two former, creatures were capable; but only rational creatures. Matter, however formed, is unconscious, and is, and must for ever remain,

incapable of happiness. However disposed and adorned, it was made for another, and not at all with reference to itself. If it be curiously wrought, it is for some other's wonder; if it has use, it is for another's convenience; if it has beauty, it is for another's eye; if harmony, it is for another's ear. Irrational animate creatures may derive advantage from mere matter; but it does not appear that they are conscious of it. They have the enjoyment of sense, but not the powers of reflection, comparison, and taste. They see without admiration, they combine nothing into relations. So to know, as to be conscious of knowing, and to feel the pleasures of knowledge; so to know, as to impart knowledge to others; so to know, as to lay the basis of future and enlarging knowledge, as to discover the efficient and the final causes of things; and to enjoy the pleasures of discovery and certainty of imagination and taste,—this is peculiar to rational beings. Above all, to know the great Creator and Lord of all; to see the distinctions of right and wrong, of good and evil in his law; to have, therefore, the consciousness of integrity and of well ordered and perfectly balanced passions; to feel the felicity of universal and unbounded benevolence; to be conscious of the favour of God himself; to have perfect confidence in his care and constant benediction; to adore him; to be grateful; to exert hope without limit on future and unceasing blessings; all these sources of felicity were added to the pleasures of intellect and imagination in the creation of rational beings. In whatever part of the universe they were created and placed, we have sufficient reason to believe that this was the primitive condition of all; and we know, assuredly, from God's own revelation, that it was the condition of man. In his creation and primeval condition, the "kindness and love of God" eminently appeared. He was made a rational and immortal spirit, with no limits to the constant enlargement of his powers; for, from all the evidence that our own consciousness, even in our fallen state, affords us, it appears possible to the human soul to be eternally approaching the infinite in intellectual strength and attainment. He was made holy and happy; he was admitted to intercourse with GOD. He was not left alone, but had the pleasure of society. He was placed in a world of grandeur, harmony, beauty, and utility; it was canopied with other distant worlds to exhibit to his very sense a manifestation of the extent of space and the vastness of the varied universe; and to call both his reason, his fancy, and his devotion, into their most vigorous and salutary exercises. He was placed in a paradise, where, probably, all that was sublime and gentle in the scenery of the whole earth was exhibited in *pattern;* and all that could delight the innocent sense, and excite the curious inquiries of the mind, was spread before him. He had labour to employ his attention, without wearying him; and time for his highest pursuits of knowing God, his will, and his works. All was a manifestation of universal love, of which he was the chief visible object; and the felicity and glory of his condition must, by his and their obedience in succession, have descended to his posterity for ever. Such was our world, and its rational inhabitants, the first pair; and thus did its creation manifest not only the power and wisdom, but the benevolence of Deity. He made them like himself, and he made them capable of a happiness like his own.—*Ibid.*, pp. 17–19

It is possible, as many contend, that the term *likeness*, as used in Genesis 1:26 (cf. 5:1), refers to that in the original, unfallen man which was lost by the fall, which held vast potentialities for the original man, and which is more than realized through redemption. The supposition that Adam unfallen was God's supreme work and purpose and that redemption is an attempt to salvage upon a lower plane something from the wreckage it has wrought, is

far removed from the truth. In his *Christian Doctrine of Sin,* Müller states: “It cannot be proved that the new creation in Christ is nothing more than the restoration of the state wherein Adam was at first created. There is, indeed, a relationship between the two; the divine image wrought by Christ’s redemption is the only true realization of the image wherein man was at first created. Man was originally given the one, in order that he might attain the other, if not directly, by continuing faithful in obedience and fellowship with God, yet indirectly after his fall by means of redemption. But it is evident that from the very nature of this relationship the two are not identical” (cited by Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man,* p. 135). Present salvation is not into the estate of unfallen Adam, but is rather a conformity to the glorified Last Adam. To this end it is written: “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29); “Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself” (Phil. 3:21); “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is” (1 John 3:2). Whether this contemplation of man’s original likeness to God be according to all that is true or not, the Scriptures declare with great emphasis that by sin man has “come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23), that unregenerate men are now “dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph. 2:1), “under sin” (Rom. 3:9), “having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12), and living “in the evil one” (1 John 5:19, R.V.). Whatever of man’s original estate is preserved under these conditions remains to be identified with exceptional care. To this end attention may be given more specifically to that which is indicated by the word *image.*

Whatever may be the force of the word *likeness*—whether it speaks of features in the original man which were lost or injured in the fall, or whether it be only an emphasis by way of repetition, or whether it be that, as G. F. Oehler contends, which is the original pattern and is ever reproduced in man—the word *image* is that term which the Scriptures employ freely. In Genesis 1:26–27 both words, *image* and *likeness,* appear, but the word *image* occurs three times while the word *likeness* occurs but once. The latter reappears in Genesis 5:1–3, along with the word *image,* and

with great force of meaning. This passage declares: “This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.” Here, again, it is to be observed that there is no apparent effort made to assign specific and varied meanings to these important terms. The passage serves to establish a vital truth, namely, that Adam, made in the image of God, generates Seth in that image. What became of the line of Cain the Bible does not fully reveal. It is not traced in subsequent sacred history. Three New Testament passages serve to record what may be known of Cain outside the historical account given in Genesis —Hebrews 11:4; 1 John 3:12; Jude 1:11 (cf. Luke 3:38). This important passage (Gen. 5:1–3) is to be recognized primarily by the truth there asserted, which is that the *image* of God, whatever may be true relative to the term *likeness*, is transmitted by physical generation and describes that which is true of all in the human family. Due consideration will be given later to the injury which the fall imposed; but the fact abides, as everywhere witnessed in the Word of God, that unregenerate, fallen man bears the image of his Creator. The importance of this disclosure could hardly be overestimated. There is no implication that man is not fallen or that he is not lost apart from redemption. It is rather that redemption is provided because of what man is. The truth that man bears the image of God enhances the reality both of his lost estate and of his final doom if unsaved. The sublime and majestic record is that God created man, not a mere unidentified order of beings. His individuality is paramount and he is supreme among all creatures of the earth. He is made in the similitude of God. There could hardly be a doubt that Genesis 9:6 and James 3:9 contemplate man in his present estate. The passages declare: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man.” “Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God.” To sin against man either by murder or by slander is reprovable on the ground of the divine image being resident in man. A sacredness appertains to human life. Man must respect his fellow man, not on the ground of kinship, but on the ground of the

exalted truth that human life belongs to God. To injure man is to injure one who bears the image of God.

Man's exalted character is especially indicated in Psalm 8 wherein his greatness is seen in his littleness; for "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." In this Psalm man is said to be made, or placed, a little lower than the angels. The Hebrew is *Elohim*, and the reference is specifically to Christ (cf. Heb. 2:9), who was for a little time made lower in estate than *Elohim* that He might suffer death. The more general application (cf. Heb. 2:6–8) refers to man, who is thus said to be crowned with rightful authority to rule over the whole earth. With this same exalted position of man in view the Apostle says "forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God" (1 Cor. 11:7). It is unimportant at this point to decide what calls forth this great statement—great, indeed, for nothing more laudable could be said of man outside those new positions into which the redeemed are brought who are *in Christ.*

Of the passages cited above, it may be observed that all, save Genesis 1:26–27; 2:7, refer to man in his present estate. Though much is said throughout the Bible of man's sinfulness and of the depths to which he has descended, it is not said that he has lost the image of God. In fact, as has been declared, the Bible directly teaches that fallen man retains that image and that it is this reality which determines the extent of his degradation.

The following passages advance a strong suggestion of what the original manifestation of the divine image was: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5:48); "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (Luke 6:36); "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Pet. 1:15–16). With reference to these passages it may be observed that here, to some degree of completeness, is described that original man in whom the Creator found satisfaction.

Two exceedingly important truths emerge from the vast array of theological writings regarding that image in which man was created, namely, (a) that fallen man bears the inalienable image of God, and (b) that man is injured by the fall to the extent that only redeeming grace can rescue him. Both of these truths are deeply embedded in the Scriptures regardless

of any seeming contradictions they may present. Neither truth may be modified or surrendered. It would be easy for uninstructed minds to declare this whole discussion concerning the image a mere battle of words and quite void of practical value; but it is here that the true ground is discovered for Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The vital part which the doctrine of man as made in the image of God takes in each of these major divisions of theology is too patent to need elucidation. The basis of distinction between various systems is to a large degree determined at this point. Both Lutherans and Calvinists subscribe to the highest view of man in his unfallen estate, and to the darkest picture of man in his fallen estate. Romanists, Socinians or Remonstrants, and modern liberals take the lower view of unfallen man and the more flattering view of fallen man. This does not mean that Augustinians—both Lutherans and Calvinists— vilify human life and that the liberals exalt that life. There could be no higher conception of man than that which is held by Lutherans and Calvinists. The whole field of truth is characterized far too much by dogmatic presuppositions. This, no doubt, is due to the exceedingly brief statement which the Scriptures present. There is much room where God has not spoken for theologians to fill in large portions wholly agreeable to their way of thinking; then, in later developments of their system, they draw out of their own creation precisely what they have prepared and need. In the light of this analysis, it is interesting to read the material men have prepared on this theme. The student would do well to pursue these writings with attention.

In concluding the consideration of the divine image in man, it is essential to arrive at some definite convictions. A constructive doctrine should be formed which conforms to the Word of God. A full agreement may be accorded John Laidlaw when he writes: “The Scripture never speaks of the divine image in man, but always of man as formed after the divine image. And this indicates a profound principle of biblical thought. It presupposes God, to account for man. It never sets us the ‘Sisyphus task’ of proving God and the supernatural from man and nature. Thus, by ‘the divine image,’ the Bible does not mean those elements in man from which an idea of God may be framed, but conversely those features in the Divine Being of which man is a copy. If we read what the Bible says of God in relation to the world, and what of God in Himself, we shall get leading lines for its delineation of man; always premising that of the Divine Idea man is a created copy, not,

like the Logos, an essential image" (*Ibid.*, p. 118). Thus, also, G. F. Oehler declares man bears the divine image in view of the facts that (a) human nature is distinguished from that of the beast, for there was no mate for man among lower forms of creation, and man may kill the beast but not the being who is made in the image of God. (b) Man is set over nature as a free personality, since he is designed for communion with God, and is appointed to exercise divine authority in the affairs of earth (*Old Testament Theology*, I, 211–12, cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 346). Jonathan Edwards summarizes thus: "The *natural image* of God consists very much in that by which God in His creation distinguished man from the beasts, viz. in those faculties and principles of nature whereby he is capable of moral agency; whereas the *spiritual and moral image*, wherein man was made at the first, consisted in that moral excellency with which he was endowed" (*On the Freedom of the Will*, pt. i, sec. 5, cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 112).

Though somewhat extended, no more illuminating statement has been found than the following from John Laidlaw:

> Advancing from the Scripture view of God's relation to the world to its view of what He is in Himself, we find those grandly simple definitions of the Divine Being: God is "Spirit," "Light," "Love." Let us see how these may find a parallel in man, the created copy.
>
> It corresponds with all we have traced of the biblical psychology, that it is on the side of *Spirit* man should primarily exhibit an analogy with the divine nature. It is the only element in man's constitution which is properly ascribed to God. He is Spirit. Absolutely and supremely, spiritual existence is affirmed of God. He is said, moreover, to be the Father of spirits, and the God of the spirits of all flesh; indicating that the spiritual world, including man in so far as he is spiritual, stands in a closer relation to God than the corporeal. We have already sufficiently guarded against the Platonizing form of this idea—a form given to it by some of the Greek fathers, who made *pneuma* something physical connecting man with God. This form of statement easily leads to the conclusion, that through the fall human nature has been constitutionally altered by the loss of a part or element; whereas the Bible doctrine is that man's nature is morally lowered by the loss of its purity. The standpoint of the Bible psychology is always that of the divine origination of man. His life—animal, intellectual, moral—is spiritual, because specially in-breathed of God. The "spirit in man" is the "inspiration of the Almighty," and man is spiritual in so far as he lives and acts according to his divine origin and basis of life. Thus does Scripture teach that the spiritual nature which man has, the spirit of man which is in him, affords a parallel or analogy to the absolute and supreme Spirit which God is.
>
> We find, accordingly, that the Bible makes *Intellect* or *Rationality* in man—not only a function of "spirit" in him, but a function flowing from and corresponding to something in God. It is the breath of the Almighty that giveth man instruction and understanding. The scene in the garden, when the Lord God brought the animals to Adam to be named, presents this idea in a pictorial form. That "admirable philosophy lecture," as Bishop Bull has it,

which Adam, appointed by God Himself, read on all the other animals, denotes the correspondence of divine and human intelligence: “Whatsoever Adam called any living creature, that was the name thereof” (Gen. 2:19). “I think, O Socrates, that the truest account of these matters is, that some power more than human gave the first names to things, so as to make them necessarily correct.” Similar is the ascription to the artificers of the tabernacle, of wisdom, understanding, cunning workmanship, together with the Spirit of God. Thus all scientific knowledge and artistic skill, all the results of reason, Scripture ascribes to divine assistance; not from a vague sentiment of piety, but in right of its consistent theory that the spirit in man corresponds to the Spirit of his Maker, and is sustained by it. Teaching like this is a foundation for the loftiest philosophy of man. It is at once an assertion of the preciousness of the individual and a prediction of the progress of the race. The true idea of human greatness we owe not to modern thought, but to the primary axioms of revelation.

Another point of analogy between the divine and the human spirit the Bible finds in *Self-consciousness.* “A candle of the Lord is the spirit of man searching through all the chambers of the heart.” The phrase “candle of the Lord” may assert divine origination—the light in man which the Lord has kindled—or divine possession—the light which is His, the true light which lighteth every man—or both; but the characteristic of the human spirit to which it affixes the description is its self-penetrating power, that it searches the innermost regions of the human being. With a very similar figure, moral consciousness or conscience is denoted in the New Testament as “the eye,” “the light of the body,” “the light within.” Still more explicitly is it asserted that the spirit of the man which is in him alone knows the things of the man, and is therefore analogous to the Divine Spirit, which alone knoweth the things of God. This analogy is, and yet another text, strengthened by the idea of correspondence or communication. “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God” (Rom. 8:16). It may be fairly inferred from these passages that the Bible regards self-consciousness in man as an essential feature of the divine similitude.

From self-consciousness it is a short step to *Personality.* It is a truism that self-conscious free personality is the Bible representation of God. Pervading every line of Scripture, from the first to the last, runs the assumption that God is personal. It is easy enough to call this anthropomorphism. But the Bible, as a revelation from God to man, begins with God. And its own account of its doctrine is not that it gives a God fashioned like unto man, but that God can reveal Himself to man, because man is made in the likeness of God. No wonder on this showing that man should be taught to think of God as Person, Will, Holiness, Love,—ideas of which he finds some copies in his own constitution, since that constitution is framed upon the divine model. It is not in any metaphysical formula that the Bible claims personality in man as the image of something in God, but in its profound principle of the relation between God and man, *i.e.* between God and the individual human being, as well as between God and the human race. This principle is asserted, for example, in Numbers 16:22, where the relation of God to the spirits of all flesh is pleaded as a reason for His dealing with one man who has sinned, rather than that He should punish a whole people. It is repeated in Numbers 27:16 as a reason why God should choose a particular leader for the congregation. The same argument of divine property in man is made the foundation of a splendid declaration by the prophet Ezekiel of God’s moral dealing with individuals, as contrasted with the unbroken federalism on which Israel presumed to reckon. The right of God in each soul (where *nephesh* denotes the human being, “all souls are mine”) is made the ground of the divine prerogative to exercise in each individual case both punishment and pardon. The other side of this relation is presented in those passages which speak of man as existing for God, even the Father, as sought for his worship, as redeemed to an eternal life which consists in the knowledge of the

> Father and the Son. Even in his present fallen condition, and under the most unfavourable forms of that condition, St. Paul represents man as being the offspring of God, to this effect, "If haply we may feel after Him, and find Him." In this passage the entire inwardness of the resemblance between the offspring and the great Parent is made a reason against the artistic efforts of the Greek paganism to humanize the divine. Since man is the offspring of God, he ought not to think that he can frame an outward image of God,—a far better one lies deep within. The relationship of man with God ought to be thought of not as physical, but as moral. The sentiment that we are the divine offspring is quoted to illustrate the fact that mankind has been destined to seek God, who was not far from them, *i.e.* who has made Himself cognisable and conceivable by them. Only personal beings can feel after and find a personal God, and in so doing their likeness to Him is affirmed and confirmed.—*Ibid.*, pp. 120–26

Any worthy contemplation of the doctrine of the divine image as displayed in man must give some attention to the relationship of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to this great theme. He, along with the Father and the Spirit, is said to be Creator of all things, and man is thus the product of His creative power; but He Himself is declared to be the first-born of all creation and, therefore, Lord of all. In this there appears a parallel with man who is divinely appointed as lord over earthly creatures. Of the Son it is said that He is the "express image" of God. His incarnation into His unfallen humanity detracted nothing from this sublime reality. The image which He is may be likened to a steel engraving which reproduces every feature to the finest detail. On the other hand, the image which man is may be likened to a shadow-profile; but it is all of that, which truth is in no way to be slighted. The first creation finds its archetype in *Elohim*, for man was made in the image of *Elohim*. The New Creation finds its archetype in the Son of God. It is into the image of Christ that saving grace brings those who are redeemed (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2).

III. The Derivation and Perpetuation of the Immaterial Part of Man

Attention has been given to the truth relative to the origin of the immaterial part of the first man, it being revealed that he became a living soul by the divine inbreathing of lives (lit., plural). The problem which now arises is concerned with generation or perpetuation of human life. The divine plan for humanity is that two original beings—male and female—should "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. 1:28). It is thus indicated that to Adam and Eve, as to their posterity, procreative power

is given which not only generates the body of their offspring, but accounts directly for the existence of their immaterial natures. Nevertheless, there are varying theories advanced—three in all—for the origin of the immaterial part of each member of the Adamic race. These theories call for consideration.

1. The Pre-Existence Theory. The advocates of this hypothesis claim on rational grounds and quite apart from Biblical authority that, whatever may have been the original derivation of the immaterial part of man—whether created or eternally existent—it is subject to reincarnation or transmigration from one embodiment—extending to the lowest forms of creature life—to another. This theory, though embraced with various modifications by men who could avail themselves of Biblical truth, owes its origin wholly to heathen philosophy. It is a leading tenet of Hinduism and is represented in modern form by Theosophy. An early theory assigned a human soul to the pre-existent Christ. Of this system the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* asserts:

> In theology, the doctrine that Jesus Christ had a human soul which existed before the creation of the world—the first and most perfect of created things—and subsisted, prior to His human birth, in union with the Second Person of the Godhead. It was this human soul which suffered the pain and sorrow described in the Gospels. The chief exposition of this doctrine is that of Dr. Watts (*Works*, v.274, etc.); it has received little support. In a wider form the doctrine has been applied to men in general—namely, that in the beginning of Creation God created the souls of all men, which were subsequently as a punishment for ill-doing incarnated in physical bodies till discipline should render them fit for spiritual existence. Supporters of this doctrine, the Pre-existants or Pre-existiani, are found as early as the 2nd century, among them being Justin Martyr and Origen (*q.v.*), and the idea not only belongs to metempsychosis and mysticism generally, but is widely prevalent in Oriental thought. It was condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 540, but has frequently reappeared in modern thought (*cf.* Wordsworth's *Intimations of Immortality*) being in fact the natural correlative of a belief in immortality.—14th edition, XVIII, 434

The contention that human life has pre-existed lends encouragement to the hope that conscious life continues after death. It thus reflects the natural desire of the human heart for unending existence. The following from Dr. William G. T. Shedd's *History of Christian Doctrine* is a clear analysis of this system: "The theory of *Pre-existence* teaches that all human souls were created at the beginning of creation,—not that of this world simply, but of all worlds. All finite spirits were made simultaneously, and prior to the

creation of matter. The intellectual universe precedes the sensible universe. The souls of men, consequently, existed before the creation of Adam. The pre-existent life was Pre-Adamite. Men were angelic spirits at first. Because of their apostasy in the angelic sphere, they were transferred, as a punishment for their sin, into material bodies in this mundane sphere, and are now passing through a disciplinary process, in order to be restored, all of them without exception, to their pre-existent and angelic condition. These bodies, to which they are joined, come into existence by the ordinary course of physical propagation; so that the sensuous and material part of human nature has no existence previous to Adam. It is only the rational and spiritual principle of which a Pre-Adamite life is asserted" (3rd ed., II, pp. 4–5).

Objections to this theory are threefold, namely, (a) the Scriptures are ignored. Though in his usual allegorizing method, Origen, who is said to be the "sunrise and sunset" of the pre-existence theory, attempted to harmonize his ideas with the Word of God, his distortions of the Bible leave little semblance of its plain teachings. (b) The doctrine of original sin is discredited, though the fact of sin is recognized. And (c) there is no proof for the theory.

2. The Creation Theory. Creationism—the present theme—and traducianism—yet to be considered—are doctrines related to the origin of the immaterial part of man which, though defended by men of equal orthodoxy, are widely different even to the point of contradiction. Creationism teaches that God creates directly and immediately a soul and spirit for each body at the time of birth, and that only the body is generated by human parents. Traducianism teaches that the soul and spirit of man are generated along with the body. The question is not authoritatively determined, and when good men differ so widely it is usually due to a lack of decisive testimony from the Scriptures. It is to be observed that, in the history of the church, creationism was largely the accepted doctrine of the Eastern division while traducianism was the accepted doctrine of the Western division. The issue has always been one of personal opinion and not a basis for theological order and separation. Nevertheless, great issues are involved. At once the humanity of Christ is implicated as well as the

whole field of truth relative to the transmission of original sin, and to heredity.

Of two great theologians of more modern times, Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. William Shedd—though equally committed to the Calvinistic system of theology—Dr. Hodge contends for creationism and Dr. Shedd for traducianism. The plan to be pursued in this discussion is to quote somewhat at length from each of these worthy men under the statement here given of the doctrine which they espouse. Following that, some general remarks will be in order.

Dr. Hodge writes:

> The common doctrine of the Church, and especially of the Reformed theologians, has ever been that the soul of the child is not generated or derived from the parents, but that it is created by the immediate agency of God. The arguments generally urged in favour of this view are,—
>
> 1. That it is more consistent with the prevailing representations of the Scriptures. In the orginal account of the creation there is a marked distinction made between the body and the soul. The one is from the earth, the other from God. This distinction is kept up throughout the Bible. The body and soul are not only represented as different substances, but also as having different origins. The body shall return to dust, says the wise man, and the spirit to God who gave it. Here the origin of the soul is represented as different from and higher than that of the body. The former is from God in a sense in which the latter is not. In like manner God is said to form "the spirit of man within him" (Zech. 12:l); to give "breath unto the people upon" the earth, "and spirit to them that walk therein." (Is. 42:5.) This language nearly agrees with the account of the original creation, in which God is said to have breathed into man the breath of life, to indicate that the soul is not earthy or material, but had its origin immediately from God. Hence He is called "God of the spirits of all flesh." (Num. 16:22.) It could not well be said that He is God of the bodies of all men. The relation in which the soul stands to God as its God and creator is very different from that in which the body stands to Him. And hence in Heb. 12:9, it is said, "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?" The obvious antithesis here presented is between those who are the fathers of our bodies and Him who is the Father of our spirits. Our bodies are derived from our earthly parents, our souls are derived from God. This is in accordance with the familiar use of the word flesh, where it is contrasted, either expressly or by implication, with the soul. Paul speaks of those who had not "seen his face in the flesh," of "the life he now lived in the flesh." He tells the Philippians that it was needful for them that he should remain "in the flesh;" he speaks of his "mortal flesh." The Psalmist says of the Messiah, "my flesh shall rest in hope," which the Apostle explains to mean that his flesh should not see corruption. In all these, and in a multitude of similar passages, flesh means the body, and "fathers of our flesh" means fathers of our bodies. So far, therefore, as the Scriptures reveal anything on the subject, their authority is against traducianism and in favour of creationism.
>
> *2. Argument from the Nature of the Soul.* The latter doctrine, also, is clearly most consistent with the nature of the soul. The soul is admitted, among Christians, to be

immaterial and spiritual. It is indivisible. The traducian doctrine denies this universally acknowledged truth. It asserts that the soul admits of "separation or division of essence." On the same ground that the Church universally rejected the Gnostic doctrine of emanation as inconsistent with the nature of God as a spirit, it has, with nearly the same unanimity, rejected the doctrine that the soul admits of division of substance. This is so serious a difficulty that some of the advocates of the *ex traduce* doctrine endeavour to avoid it by denying that their theory assumes any such separation or division of the substance of the soul. But this denial avails little. They maintain that the same numerical essence which constituted the soul of Adam constitutes our souls. If this be so, then either humanity is a general essence of which individual men are the modes of existence, or what was wholly in Adam is distributively, partitively, and by separation, in the multitude of his descendants. Derivation of essence, therefore, does imply, and is generally admitted to imply, separation or division of essence. And this must be so if numerical identity of essence in all mankind is assumed to be secured by generation or propagation.

3. A third argument in favour of creationism and against traducianism is derived from the Scriptural doctrine as to the person of Christ. He was very man; He had a true human nature; a true body and a rational soul. He was born of a woman. He was, as to his flesh, the son of David. He was descended from the fathers. He was in all points made like as we are, yet without sin. This is admitted on both sides. But, as before remarked in reference to realism, this, on the theory of traducianism, necessitates the conclusion that Christ's human nature was guilty and sinful. We are partakers of Adam's sin both as to guilt and pollution, because the same numerical essence which sinned in him is communicated to us. Sin, it is said, is an accident, and supposes a substance in which it inheres, or to which it pertains. Community in sin supposes, therefore, community of essence. If we were not in Adam as to essence we did not sin in him, and do not derive a corrupt nature from him. But, if we were in him as to essence then his sin was our sin both as to guilt and pollution. This is the argument of traducianists repeated in every form. But they insist that Christ was in Adam as to the substance of his human nature as truly as we were. They say that if his body and soul were not derived from the body and soul of his virgin mother he was no true man, and cannot be the redeemer of men. What is true of other men must, consequently, be true of Him. He must, therefore, be as much involved in the guilt and corruption of the apostasy as other men. It will not do to affirm and deny the same thing. It is a contradiction to say that we are guilty of Adam's sin because we are partakers of his essence, and that Christ is not guilty of his sin nor involved in its pollution, although He is a partaker of his essence. If participation of essence involve community of guilt and depravity in the one case, it must also in the other. As this seems a legitimate conclusion from the traducian doctrine, and as this conclusion is anti-Christian, and false, the doctrine itself cannot be true.—*Systematic Theology*, II, 70–72.

3. The Traducian Theory. This system of belief avers that both the immaterial and material parts of man are propagated by human generation. On its general character, Dr. Shedd writes:

Traducianism applies the idea of species to both body and soul. Upon the sixth day, God created two human individuals, one male and one female, and in them also created the specific psychico-physical nature from which all the subsequent individuals of the human family are procreated both psychically and physically. … Creationism confines the idea of species to the body. In this respect, it agrees with the theory of pre-existence; the difference

relating only to the time when the soul is created. Creationism and pre-existence both alike maintain that the human soul is individual only, and never had a race-existence in Adam. The creationist holds that God on the sixth day created two human individuals, one male and one female, and in them also created the specific physical nature from which the bodies of all the subsequent individuals were procreated; the soul in each instance being a new creation ex nihilo, and infused into the propagated body. … The choice must be made between traducianism and creationism, since the opinion that man as to his soul existed before Adam has no support from revelation. The Bible plainly teaches that Adam was the first man; and that all finite spirits existing before him were angels. The question between the traducianist and the creationist is this: When God created the first two human individuals, Adam and Eve, did he create in and with them the invisible substance of all the succeeding generations of men, both as to the soul and body, or only as to the body? Was the human nature that was created in Adam and Eve simple, or complex? Was it physical solely, or was it psychico-physical? Had the human nature in the first pair two sides, or only one? Was provision made for propagating out of the specific nature deposited in Adam, individuals who would be a union of body and soul, or only a mere body without a soul? The question, consequently, between the parties involves the *quantity* of being that was created on the sixth day, when God is said to have created "man." The traducianist asserts that the entire invisible substance of all the generations of mankind was originated ex nihilo, by that single act of God mentioned in Gen. 1:27, by which he created "man male and female." The creationist asserts that only a part of the invisible substance of all the generations of mankind was created by that act: namely, that of their bodies; the invisible substance which constitutes their souls being created subsequently, by as many distinct and separate creative acts as there are individual souls. Traducianism and creationism agree with each other in respect to the most difficult point in the problem: namely, a kind of existence that is prior to the individual existence. The creationist concedes that human history does not start with the birth of the individual man. He does not attempt to explain original sin with no reference to Adam. He maintains that the body and physical life of the individual is not a creation ex nihilo in each instance, but is derived from a common physical nature that was originated on the sixth day. In so doing, the creationist concedes existence in Adam, quoad hoc. But this race-mode of human existence, which is prior to the individual mode, is the principal difficulty in the problem, and in conceding its reality as to the body, the creationist carries a common burden with the traducianist. For it is as difficult to think of an invisible existence of the human body in Adam, as to think of an invisible existence of the human soul in him. In reality, it is even more difficult; because the body of an individual man, as we now know it, is visible and tangible, while his soul is not. And an invisible and intangible existence in Adam is more conceivable than a visible and tangible. … There are difficulties attending either theory of the origin of man, but fewer connected with traducianism than with creationism. If the mystery of a *complete* existence in Adam on both the psychical and physical side is accepted, the difficulties connected with the imputation of the first sin and the propagation of corruption are relieved. As Turretin says, "there is no doubt that by this theory all the difficulty seems to be removed." It is only the first step that costs. Adopting a revealed mystery in the start, the mystery in this instance, as in all the other instances of revealed mysteries, throws a flood of light, and makes all things plain.—*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 7–19

Following this portion of Dr. Shedd's treatment of this theme, he undertakes in seventy-five pages to discuss problems from three avenues of

approach, namely, (a) the Scriptures, (b) theology, and (c) physiology. An attentive study of these pages is enjoined upon students who would pursue an exhaustive treatment of these far-reaching issues. No such an array of convincing argument has been presented, it is believed, by any creationist and it is doubtful whether the creation theory is capable of such a worthy expansion. As has been intimated, the problem of Christ's humanity—which included a human soul and a human spirit as well as a human body—and the problem of original sin and of heredity enter largely into this controversy. Regarding the human soul and human spirit of Christ, Dr. Hodge, influenced by his creationist views, cannot see how under the traducian theory Christ could be saved from partaking of the Adamic nature. Theologians of the traducian group have always believed that there was exercised a special divine protection against the Adamic nature being imparted to the Son from the human mother. What is termed "the immaculate conception," according to the Roman Catholic view of traducianism, secures this freedom from the taint of original sin. Speaking to Mary, the angel said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). On the other hand, it is difficult to understand that a sinful nature which is attributed to all men and traced to the sin of Adam can exist, if God creates each soul and spirit individually at birth *ex nihilo*. If, as the traducianist contends, the immaterial part of man is transmitted from father to son, the father propagating after his kind, the conveying of the Adamic nature is not only reasonable but is an inevitable consequence. When attempting to account for the universal sin nature, strange speculations have been advanced by creationists. These are to be examined later under the general discussion of imputation. It is the witness of the Bible that *sons* and not merely human bodies are generated by human parents. It is clear, also, that mental and temperamental characteristics are as much inherited as are physical likenesses. Probably no Scripture is more revealing than Hebrews 7:9–10, "And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." Here it is declared that Levi paid tithes—an act which could not be attributed to a mere germ of a lifeless human body —while in the loins of his great-grandfather, Abraham. It is recognized by traducianists that God

accomplishes a creative act when men are regenerated and that He will yet create a new heaven and a new earth, but it is also true that that sequence of creation in which man came into being ceased with the production of the first man and as the consummation of the sixth day. It should be recognized, also, that if man is not procreated—body, soul, and spirit—he is, by so much, an exception to all other forms of created life. There would be a striking lack of real kinship between those who, perchance, are individually created *ex nihilo* at birth and all animals. Human relationship must, under those conditions, depend only on the procreation of the lifeless body. Thus the doctrine of a Kinsman-Redeemer is involved. If that immaterial part of Christ which was human was a direct and a wholly unrelated creation of God, the foundation for His service as Kinsman-Redeemer is diminished to near the vanishing point.

The conclusion is that, though the subject is shrouded in mystery—as is the fact of all life of every kind—the preponderance of evidence sustains the traducian theory.

IV. Elements Which Comprise the Immaterial Part of Man

The mystery of life is baffling and never more so than when an analysis of the immaterial part of man is undertaken. The whole reality of being is largely due to that in a living person which actuates the body, which sustains a conscious relation to all things, and without which the body is not only dead, but immediately subject to decay; but as long as that reality remains in the body, life continues, the body is preserved, and its structure renewed. It is that which thinks, which feels, which reasons, which wills. It is that enigmatic actuality which comprehends, yet itself cannot be comprehended.

When referring to the “inner man,” the Bible employs various terms — soul, spirit, heart, flesh, mind—and the query arises whether these are separate elements which might exist apart from each other, or whether they are functions or modes of expression of the one *ego*. That the latter is nearer the truth is generally believed and for worthy reasons; nevertheless, to these elements or faculties of the “inner man” reference is constantly made in the Bible and in such a manner that anyone may be made to represent the whole of man’s immaterial nature. What is specifically true of each of these

elements will be discovered only as a complete induction is secured. What these terms mean as used in the Bible must be discovered from their use in the Sacred Text. The Bible is not a book of definitions. Its greatest realities are assumed to be what they are. Concerning these features of human life, it may be said that human speculation tends more to confuse than to clarify. These terms are distinctive and used in the Word of God with infinite accuracy. Of these terms, the two—*soul* and *spirit*—are given especial prominence; not that their use is numerically superior, but because of the manner in which they are employed. The entire man is said to be body, soul, and spirit, and without recognition of other features of the "inner man" which are noted above.

A question arises at this point which has engaged and divided theologians in all generations, namely, Is man a *dichotomous* being—two parts, material and immaterial, with the supposition that soul and spirit are the same—or Is he *trichotomous*—body, soul, and spirit? It would be readily conceded by all that, under any consideration, there is not the same breadth of distinction observable between *soul* and *spirit* as between *soul* and *body*, or *spirit* and *body.* Distinction—far-reaching indeed—is implied between *soul* and *spirit*, yet these terms are used synonymously. Thus the controversy is between those who are impressed with the distinctions and those who are impressed with the similarities. It would be well to recognize that, when so required, the Bible assigns to these two terms a distinctive meaning and that when no specific distinction is in view the Bible uses them as interchangeable. In other words, the Bible supports both dichotomy and trichotomy. The distinction between soul and spirit is as incomprehensible as life itself, and the efforts of men to frame definitions must always be unsatisfactory. In confirmation of what has been asserted regarding the Bible's use of these terms, it may be noted: the term *spirit* is used freely to indicate the immaterial part of man (cf. 1 Cor. 5:3; 6:20; 7:34; James 2:26); so, also, the term *soul* is used in the same manner (cf. Matt. 10:28; Acts 2:31; 1 Pet. 2:11. For a parallel use of these terms see Luke 1:46–47). Likewise the same general functions are ascribed to both soul and spirit (cf. Mark 8:12; John 11:33; 13:21 with Matt. 26:38; John 12:27. Cf. 2 Cor 7:13; 1 Cor. 16:18 with Matt. 11:29. Cf. 2 Cor. 7:1 with 1 Pet. 2:11; 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 10:39. Cf. James 5:20 with 1 Cor. 5:5. Observe, also, Mark 8:36–37; 12:30; Luke 1:46; Heb. 6:18–19; James 1:21). Those

departed from this life are sometimes mentioned as *souls* and sometimes as *spirits* (cf. Gen. 35:18; 1 Kings 17:21; Matt. 27:50; John 19:30; Acts 2:27, 31; 7:59; Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 3:18; Rev. 6:9; 20:4). So, also, God is revealed as being spirit and soul (Isa. 42:1; Jer. 9:9; Matt. 12:18; John 4:24; Heb. 10:38).

Basing their conclusions upon these generalities, many have assumed that the Bible teaches only a dichotomy. Over against this is the truth that oftentimes these terms cannot be used interchangeably. At this point it may be observed that there is the closest relation between the human spirit and the Holy Spirit—so close, indeed, that it is not always certain to which a reference is made in the Sacred Text. The Holy Spirit works in and through the human spirit, but this is not said with respect to the human soul. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit" (Rom. 8:16). A soul may be lost, but this is not declared of the spirit (Matt. 16:26). The three important texts which distinguish between *soul* and *spirit* are: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:44); "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. 5:23); "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). Much has been written with a view to bringing these three passages into harmony with the dichotomous view. In this effort 1 Corinthians 15:44 is too often wholly ignored, yet it presents a field of distinction which is immeasurable. The English translation, *natural*, obscures the fact from the usual reader, that reference here is to the present body which is said to be adapted to the soul, as in contrast with that body which is future and is adapted to the spirit. The future body is to be like Christ's glorious body and the difference, as here measured, between the present body—corruptible, dishonorable, weak, and soulish—and the resurrection body—incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and of the spirit —measures that which is the outlook and capacity of the soul as in contrast with that which is the outlook and capacity of the spirit.

Each of the elements which together comprise the immaterial part of man should be considered individually:

1. Soul. No better analysis of both soul and spirit has been found than that by J. I. Marais in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia.* Concerning the human soul he writes:

> Soul, like spirit, has various shades of meaning in the Old Testament, which may be summarized as follows: "Soul," "living being," "life," "self," "person," "desire," "appetite," "emotion" and "passion." In the first instance it meant that which breathes, and as such is distinguished from *bāsār*, "flesh" (Isa. 10:18; Dt. 12:23); from *sh^{e}ʾēr*, "the inner flesh," next the bones (Prov. 11:17, "his own flesh"); from *beṭen*, "belly" (Ps. 31:10, "My soul and my belly are consumed with grief"), etc.
>
> As the *life-breath*, it departs at death (Gen. 35:18; Jer. 15:2). Hence the desire among Old Testament saints to be delivered from Sheol (Ps. 16:10, "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol") and from *shaḥath*, "the pit" (Job 33:18, "He keepeth back his soul from the pit"; Isa. 38:17, "Thou hast … delivered it [my soul] from the pit of corruption").
>
> By an easy transition the word comes to stand for the *individual, personal life*, the *person*, with two distinct shades of meaning which might best be indicated by the Latin *anima* and *animus.* As *anima*, "soul," the life inherent in the body, the animating principle in the blood is denoted (cf. Dt. 12:23, 24, "Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the soul; and thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh"). As *animus*, "mind," the center of our mental activities and passivities is indicated. Thus we read of "a hungry soul" (Ps. 107:9), "a weary soul" (Jer. 31:25), "a loathing soul" (Lev. 26:11), "a thirsty soul" (Ps. 42:2), "a grieved soul" (Job 30:25), "a loving soul" (Cant. 1:7), and many kindred expressions. Cremer has characterized this use of the word in a sentence: "*Nephesh* [soul] in man is the subject of personal life, whereof *pneuma* or *rūᵃḥ* [spirit] is the principle" (*Lexicon*, s.v., 795).
>
> This individuality of man, however, may be denoted by *pneuma* as well, but with a distinction. *Nephesh* or "soul" can only denote the individual life with a material organization or body. *Pneuma* or "spirit" is not so restricted. Scripture speaks of "spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. 12:23), where there can be no thought of a material or physical or corporeal organization. They are "spiritual beings freed from the assaults and defilements of the flesh" (Delitzsch, in loc.). For an exceptional use of *psuchē* in the same sense see Rev. 6:9; 20:4, and (irrespective of the meaning of Ps. 16:10) Acts 2:27.
>
> In the New Testament *psuchē* appears under more or less similar conditions as in the Old Testament. The contrast here is as carefully maintained as there. It is used where *pneuma* would be out of place; and yet it seems at times to be employed where *pneuma* might have been substituted. Thus in John 19:30 we read: "Jesus gave up his *pneuma*" to the Father, and, in the same Gospel (John 10:15), Jesus gave up His "*psuchē* for the sheep," and in Matthew 20:28 He gave His *psuchē* (not His *pneuma*) as a ransom—a difference which is characteristic. For the *pneuma* stands in quite a different relation to God from the *psuchē.* The "spirit" (*pneuma*) is the outbreathing of God into the creature, the life-principle derived from God. The "soul" (*psuchē*) is man's individual possession, that which distinguishes one man from another and from inanimate nature. The *pneuma* of Christ was surrendered to the Father in death; His *psuchē* was surrendered, His individual life was given "a ransom for many." His life "was given for the sheep."
>
> This explains those expressions in the New Testament which bear on the salvation of the soul and its preservation in the regions of the dead. "Thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades" (the world of shades) (Acts 2:27); "Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man

that worketh evil" (Rom. 2:9); "We are … of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul" (Heb. 10:39); "Receive … the implanted word, which is able to save your souls" (Jas. 1:21). The same or similar expressions may be met with in the Old Testament in reference to the soul. Thus in Psalms 49:8, AV "The redemption of their soul is precious," and again: "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol" (Ps. 49:15). Perhaps this may explain—at least this is Wendt's explanation—why even a corpse is called *nephesh* or soul in the Old Testament, because, in the region of the dead, the individuality is retained and, in a measure, separated from God (cf. Hag. 2:13; Lev. 21:11).

The distinction between *psuchē* and *pneuma*, or *nephesh* and *rūᵃḥ*, to which reference has been made, may best be described in the words of Oehler (*O.T. Theology*, I, 217): "Man *is* not spirit, but *has* it: he is *soul*.… In the soul, which sprang from the spirit, and exists continually through it, lies the individuality —in the case of man, his personality, his self, his *ego*." He draws attention to the words of Elihu in Job (33:4): "God's *spirit* made me," the soul called into being; "and the *breath* of the Almighty animates me," the soul kept in energy and strength, in continued existence, by the Almighty, into whose hands the inbreathed *spirit* is surrendered, when the *soul* departs or is taken from us (1 Ki. 19:4). Hence according to Oehler the phrases *naphshī* ("my soul"), *naphshᵉkhā* ("thy soul") may be rendered in Latin *egomet, tu ipse;* but not *rūḥī* ("my spirit"), *ruḥăkhā* ("thy spirit")—soul standing for the whole person, as in Genesis 12:5; 17:14; Ezekiel 18:4, etc.—V, 2837–38

2. Spirit. Similarly, the analysis of the human spirit by the same author is partially quoted:

Used primarily in the Old Testament and the New Testament of the *wind*, as in Genesis 8:1; Numbers 11:31; … Hebrews 1:7 (angels, "spirits" or "winds" in margin); often used of the *breath*, as in Job 12:10; 15:30, and in 2 Thessalonians 2:8 (wicked consumed by "the breath of his mouth"). In a figurative sense it was used as indicating *anger* or *fury*, and as such applied even to God, who destroys by the "breath of his nostrils" (Job 4:9; Ex. 15:8; 2 Sam. 22:16; see 2 Thess. 2:8). Hence applied to man—as being the seat of emotion in desire or trouble, and thus gradually of mental and moral qualities in general (Ex. 28:3, "the spirit of wisdom"; Ezk. 11:19, "a new spirit," etc.). Where man is deeply stirred by the Divine Spirit, as among the prophets, we have a somewhat similar use of the word, in such expressions as: "The Spirit of the Lord came … upon him" (1 Sam. 10:10).

The spirit as life-principle in man has various applications: sometimes to denote an *apparition* (Matt. 14:26, AV "saying, It is a spirit"; Luke 24:37, AV "had seen a spirit"); sometimes to denote angels, both fallen and unfallen (Heb. 1:14, "ministering spirits"; Matt. 10:1, "unclean spirits"; cf. also 12:43; Mark 1:23, 26, 27; and in Rev. 1:4, "the seven Spirits … before his throne"). The spirit is thus in man the principle of life—but of man as distinguished from the brute—so that in death this spirit is yielded to the Lord (Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; 1 Cor. 5:5, "that the spirit may be saved"). Hence God is called the "Father of spirits" (Heb. 12:9). Thus generally for all the manifestations of the spiritual part in man, as that which thinks, feels, wills; and also to denote certain qualities which characterize the man, e.g. "poor in spirit" (Matt. 5:3); "spirit of gentleness" (Gal. 6:1); "of bondage" (Rom. 8:15); "of jealousy" (Num. 5:14); "of fear" (2 Tim. 1:7 AV); "of slumber" (Rom. 11:8 AV). Hence we are called upon to "rule over our own spirit" (Prov. 16:32; 25:28), and are warned against being overmastered by a wrong spirit (Luke 9:55 AV, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of"). So man may submit to the "spirit of error," and turn away from the "spirit

of truth" (1 John 4:6). Thus we read of the "spirit of counsel" (Isa. 11:2); "of wisdom" (Eph. 1:17).

We go a step higher when we find the human spirit brought into relationship with the Divine Spirit. For man is but a creature to whom life has been imparted by God's spirit—life being but a resultant of God's breath. Thus life and death are realistically described as an imparting or a withdrawing of God's breath, as in Job 27:3; 33:4; 34:14, "spirit and breath" going together. The spirit may thus be "revived" (Gen. 45:27), or "overwhelmed" (Ps. 143:4), or "broken" (Prov. 15:13). And where sin has been keenly felt, it is "a broken spirit" which is "a sacrifice to God" (Ps. 51:17); and when man submits to the power of sin, a new direction is given to his mind: he comes under a "spirit of whoredom" (Hos. 4:12); he becomes "proud in spirit" (Eccl. 7:8), instead of being "patient in spirit"; he is a fool because he is "hasty in spirit" and gives way to "anger" (Eccl. 7:9). The "faithful in spirit" are the men who resist talebearing and backbiting in the world (Prov. 11:13). In such instances as these the difference between "soul" and "spirit" appears.—*Ibid.*, V, 2841–42

In the same work and under the head of *Psychology*, the same author presents important contrasts between *soul* and *spirit*: "Gathering all together, the Scriptural position seems to be as follows: The Divine Spirit is the source of all life, and its power is communicated in the physical, intellectual and moral sphere. That Spirit, as the *spiritus spirans*, the inspiring spirit, by its very breath makes man a living soul: 'The Spirit [or breath] of God is in my nostrils' (Job 27:3); 'Thou takest away their breath [$r\bar{u}^{a}ḥ$, 'spirit'], they die, and return to their dust' (Ps. 104:29). Hence God is called 'God of the spirits of all flesh' (Num. 16:22; 27:16).

"Soul, though identical with spirit, has shades of meaning which spirit has not; it stands for the individual. 'Man is spirit, because he is dependent upon God. Man is soul, because, unlike the angels, he has a body, which links him to earth. He is *animal* as possessing *anima*, but he is a reasoning animal, which distinguishes him from the brute' (Bavinck, *Ger. Dogm.*, II, 628)" (*Ibid.*, IV, 2497).

Having quoted C. A. Auberlen as saying, "Body, soul, and spirit are nothing else than the real basis of the three elements of man's being, world-consciousness, self-consciousness, and God-consciousness," John Laidlaw goes on to say:

It would be easy enough to refute each of these proposed divisions by confronting it with one or more texts which it will not cover. It is better to accept them all as evidence that a trichotomic usage in Scripture plainly there is, and that it requires recognition and explanation. Only a patient investigation of its rise will enable us to apprehend its force. That soul and spirit denote distinct natures in man, or, as Delitzsch has it, separable elements of one nature, or even, as others, distinct faculties of the inner man, implies a kind of analysis

which is out of harmony with biblical thought, and will not stand upon an impartial examination of the biblical phraseology. On the other hand, that in the passages to be explained we have nothing more than rhetorical accumulation of terms, will not satisfy the facts.…

When we pass from the natural to the theological use of these two terms in the New Testament, the important question arises, whether the distinction to be found between *pneuma* with its adjective on the one hand, and *psyche* with its adjective on the other, in the well-known group of texts, mainly Pauline, 1 Thess. 5:23, 1 Cor. 2:14, 15:44, Heb. 4:12, Jude 19, is identical with that of the Jewish schools, or owes its force to another and higher influence. If the Old Testament use of them, followed, as we learn from the Gospels, by our Lord and the elder apostles, was not analytic, was natural and real as opposed to philosophical, then though Paul may be said to have adopted the philosophical language of the Jewish schools, he was rather redeeming the Old Testament terms out of their hands for a new purpose. The parallel between his tripartite language and that of the Platonists and Stoics is obvious enough. But the difference is no less distinct. What he took from them was sanctioned by the usage of the Septuagint; what he added was an application of Old Testament language to express the New Testament revelation of grace. The tripartition of Plato and the Platonizing schools was part of a method for solving the problem of evil. It was intended to account for divergent moral forces in man, for the subjugation in him of what is best by what is worst; and it did so by assuming that there was in his formation a physical element eternally opposed to the divine. In the terms of the trichotomy, as derived from the Old Testament, there was no such taint. They were fitted to do a better thing than to account for man's evil—namely, to express under the power of a new revelation the way of his recovery. They were exactly suited to express the new idea. One of them especially, "spirit" (πνεῦμα), had never been debased by ethnic or erroneous thought. It was never used in the Greek psychology. Even Plato's highest pinciple is not πνεῦμα, but νοῦς and its derivatives. While, therefore, the idea of the New Testament trichotomy was suggested by the usage of the Greek and Graeco-Jewish schools, the terms themselves were biblical. The meaning was at once true to the simple psychology of the Old Testament, and enlarged with fulness of New Testament revelation. It is clear that the distinction between the psychical man and the spiritual man, the psychical body and the spiritual body, is one radical to the theology of Paul's Epistles. But instead of being rooted in a philosophical analysis of the constituents of human nature, it is mainly born of two disclosures of advancing revealed thought. The one is the clear revelation of the personality of a third hypostasis in the Godhead, definitely and fully indicated in the New Testament by the term Spirit, Holy Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ. The other is the spiritual union of redeemed humanity with God through Christ Jesus. The new life or nature thus originated is variously called "the new man," "a new creature," "the inner man" and especially "the spirit" as contrasted with "the flesh." Why this word *pneuma* should be adopted to express the new nature in believers, or the indwelling of God with man, is plain. The Third Person in the Trinity is the agent in originating and maintaining this new life, and with a rare felicity the same word (*ruach* of the Old Testament, and *pneuma* of the New) denotes the Holy Spirit of God and the heaven-derived life in renewed man. It is an instance at once of the elevating influence of revelation upon language, and of that insight into the capacity and destinies of human nature which the progress of revelation brings with it. *Pneuma* and *psyche*, with their derivatives, thus assume under the influence of New Testament theology a new and enlarged significance. Besides denoting physical life in common, yet with difference of aspect; besides denoting the inner life in general with corresponding difference of emphasis, they denote a moral and spiritual distinction. The

> psychical man is man as nature now constitutes him, and as sin has infected him. The spiritual man is man as grace has reconstituted him, and as God's Spirit dwells in him. The unrenewed man is "psychical not having the spirit." The word of God divides and discriminates between that which is psychical and that which is spiritual. The Christian is to be sanctified wholly in his three-fold life,—the physical life of the body, the individual life of the soul, the inner life of the spirit; which latter two become again the basis of the natural and of the regenerate life respectively. In the progress of redemption he shall exchange a body psychical or natural, which he has in common with all men as derived from Adam, for a body spiritual or glorified, adapted to his new nature and fashioned like unto the glorious body of his Lord; for the first head of the race was made a living *psyche*, but the second Adam is a life-giving *Pneuma.—Op. cit.*, pp. 66–67, 70–73

3. HEART. In its psychological sense, the term *heart* refers, alike in both Testaments, to human life with its energies exercised. The physical organ which bears this name is the distributor of the blood and the Biblical conception is that the life is in the blood (Lev. 17:11). It is thus natural that the heart should be deemed the center of human life. Similarly, the heart is the organ that reacts to human emotions and is thus as easily considered the center of sensibility. In Proverbs it is written, "The heart knoweth its own bitterness" (14:10, R.V.), and "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life" (4:23). In this manner the Word of God relates the term *heart* to natural self-knowledge. To the same end, Isaiah 6:10—a passage six times quoted in the New Testament—and 1 Corinthians 2:9 are especially revealing. It is written: "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed" (Isa. 6:10); "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (1 Cor. 2:9). It was declared of man as early in his history as the record of Genesis 6:5 that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." The prophet Ezekiel declares it to be Jehovah's purpose to give Israel a "new heart" (Ezek. 36:26), and the Apostle writes of the law being "written in their hearts." The heart is to be purified "by faith," Peter writes of the "hidden man of the heart," Jehovah "searches the heart." From such passages as these it is to be seen that the term *heart* represents specific exercise of the realities of human life and may thus, to some extent, be distinguished from the soul and the spirit, though here, again, no close line may be drawn and human speculation is of little profit.

The word *heart* occurs over 600 times in the Old Testament and at least 120 times in the New Testament. The word *soul* occurs but about 400 times in the whole Bible and the word *spirit* but slightly more—including all references to the Spirit of God. The extensive use of the word *heart* in all its varied implications places it in a position of supreme importance in Biblical psychology. Closely related to the word *heart* in its psychological import is the word *reins,* which is used in the Bible fifteen times and but once in the New Testament (Rev. 2:23). In this term the kidneys seem to symbolize the innermost part of man's being, the seat of man's deepest emotions which God alone can fully know. Six times the word *reins* is used along with the word *heart* and evidently as an emphasis upon the emotional nature of man.

4. Flesh. This the fourth psychological term to be named which the Bible employs introduces a reality which is even more complex than any other. The word *flesh* (σάρξ) is subject to a threefold usage in the New Testament, and when these uses are distinguished, some light will fall on this easily misunderstood theme. In some instances the term *flesh* refers only to the material part of man, in which case it has no psychological implications whatever. It is equivalent to its synonym, *body* (σῶμα). In his Pentecostal sermon, Peter, referring to David's expectation that Christ would be raised from the dead, states: "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption" (Acts 2:30–31). In both instances where this term is used in this passage the meaning is restricted to the substance of the body. In 1 Corinthians 15:39 the Apostle extends its meaning to include the substance of all forms of living creatures. The term is several times joined with the word *blood,* as "flesh and blood" and with weighty significance. Though used of the human body (Eph. 5:29) and of Christ's body (John 1:14; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 5:7), it is in this specific use no more than a synonym of *body.*

In its second meaning it refers to humanity's relationships and classifications. Bearing this sense the term *flesh* appears many times in the Old Testament. Quoting Isaiah 40:6–8, Peter declares: "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth,

and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you" (1 Pet. 1:24–25). This reference is to living people of the earth—not to so many bodies composed of fleshly substance, but bodies ensouled and alive. However, though this use of the word signified both the body and the life which is in it, there is no direct reference in any such use of the word to moral or ethical qualities.

The third use of the word *flesh* is that which is wholly restricted to the immaterial part of man. In approaching this specific application of this word, it will be observed that in the first instance it is seen to be restricted to the body alone; in the second instance it combines both material and immaterial, but without moral significance; while in this the third instance it is restricted to the immaterial part of man and with special moral or ethical meaning. It is an element in man which is predicated of both the unregenerate and the regenerate. It is opposed to God and godliness. Being isolated from mere substance, it may be defined as a fallen nature, a disposition to sin. It manifests self, and in that evaluation of it, the body may be indirectly included, but without any contributing import. The Apostle spoke of *himself* thus: "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not" (Rom. 7:18). The usual expression of the flesh is through the body, but evil tendencies are not always referred to under the term *flesh*. There are evil desires of the mind (Eph. 2:3), and there is a "filthiness" of the "spirit" (2 Cor. 7:1). Some "works of the flesh," such as "hatred, variance, emulations, heresies," are wholly unrelated to the body. There is that which is called "fleshly wisdom" (2 Cor. 1:12)—the wisdom of men as opposed to the wisdom of God—and a "fleshly mind" (Col. 2:18) which characterizes Gnosticism. The term *flesh*, being ethical in character, is similar to such expressions as the "old man," "the body of sin" (Rom. 6:6), "the body of the sins of the flesh" (Col. 1:22), "law … in my members" (Rom. 7:23), "members which are upon the earth" (Col. 3:5).

Thus it is disclosed that the term *flesh*, when sustaining an ethical significance, refers to that part of man which, because of the fall, is opposed to God and to holiness. It is a fallen nature which, though expressing itself through the deeds of the body, is, nevertheless, to be identified as that which is immaterial and related to the material only as all that is immaterial is

resident in, and expressed through, the material. To the Apostle the present life is a "life … in the flesh" (Gal. 2:20). He is in the flesh much as he is in the *cosmos.* It is the sphere of his present abode, and is therefore ever an occasion for conflict. At this point is introduced the New Testament word *carnal*, which is the English translation of σαρκικός, and indicates that which is fleshly in its character. One important passage bears directly upon this theme (1 Cor. 3:1–4), in which context this Greek word appears twice. That the Corinthians are addressed as "brethren" and are "babes in Christ" (3:1), is conclusive evidence that they are regenerate. Yet they are *carnal* or *fleshly* and because of conditions which are mentioned in the context. The term *carnal* is thus seen to be a description of the spiritual estate of a Christian who is dominated by the flesh rather than by the Spirit of God. He is one who is "walking" after the flesh. In the same context (Rom. 7:14–25) in which he declares himself to be *flesh* (7:18), the Apostle asserts, "but I am carnal, sold under sin" (7:14). This portion of the Scriptures—so personal in character—is presented by the Apostle as an example of the conflict which is developed by the presence of the flesh in the one who is saved. In this Peter concurs with an admonition to "abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul" (1 Pet. 2:11). The function of the soul is usually in a lower sphere of human life than that of the spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 15:44); but here it is disclosed that the flesh is lower than the spirit, for its lusts are a detriment to the soul. In a similar passage (Rom. 8:5–13), the fundamental problem of whether the flesh or the Spirit of God shall dominate the believer's life is carried to its logical end, namely, to live according to the flesh is to be in the way of death, and to live according to the Spirit is to be in the way of life with its victory over the flesh. It is not asserted that Christians are in danger of spiritual death, but it is nevertheless true that they may live in the realms in which those who are spiritually dead (cf. Eph. 2:3) live. They may indulge in the "deeds of the body." The English word *carnal*(*ly*) appears in the Authorized Version of Romans 8:6–7, but the word σάρξ and not σαρκικός appears in the original. A worthy consideration of this context cannot but impress the mind with respect to the evil character of the flesh when ethically considered, and in its determined and unrelenting opposition to the Spirit of God. Since no unregenerate person is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, the conflict here described is between what the Christian is in himself—flesh—and the Spirit of God who indwells

him. Such a warfare belongs only to the child of God. In respect to this conflict, a distinction is to be seen between the *flesh* in its counterpoise to the *mind* (νοῦς, Rom. 7:23, 25), and the *flesh* in its counterpoise to the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:4–13; Gal. 5:16–26). In the former conflict, or that between the flesh and the mind, there is only defeat, though the truth is established that with the mind a Christian may serve the "law of God," and yet with the flesh serve "the law of sin" (Rom. 7:25). In the wider conflict between the flesh and the Holy Spirit there may be victory. This possible triumph is published in two major passages, each of which is followed by a most vital explanatory portion. These passages read, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:2–4); "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would" (Gal. 5:16–17). No doubt about the evil character of the flesh—ethically considered—could be entertained when upwards of twenty New Testament passages are contemplated. The quoting of five of them will suffice: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Rom. 8:13); "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24); "For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting" (Gal. 6:8); "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ" (Col. 2:11); "And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh" (Jude 1:23).

5. Mind. In the Pauline Epistles, the word *mind* is employed as one of the elements of the immaterial part of man. It is closely related to both the Holy Spirit and the flesh. The Apostle speaks of "the mind of the Spirit," and "the mind of the flesh." Obviously, the human *mind* may be related to that which is good or to that which is evil. The Apostle writes, as before indicated, that

with the mind he served the law of God (Rom. 7:25). He as definitely asserts that the carnal *mind* is enmity against God (Rom. 8:7). In another place he joins *flesh* and *mind* in one phrase: “the desires of the flesh and of the mind” (Eph. 2:3), with an evil implication regarding each. The mind may be defiled (Titus 1:15), and, against this, Peter says that the mind may be “girded up” as loins are girded (1 Pet. 1:13).

A summarization of the Biblical doctrine respecting the four leading elements which comprise the immaterial part of man—*soul, spirit, heart*, and *flesh*—is presented by John Laidlaw as follows:

> To sum up: no one need be at any loss to grasp the simple psychology of the Bible who keeps well in view the original signification and subsequent growth of the four leading terms SPIRIT, SOUL, FLESH, HEART. These are the *voces signatae* of the entire Scripture view of man’s nature and constitution. They are all grouped round the idea of life or of a living being. The first two, *soul* and *spirit*, represent in different ways the life itself of a living being (not life in the abstract). The last two, *flesh* and *heart*, denote respectively the life-environment and the life-organ; the former that in which life inheres, the latter that through which it acts. So much for their simple and primitive meaning. In their secondary meaning (which again in the case of the first three—*spirit, soul, flesh*—becomes the basis of a tertiary, viz. an ethical or theological meaning in the latest development of inspired thought) they are to be grouped as follows. *Spirit, soul*, and *flesh* are expressions for man’s nature viewed from different points. They are not three natures. Man’s one nature is really expressed by each of them, so that each alone may designate the human being. Thus man is *flesh*, as an embodied perishable creature: “All flesh is grass.” He is *soul*, as a living being, an individual responsible creature: “All souls are mine” (Ezek. 18:4); “There were added about three thousand souls” (Acts 2:41). Once more, he is *spirit.* More commonly, however, he is said to have it, as his life-principle derived from God. He is of the spiritual order—that, namely, of God and angels. But “spirits” designates men only as disembodied: “The spirits of just men made perfect” (Heb. 12:23), “spirits in prison” (1 Pet. 3:19), exactly as we read “souls under the altar” (Rev. 6:9). *Heart* stands outside of this triad, because man is never called “a heart,” nor men spoken of as “hearts.” *Heart* never denotes the personal subject, but always the personal organ. Again, they may be grouped thus: *Spirit, soul, heart*, may be used each of them to indicate one side of man’s double-sided nature, viz. his higher or inner life. Over against them stands *flesh*, as representing that nature on the lower or outer side, so that any one of the first three combined with flesh will express, dichotomically, the whole of man—flesh and spirit, flesh and soul, or flesh and heart. Then, looking at the first three once more, not in relation to *flesh* but in their mutual relations to “life,” we get that correct and convenient division suggested by Beck and followed by most competent inquirers since,—a clear and intelligible result, which justifies itself throughout the whole Scripture, viz. that *spirit* represents the principle of life, *soul* the subject of life, and *heart* the organ of life; definitions which will be found to apply accurately to all the three constitutent lives which the human being can lead—(*a*) the physical, (*b*) the mental and moral, (*c*) the spiritual and religious.—*Ibid.*, pp. 91–93

V. The Capacities and Faculties of the Immaterial Part of Man

In turning from the consideration of the elements which comprise the immaterial part of man to the capacities and faculties, attention is removed from the general theme of what the immaterial part of man *is*, to what the immaterial part of man *does*. Much vital truth may be drawn from the Bible bearing on the activities of the immaterial part of man. The philosophy of Kant which classifies these activities into *intellect, sensibility*, and *will* is usually accepted as a working basis for thought. However, to this must be added that strange and mysterious function termed *conscience*, which might as easily be classified with those elements which make up the immaterial part of man as with the activities wrought by him. In fact, conscience stands quite alone as a monitor sitting in judgment on all else within the man. Following the Kantian divisions, each activity will be examined separately.

1. Intellect. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th ed., *s.v.*) alludes to the word *intellect* as "the general term for the mind in reference to its capacity for understanding." This theme belongs properly to the science of psychology. However, when that augmented understanding which is wrought in the human mind by the power of the Holy Spirit is in view, the subject becomes theological. A supernatural illumination for the unregenerate was promised by Christ when He said, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:7–11). This illumination is evidently designed to overcome that incapacity described in 2 Corinthians 4:3–4, which reads, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." In like manner, an unlimited field of truth is made available to the regenerate by the same Spirit. Of this teaching, or enlightening, work of the Spirit Christ spoke as recorded in

John 16:12–15: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you” (cf. John 3:3; 1 Cor. 2:9–3:4; Heb. 5:12–14; 11:3; 1 Pet. 2:2; 1 John 2:27). Praying for the Ephesian saints, the Apostle introduces a vital reality when he makes request “that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints” (Eph. 1:17–18). Here the word *understanding* is a translation of καρδία (as in all the best MSS.), the thought being, evidently, that the heart, though usually supposed to be the seat of the emotions, is also the seat of thought and will (cf. Rom. 1:21). The reception of the great revelation for which the Apostle prays is, therefore, more extended than it would be if restricted to either the intellect or the emotions. Plato employs the phrase, “eye of the soul” (*Sophist*, 254), and Ovid, speaking of Pythagoras, says: “With his mind he approached the gods, though far removed in heaven, and what nature denied to human sight, he drew forth with the eyes of his heart” (*Metamorphoses*, xv., 62–64, citations made by M. R. Vincent, *Word Studies*, III, 371). All that the Apostle prays is to the end “that ye may know,” and know by the peculiar capacity of the heart, since the heart both feels and understands.

2. Sensibility. This, another function of the immaterial part of man, is properly classed, also, as an important theme of psychology; yet there is much that is emotional in both God and man which is theological. In this respect man reflects or images that which is true of God. How vast is the love of God, and how real is the love and devotion of the human heart! Again, the human emotional nature, like the human intellect, may be wrought upon and enlarged experimentally by the power of the indwelling Spirit. “The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us” (Rom. 5:5). The Scriptures declare that the divine compassion may find expression through the Christian and that it arises, not

in the Christian's capacity, but from the Spirit who indwells him. "The fruit of the Spirit is love" (Gal. 5:22; cf. 1 Cor. 13:1–13). The Christian, loving with divine love, will love those objects which God loves. The extent of such a possibility is limitless. This divine love being the actuating force, the emotions and life are lifted to the plane of that which is supernatural.

3. WILL. The human will is rightfully a major theme in theology. It appears not only in Anthropology, but also in Soteriology, and, in so far as man is created in the image of God and reflects the divine attributes, the will of man is indirectly related to Theism. The *fact* of the will is a psychological truth, while the *freedom* of the will is theological. The latter aspect of the subject belongs specifically to Soteriology, and will be attended in due time. It may be recorded here, however, that the will usually acts as moved or influenced by the intellect and emotions, and its freedom is no more than the experience of acting without *conscious* necessity; yet no greater necessity could be imposed than that which arises when the intellect and emotions are themselves influenced by a superior power. Of the unregenerate it is said that Satan is working in them or energizing them (Eph. 2:2), while of the regenerate it is said that God is energizing them "both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). These two passages account for the whole of humanity and therefore determine the truth—important indeed—that no human will, in the absolute sense, is free. Addressing those who were under Satan's influence, as all unregenerate are, Christ said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John 5:40). He also declared, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6:44; cf. 5:21). Such "drawing" is evidently a divine moving of the whole inner man and is experienced by the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will. Faith, or confidence in God, is a divinely wrought state of mind and to such the gracious invitation, "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6:37), is most attractive. There is such a thing as seeing the Son and believing on Him because of that vision (cf. John 6:40). Apart from this none is naturally inclined to believe. To those who are subject to the will of God, there is ever-increasing knowledge of the truth available. Of this gracious fact Christ said, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (John 7:17).

Of the will in general the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states:

Will, in psychology, is sometimes used as synonymous with conation (*q.v.*), but more usually in the restricted sense of deliberate decision, as contrasted with mere impulse (*q.v.*) or desire. In an act of will there is a deliberate choice of one of several alternatives, and frequently a conscious reference to the interests of the subject's self as a whole. People sometimes speak as though the will were a kind of independent entity or faculty which makes the decisions, etc. But that is only a loose way of talking. As Spinoza and Locke pointed out long ago, there is no will apart from particular acts or processes of willing; and it is not the will that wills but the whole self that does it. Similarly with the related hypostasis of "will-power" or "strength of will." There is no strong "will," but there are strong-willed characters, that is, people who can pursue distant ends (good or bad) with great perseverance; weak-willed people, on the other hand, are easily influenced and carried away by every instinct or impulse or desire that prompts them from time to time, and cannot subordinate them to the pursuit of remote ends.—14th Edition, XXIII, 605

Of the will theologically considered, Dr. Augustus H. Strong writes:

A. Will defined.—Will is the soul's power to choose between motives and to direct its subsequent activity according to the motive thus chosen,—in other words, the soul's power to choose both an end and the means to attain it. The choice of an ultimate end we call immanent preference; the choice of means we call executive volition.

B. Will and other faculties.—(*a*) We accept the threefold division of human faculties into intellect, sensibility, and will. (*b*) Intellect is the soul knowing; sensibility is the soul feeling (desires, affections); will is the soul choosing (end or means). (*c*) In every act of the soul, all the faculties act. Knowing involves feeling and willing; feeling involves knowing and willing; willing involves knowing and feeling. (*d*) Logically, each latter faculty involves the preceding action of the former: the soul must know before feeling; must know and feel before willing. (*e*) Yet since knowing and feeling are activities, neither of these is possible without willing.

C. Will and permanent states.—(*a*) Though every act of the soul involves the action of all the faculties, yet in any particular action one faculty may be more prominent than the others. So we speak of acts of intellect, of affection, of will. (*b*) This predominant action of any single faculty produces effects upon the other faculties associated with it. The action of will gives a direction to the intellect and to the affections, as well as a permanent bent to the will itself. (*c*) Each faculty, therefore, has its permanent states as well as its transient acts, and the will may originate these states. Hence we speak of voluntary affections, and may with equal propriety speak of voluntary opinions. These permanent voluntary states we denominate character.

D. Will and motives.—(*a*) The permanent states just mentioned, when they have been once determined, also influence the will. Internal views and dispositions, and not simply external presentations, constitute the strength of motives. (*b*) These motives often conflict, and though the soul never acts without motive, it does notwithstanding choose between motives, and so determines the end toward which it will direct its activities. (*c*) Motives are not *causes*, which compel the will, but *influences*, which persuade it. The power of these motives, however, is proportioned to the strength of will which has entered into them and has made them what they are.

E. Will and contrary choice.—(*a*) Though no act of pure will is possible, the soul may put forth single volitions in a direction opposed to its previous ruling purpose, and thus far man has the power of a contrary choice (Rom. 7:18—"to will is present with me"). (*b*) But in so far as will has entered into and revealed itself in permanent states of intellect and sensibility and in a settled bent of the will itself, man cannot by a single act reverse his moral state, and in this respect has not the power of a contrary choice. (*c*) In this latter case he can change his character only indirectly, by turning his attention to considerations fitted to awaken opposite dispositions, and by thus summoning up motives to an opposite course.

F. Will and responsibility.—(*a*) By repeated acts of will put forth in a given moral direction, the affections may become so confirmed in evil or in good as to make previously certain, though not necessary, the future good or evil action of the man. Thus, while the will is free, the man may be the "bondservant of sin" (John 8:31–36) or the "servant of righteousness" (Rom. 6:15–23; *cf.* Heb. 12:23—"spirits of just men made perfect"). (*b*) Man is responsible for all effects of will, as well as for will itself; for voluntary affections, as well as for voluntary acts; for the intellectual views into which will has entered, as well as for the acts of will by which these views have been formed in the past or are maintained in the present (2 Pet. 3:5—"wilfully forget").

G. Inferences from this view of the will.—(*a*) We can be responsible for the voluntary evil affections with which we are born, and for the will's inherited preference of selfishness, only upon the hypothesis that we originated these states of the affections and will, or had a part in originating them. Scripture furnishes this explanation, in its doctrine of Original Sin, or the doctrine of a common apostasy of the race in its first father, and our derivation of a corrupted nature by natural generation from him. (*b*) While there remains to man, even in his present condition, a natural power of will by which he may put forth transient volitions externally conformed to the divine law and so may to a limited extent modify his character, it still remains true that the sinful bent of his affections is not directly under his control; and this bent constitutes a motive to evil so constant, inveterate, and powerful, that it actually influences every member of the race to reäffirm his evil choice, and renders necessary a special working of God's Spirit upon his heart to ensure his salvation. Hence the Scripture doctrine of Regeneration.—*Systematic Theology*, pp. 257–58

4. Conscience. The faculty of *conscience* is one of the major manifestations of the immaterial part of man, and doubtless no other faculty reflects more fully that which is in likeness to God. The estimation on the part of men of what the conscience really is varies to a large degree. Some maintain that it is not an integral part of man, but is rather the voice of God speaking directly to the one who is exercised by conscience. On the other hand, and far removed indeed, is the notion that conscience is no more than a bent of mind received by the discipline of childhood. Neither one of these extremes is sustained by Scripture. It is to be observed, however, that the voice of conscience, when normal to any degree, is ever true to the divine ideal, and this in spite of the fact that there is much in man—especially his flesh—which is contrary to God. Conscience is not subject to the will, but

rather sits in judgment over the will and all other features of the life of man. The unity of man's being is none the less real regardless of the various elements in his immaterial nature—*soul, spirit, heart, flesh*, and *mind*—and regardless of the various modes of expression of that immaterial nature—*intellect, sensibility, will, memory*, and *conscience*. All these elements and manifestations perfectly articulate to form one experience which is called *life*. The mind may originate thoughts, the memory may retain thoughts, the spirit may discern the value of thoughts, and the soul respond to thoughts, but the conscience judges thoughts in respect to their moral worthiness. Naturally but little that is experienced by man is moral in character and therefore the conscience is not always exercised. At times and as occasion demands, conscience may become a torment, a lash, which is all but unbearable. In this, God seems to be more or less identified by every individual. He knows that God knows what he knows. Conscience is little concerned with the fact, as the case may be, that other people know that which constitutes its burden.

The Bible testimony concerning conscience is that it is either (a) *natural*—that which belongs to the unregenerate—or (b) *supernatural* that which belongs to the regenerate. The conscience of the unregenerate is *defiled* (Titus 1:15), *evil* (Heb. 10:22), *convicting* (John 8:9), *seared* (1 Tim. 4:2). On the other hand, the supernatural conscience, or that of the Christian, is far more complex. In fact a real question is raised properly whether the Christian lives by his conscience at all. It is contended that he is influenced by the indwelling Holy Spirit who is either grieved or not grieved by the manner of the Christian's life. No more vivid description of the experience of one in whom the Spirit is grieved could be found than that written by David concerning himself in Psalm 32:3–4. He declares: "When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer. Selah." The Apostle Paul significantly states that his conscience bore him witness in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 9:1). By this it would seem that the Spirit employs the conscience as His means of expression and impression, and perhaps that is the unveiling of the true relation between the Holy Spirit and the believer's conscience. With this in mind, certain revealed truths regarding the Christian's conscience may be considered. The conscience is *purged*. It is written: "For the law having a shadow of good

things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins" (Heb. 10:1–2). There is no intimation here that the Christian will not be conscious of unconfessed sin in his life; it is rather that the whole record of past sins, having been forgiven as a part of salvation, the purged conscience will not be exercised over them. This specific Scripture presents a vital test which may prove whether one is saved and may be applied to any professed believer. Closely related to this is the *good* conscience which is mentioned six times in the New Testament (note 1 Pet. 3:16). This aspect of conscience relates to or reflects the state of the believer's heart. A good conscience is free from self-condemnation. Two passages serve to describe this reality. In 1 Corinthians 4:4, the Apostle asserts, "For I know nothing by [or, against] myself," and in 1 John 3:20–22 this good conscience is said to be an important factor in effectual prayer. The passage states: "For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." Evidently the particular form of conscience noted here was experienced by those who were faithful to Jehovah under Judaism (cf. Acts 23:1; 2 Tim. 1:3). It is in this manner that conscience *witnesses* (Rom. 9:1) and may be void of offense (Acts 24:16). It is also worthy of note that the conscience of an immature Christian may be encouraged in the ways of sin by the example which other Christians present. It is written: "For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols?" (1 Cor. 8:10). The Apostle also identifies this as a *wounded* conscience: "But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ" (vs. 12).

Chapter XV

THE STATE OF INNOCENCE

I. The Environment of the First Man

THE DESCRIPTION of the environment of the first man is recorded in Genesis 2:8–9, 15, which reads: “And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.” It may be assumed that when Jehovah planted a garden in which was “every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food,” the prospect was as pleasing as could be secured by means of material things. The attractiveness of the garden was in harmony with all else that God had created and concerning which He had said it was “very good.” The evidence points unmistakably to the fact that a poor environment tends to encourage all manner of evil. The situation in which the first man was placed could not by any reasoning have been a contributing cause of his failure. What remains of this wonderful garden is only a poet’s dream. J. Vondel (1654), the greatest of Holland’s poets, in his greatest work, *Lucifer*, represents Apollyon reporting to Beelzebub of his visit to the Garden of Eden thus (translation by Leonard Charles van Noppen, pp. 269–70): Apollion:

> I have, Lord Belzebub,
> The low terrene observed with keenest eye, And now I offer thee the fruits grown there So far below these heights, ’neath other skies And other sun: now judge thou from the fruit The land and garden which even God Himself Hath blessed and planted for mankind’s delight.
> Belzebub:
> I see the golden leaves, all laden with Ethereal pearls, the sparkling silvery dew.
> What sweet perfume exhale those radiant leaves Of tint unfading! How alluring glows
> That pleasant fruit with crimson and with gold!
> ’Twere pity to pollute it with the hands.
> The eye doth tempt the mouth. Who would not lust For earthly luxury? He loathes our day
> And food celestial, who the fruit may pluck Of Earth. One would for Adam’s garden curse Our Paradise. The bliss of Angels fades In that of man.
> Apollion:

Too true, Lord Belzebub,
Though high our Heaven may seem, ’tis far too low.
For what I saw with mine own eyes deceives Me not. The world’s delights, yea, Eden’s fields Alone, our Paradise excel.

. . .

Apollion:
Round is the garden, as the world itself.
Above the centre looms the mount from which The fountain gushes that divides in four, And waters all the land, refreshing trees And fields; and flows in unreflective rills Of crystal purity. The streams their rich Alluvion bring and nourish all the ground.
Here Onyx gleams and Bdellion doth shine; And bright as Heaven glows with glittering stars; So here Dame Nature sowed her constellations Of stones that pale our stars. Here dazzle veins Of gold; for Nature wished to gather all Her treasures in one lap.

. . .

Apollion:
No angel us among, a breath exhales
So soft and sweet as the pure draught refreshing That there meets man, that lightly cools his face And with its gentle, vivifying touch
All things caresses in its blissful course: There swells the bosom of the fertile field With herb and hue and bud and branch and bloom And odors manifold, which nightly dews
Refresh. The rising and the setting sun Know and observe their proper, measured time And so unto the need of every plant
Temper their mighty rays that flower and fruit Are all within the selfsame season found.

II. The Responsibility of the First Man With respect to his manner of life, the obligation resting on the first man—aside from the task of dressing and keeping the garden—is the norm or pattern for all human life on the earth. During that undetermined period in which Adam lived before the fall, that ideal was realized to the fullest satisfaction of his Creator. That responsibility is easily stated in the words, *he did the will of God.* Evidence is not wanting to prove that in unbroken fellowship with God Adam received daily counsel and direction from God. But one prohibition was imposed upon him. This, indeed, formed an exceedingly small proportion of all the gracious instructions which fell from the lips of Jehovah. The present ideal for the redeemed is that they also may find and do the will of God for them. Too often the negative side of God’s

will is stressed out of all proportion. There are things which are evil and not convenient from which the Christian should abstain, but the will of God is *positive.* It is that which one may *do,* and in joyous fellowship with the Father and with His Son (1 John 1:3–4). That the Christian may walk and talk with God, that the guiding and teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit is vouchsafed to him, and that the enabling power to realize God's perfect will and plan is freely bestowed, illustrates, to some measure, the high privilege and responsibility of the first man when no cloud intervened between his Creator and himself. "The husbandman's calling is an ancient and honourable calling; it was needful even in paradise. The garden of Eden, though it needed not to be weeded (for thorns and thistles were not yet a nuisance), yet must be dressed and kept. Nature, even in its primitive state, left room for the improvements of art and industry. It was a calling fit for a state of innocency, making provision for life, not for lust, and giving man an opportunity of admiring the Creator and acknowledging his providence: while his hands were about his trees, his heart might be with his God" (MATTHEW HENRY'S *Commentary,* Fleming H. Revell Co., new ed., revised, *in loc.*, Gen. 2:15).

III. The Moral Qualities of the First Man Since holiness may be either *active* or *passive*—positive virtue, or the absence of evil—the moral qualities of the first man were passive. He was innocent of wrong. There had been no opportunity to develop a tested moral character; yet no record asserts that he had not understood the difference between right and wrong. What might have been required morally of the first man and the measure of his obligation, depended largely upon the degree of his development as created. If, as some have claimed, he was

only an infant in his mental powers—being an infant with respect to days of his existence—then his moral responsibility is lowered to the vanishing point and the transgression by which he fell called for no judgment whatsoever. In the matter of his transgression, God treated Adam as being wholly accountable and this fact alone certifies the moral development which he sustained. God created a *mature* man. It is true that he could recall no past history, nor could he marshal the value of accumulated experience; but these values were possessed to the degree required for maturity of action. Such was the character of the creative act of God. No higher attestation of full-grown human excellence could be found than is exhibited in the truth that man as created was well-pleasing to God and thus received into divine companionship. By so much the thought of immaturity or of irresponsibility is precluded; yet the holiness of the unfallen first man was passive in that it was innocence and untested character.

IV. The Tempter of the First Man

Of this being—identified as Satan—much has been written under Angelology about his person and the temptation he imposed, and more will be introduced at a later time under hamartiology.

It is to be recognized that the tempter is not identified in the Genesis account, which reads: "Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" (Gen. 3:1). It is not until the writing of Revelation 12:9 that the title *serpent* is identified as referring to the devil and Satan. Earlier in the New Testament there are clear references to the fact that it was Satan who tempted the first parents (2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14). It is to be observed that, in the progress of doctrine, the clear revelation respecting the tempter is not given until after redemption is completed in the cross. The fact that the original account as given in Genesis does not identify the tempter, but deals only with the creature Satan

employed as his means of communication, has encouraged various explanations of this momentous event, and has drawn out much criticism. The record states that the man and the woman, being created evidently outside the garden, are placed in it and appointed to dress it. Within the garden are two trees—"the tree of life" and "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." Of the latter the first parents are restrained from eating. The penalty for eating is death in all its forms, for God said to them, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The serpent appears and denies the word God has spoken, and declares that in the act of eating their eyes would be opened, they would be as *Elohim*, and know good and evil. The woman first partook of the fruit and then gave it to her husband who ate of it also. According to the Word of God, they became death-doomed and were expelled from the garden. In the light of subsequent Scriptures it is not difficult to identify the tempter as Satan, who is later revealed as ever going about seeking the ruin of God's human creatures. That he should have sought the downfall of Adam and Eve is in harmony with all his wiles, which are faithfully depicted in the later Scriptures.

Three opinions relative to this narrative may be listed, namely, (a) those who treat the record as a fiction, a *mythos*, and to these it is ever a difficulty to define the moral of the fable. Having departed so completely from the natural interpretation, they introduce freely as many ideas as the human mind may invent. (b) The second group of interpreters are those who attempt to blend reality with allegory and to varying degrees of reality and allegory. The absurdity of introducing allegorical features into that which purports to be real has been well pointed out by Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733–1806) thus: No writer of true history would mix plain matter of fact with allegory in one continued narrative, without any intimation of a transition from one to the other. If, therefore, any part of this narrative be matter of fact, no part is allegorical. On the other hand, if any part be allegorical, no part is naked matter of fact: and the consequence of this will be, that every thing in every part of the whole narrative must be allegorical. If the formation of the woman out of the man be allegory, the woman must be an allegorical woman. The man therefore must be an allegorical man; for of such a man only the allegorical woman will be a meet companion. If the man is allegorical, his paradise will be an allegorical garden; the trees that grow in it, allegorical trees; the rivers that watered it, allegorical rivers; and thus we may ascend to the very beginning of the creation; and conclude at last, that the heavens are allegorical heavens, and the earth an allegorical earth. Thus the whole history of the creation will be an allegory, of which the real subject is not disclosed; and in this absurdity the scheme of allegorizing ends.—Cited by Watson, *Theological Institutes*, II, 30

(c) A third group believe the record to be literal. They contend that the Mosaic account, while doubtless conveying deeper truths than those which appear on the surface, is, nevertheless, a historical record regarding actual beings and conditions. That it is a literal account is proved, first, by the fact that it is a part of a *continuous* history. The narrative goes on without a break into all subsequent history. If this record be fable and not history, the historical character of the entire Pentateuch is to be called in question, for none could point out a convenient place where early fable becomes history. The argument based on a continuous history cannot be refuted. The story is as clearly literal at its beginning as it is at its end, or at any point in its progress. In the second place, the literal character of this record is evidenced by the fact that reference is made to it in all candor in later Scriptures, and is there made the basis of instruction and appeal which would have no weight if drawn from a fable. The Bible, as a whole and without exception, treats the Genesis record as literal. This suggests an extensive theme which can be pursued here only to a limited degree.

Since the book of Job is earlier with respect to its writing than the Genesis account by Moses, it is significant that this book states: “Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?” (20:4–5). In this text the word *man* could as well be translated *Adam*. Again Job declares: “If I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom” (31:33). Thus, also, since God made man upright (Eccl. 7:29), the first sin of the woman is implied when Eliphaz says, “What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?” (Job 15:14). “Eden the garden of God” is mentioned by the prophets, and “the tree of life” is four times referred to in Proverbs and three times in Revelation. Perhaps no word is more conclusive than the words of Christ as they appear in Matthew 19:4–5, “And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?” In this Scripture it is to be seen that Christ recognized that God made the first man and first woman and that the marriage relation rests on that basic fact to which Christ refers, namely, that the woman was taken from the man, and, because of that truth, Adam said, “This is now bone of

my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. 2:23–24). In this instance, there could be no serious doubt concerning the truth that Christ was contemplating a historical event. The whole field of typology which obtains between Christ and Adam ceases to have any meaning or purpose if Adam, and all that concerns him, is unreal. "As by one man sin entered into the world"; "Adam to Moses"; "one that sinned"; "for if by one man's offence"; "one man's disobedience" (Rom. 5:12–21); "since by man came death"; "for as in Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:21–22); "the first man Adam was made a living soul"; "the first man is of the earth earthy" (1 Cor. 15:45, 47). "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3); "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" (1 Tim. 2:13–14). Not one of the passages presents a rhetorical allusion. They are rather the basis of sound reasoning and the ground of far-reaching doctrine which is altogether sacrificed if the events recorded early in Genesis are no more than fable. The only motive that promotes argument against the historicity of these Mosaic records is that they seem absurd since, as is claimed, they are unlike present human experience; but such reasoning not only assumes that God is restricted to those modes of operation which are current today, but that man is free to sit in judgment upon the Word of God. The contention gathers around the two trees and the serpent. Of these objections Richard Watson has discoursed to some length as follows: The fallacy of most of these objections is, however, easily pointed out. We are asked, first, whether it is reasonable to suppose, that the fruit of the tree of life could confer immortality? But what is there irrational in supposing that, though Adam was made exempt from death, yet that the fruit of a tree should be the appointed instrument of preserving his health, repairing the wastes of his animal nature, and of maintaining him in perpetual youth? Almighty God could have accomplished this end without means, or by other means; but since he so often employs instruments, it is not more strange that he should ordain to preserve Adam permanently from death by food of a special quality, than that now he should preserve men in health and life, for three-score years and ten, by specific foods; and that, to counteract disorders, he should have given specific medicinal qualities to herbs and minerals: or if, with some, we regard the eating of the tree of life as a sacramental act, an expression of faith in the promise of continued preservation, and a means through which the conserving influence of God was bestowed, a notion, however, not so well founded as the other, it is yet not inconsistent with the literal interpretation, and involves no really unreasonable consequence, and nothing directly contrary to the analogy of faith. It has been, also, foolishly enough

asked whether the fruit of the prohibited tree, or of any tree, can be supposed to have communicated "knowledge of good and evil," or have had any effect at all upon the intellectual powers? But this is not the idea conveyed by the history, however literally taken, and the objection is groundless. That tree might surely, without the least approach to allegory, be called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," whether we understand by this, that by eating it man came to know, by sad experience, the value of the "good" he had forfeited, and the bitterness of "evil," which he had before known only in name; or, as others have understood it, that it was appointed to be the test of Adam's fidelity to his Creator, and, consequently, was a tree of the knowledge of good and evil, a tree for the purpose of knowing (or making known) whether he would cleave to the former, or make choice of the latter. The first of these interpretations is, I think, to be preferred, because it better harmonizes with the whole history; but either of them is consistent with a literal interpretation, and cannot be proved to involve any real absurdity.

> To the account of the serpent, it has been objected that, taken literally, it makes the invisible tempter assume the body of an animal to carry on his designs; but we must be better acquainted with the nature and laws of disembodied spirits before we can prove this to be impossible, or even unlikely; and as for an animal being chosen as the means of approach to Eve, without exciting suspicion, it is manifest that, allowing a superior spirit to be the real tempter, it was good policy in him to address Eve through an animal which she must have noticed as one of the inhabitants of the garden, rather than in a human form, when she knew that herself and her husband were the only human beings as yet in existence. The presence of such a stranger would have been much more likely to put her on her guard. But then, we are told that the animal was a contemptible reptile. Certainly not before he was degraded in form; but, on the contrary, one of the "beasts of the earth," and not a "creeping thing;" and also more "subtle," more discerning and sagacious "than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made"—consequently the head of all the inferior animals in intellect, and not unlikely to have been of a corresponding noble and beautiful form; for this, indeed, his bodily degradation imports. If there was policy, then, in Satan's choosing an animal as the instrument by which he might make his approaches, there was as much good taste in his selection as the allegorists, who seem anxious on this point, can wish for him. The *speaking* of the serpent is another stumbling-block; but as the argument is not here with an infidel, but with those who profess to receive the Mosaic record as Divine, the speaking of the serpent is no more a reason for interpreting the relation allegorically, than the speaking of the ass of Balaam can be for allegorizing the whole of that transaction. That a good or an evil spirit has no power to produce articulate sounds from the organs of an animal, no philosophy can prove, and it is a fact which is, therefore, capable of being rationally substantiated by testimony. There is a clear reason, too, for this use of the power of Satan in the story itself. By his giving speech to the serpent, and representing *that*, as appears from the account, as a consequence of the serpent having himself eaten of the fruit, he took the most effectual means of impressing Eve with the dangerous and fatal notion, that the prohibition of the tree of knowledge was a restraint upon her happiness and intellectual improvement, and thus to suggest hard thoughts of her Maker. The objection that Eve manifested no *surprise* when she heard an animal speak, whom she must have known not to have had that faculty before, has also no weight, since that circumstance might have occurred without being mentioned in so brief a history. It is still more likely that Adam should have expressed some marks of surprise and anxiety too, when his wife presented the fruit to him, though nothing of the kind is mentioned.—*Ibid.*, II, 24–26

As to the equity of the judgment which fell upon the serpent, Watson continues thus: An objection is taken to the *justice* of the sentence pronounced on the serpent, if the transaction be accounted real, and if that animal were but the unconscious instrument of the great seducer. To this the reply is obvious, that it could be no matter of just complaint to the serpent that its form should be changed, and its species lowered in the scale of being. It had no original right to its former superior rank, but held it at the pleasure of the Creator. If special pain and sufferings had been inflicted upon the serpent, there would have been a semblance of plausibility in the objection; but the serpent suffered, as to liability to pain and death, no more than other animals, and was not therefore any more than another irrational creature, accounted a responsible offender. Its degradation was evidently intended as a memento to man, and the real punishment, as we shall show, fell upon the real transgressor who used the serpent as his instrument; while the enmity of the whole race of serpents to the human race, their cunning, and their poisonous qualities, appear to have been wisely and graciously intended as standing warnings to us to beware of that great spiritual enemy, who ever lies in wait to wound and to destroy.—*Ibid.*, II, 27

That no direct sentence is pronounced upon Satan is in harmony with the evident divine intention to withhold the fuller revelation to a later place in the Divine Oracles. None can doubt but that unmitigated judgment does fall on Satan eventually for his original sin, for his share in the lapse of man, and for all his subsequent wickedness. The real issues between God and Satan belong to another sphere of existence which could not be incorporated into the records of human history at this point without complicating the simplicity of the narrative of man’s fall. Attention is called in passing to the veiled intimation, in the curse which fell on the serpent, of the judgment which descended upon the real tempter at the cross and those judgments, also, which will yet descend upon him in future times. No uncertainty exists about the judgment of Satan in the word of God to the serpent when He said: “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel” (Gen. 3:15). Archbishop William King (1650–1729) has written: “As the literal sense does not exclude the mystical, the cursing of the serpent is a symbol to us, and a visible pledge of the malediction with

which the devil is struck by God, and whereby he is become the most abominable and miserable of all creatures. But man, by the help of *the seed of the woman*, that is, by our Saviour, shall bruise his head, wound him in the place that is most mortal, and destroy him with eternal ruin. In the meantime, the enmity and abhorrence we have of the serpent is a continual warning to us of the danger we are in of the devil, and how heartily we ought to abhor him and all his works" (cited by Watson, *ibid.*, II, 39).

Five quotations from the Apocryphal writings serve to reveal the truth that the Jews of the early times believed in the literal character of the Genesis account: 2 Esdras 3:4–7, "O Lord, thou barest rule, thou spakest at the beginning, when thou didst plant the earth, and that thyself alone, and commandest the people; and gavest a body to Adam without soul, which was the workmanship of thy hands, and didst breathe into him the breath of life, and he was made living before thee; and thou leddest him into paradise, which thy right hand had planted, and unto him thou gavest commandment to love thy way, which he transgressed, and immediately thou appointedst death in him and in his generations, of whom came nations, tribes, people, and kindreds out of number." 2 Esdras 7:48, "O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we are all that came of thee." Wisdom 2:24, "Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world." Wisdom 10:1, "She (wisdom) preserved the first-formed father of the world, that was created alone, and brought him out of his fall." Ecclesiasticus 17:1, etc., "The Lord created man of the earth, and turned him into it again. He gave them a few days and a short time, and also power over all things therein—he filled them with the knowledge of understanding, and showed them good and evil."

V. The Temptation of the First Man

The chronicle of the temptation is in like manner presented in the simplest of terms. It is written: "Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons" (Gen. 3:1–7).

The plain question raised by Satan, as stated in verse 1, may have breathed the suggestion that there was injustice in the divine restriction touching the one tree. This question served to draw out the reaction of the woman who, in turn, was bold enough to add the words "neither shall ye touch it" to what God had said, and this altered to no small degree the divine command. Whether a resentment is present in these added words could not be proved. However, Satan is even bolder in his response when he asserts, "Ye shall not surely die," which is a flat contradiction of Jehovah's decree. It is possible that, as Satan was seeking the allegiance of Adam and Eve in his own great cause which involved his independence of God, he was promising that by power which he would exercise they would be saved from this divine judgment. Aside from this contradiction, Satan disclosed the truth that by independent action, such as disobedience really is, they would become as *Elohim.* As before stated, the word *Elohim* occurs twice in verse 5, and there is as much reason for translating the name *Elohim* 'gods' in the first instance as in the second, and no reason can be assigned in either case. The ambition to become "like the most High" (Isa. 14:14) was the original sin of this great angel, and no little meaning is attached to the fact that he brought his own identical sin of independence of God as a temptation to Adam and Eve and that they adopted this philosophy of life. It is even more significant that in the threefold temptation of Christ—the Last Adam—Satan sought in the sphere of Christ's humanity to get Him to act outside the will of God. Thus it is evident that there resides in this disposition to independence of God the essential character of sin. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the final act in Satan's tragic enterprise is to promote and exalt the man of sin whose identification is ever his avowed claim to be God. A more exhaustive treatment of this great

theme, beyond what has already appeared under satanology, awaits the time of its logical consideration under hamartiology.

Since Adam and Eve had known enough of the difference between right and wrong to form a basis for right action concerning the will of God as involved in the one prohibition placed upon them, it is evident that the new knowledge of good and evil which came to them through their disobedience was deeper and of a different character. Though there was nothing attractive in the exploit of coming to know evil by the sorrow which the experience of it secures and the value of good by the loss of it, there is, nevertheless, a strange zest in free action. Of Moses it is written that he chose "rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season" (Heb. 11:25). To the woman the forbidden fruit appeared as that which was "good for food," "pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise" (cf. 1 John 2:16). The inner cravings of her own being responded to the temptation from without and she yielded to evil, and thus repudiated God. That Adam followed in the same sin adds nothing to the account more than that, as declared in 1 Timothy 2:14, he was not deceived but sinned knowingly and willfully.

The range of possible testing for unfallen Adam was greatly restricted. He was not subject to the solicitation of avarice and covetousness since he was lord over earth's creation. He could not be drawn into immoral sexual relations since he was united in marriage to the only one in the world who might attract him. The one supreme sin of the repudiation of God was possible. The fallen man is susceptible to sinful desires; the unfallen man was susceptible to innocent desires. There was no inherent wrong in the eating of fruit. The first sin did not consist in a dietetic error. It was not a question of nourishing or injurious food. The tree and its fruit became the ground of testing with respect to the creature's obedience to his Creator—an issue as extensive and real as life itself. The end in view was whether the creature would abide in the sphere into which he had been placed by creation, or would revolt against his Creator. The importance of this tree as a means of testing unfallen man is stated by Dr. William G. T. Shedd in the following words: "The 'tree of knowledge' was an actual tree bearing fruit in the garden. It might have been a date-tree, or any other kind of tree, and still have been the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Because, when once God had selected a particular tree in the garden, and by a positive

statute had forbidden our first parents to eat of it, the instant they did eat of it they transgressed a Divine command, and then *knew* consciously and bitterly what evil is, and how it differs from good. The tree thus became 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,' not because it was a particular species of tree, but because it had been selected as the tree whereby to test the implicit obedience of Adam. The first sin was unique, in respect to the statute broken by it. The Eden commandment was confined to Eden. It was never given before or since. Hence the first Adamic transgression cannot be repeated. It remains a single solitary transgression; the 'one' sin spoken of in Rom. 5:12, 15–19" (*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 154).

The prohibition imposed upon Adam has been made the subject of many "a fool-born jest." Likewise, its penalty has been deemed to be out of all proportion to the seeming wickedness of the sin. Enough has been said already to serve as an answer to such shallow suggestions. Bishop Joseph Butler (1692–1752) in his *Analogy* distinguishes between precepts which are *positive* and precepts which are *moral.* He states: "Moral precepts are those the reasons of which we see; positive precepts those, the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command: positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all, were it not for such command received from him whose creatures and subjects we are" (cited by Watson, *op. cit.*, II, 35–36).

Very much has been written with reference to the action of the will of unfallen Adam. The problem is difficult and psychological in character. The influence of the tempter over Adam cannot be estimated. There was a kingdom of evil already in the universe when Adam was created. God had permitted the fall of the greatest of the angels, and he had led, by the same permissive will, an unnumbered host of angels into rebellion against God. The problem arises rather with Adam's own desires. If he were lusting after forbidden knowledge and independence of God, he was fallen already. The situation is exceeded in complexity only by the fall of Satan; in which instance there was no tempter nor was there any inward urge which springs from a fallen nature. Yet Satan was lifted up with pride (1 Tim. 3:6) and became subject to unholy ambition desiring to reach beyond the sphere into which he was placed by creation—a sphere determined by infinite wisdom, in which he might know the benefit of infinite power, and be sustained and

blessed by infinite love. The same sin is re-enacted by Adam. It is written: “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” (Rom. 5:12). The precise nature of sin was not changed by its entrance into the world. A cause may be assigned for sin, but it is never rational. Of this truth Augustine (354–430) wrote: “Let no one look for an efficient cause of the evil will; for it is not efficient, but deficient, since the evil will itself is not an effecting of something, but a defect. To seek for an efficient cause of sin [out of the will, and other than the will], is like attempting to see darkness, or hear silence.” Again he says, “God made man upright, and consequently with a good inclination. The good inclination, then, is the work of God. But the first evil inclination, which preceded all of man’s evil acts, was rather a kind of falling away from the good work of God to its own work, than any positive work; the will now not having God, but the will itself, for its end” (both passages cited by Shedd, *op. cit.*, p. 157).

The penalty threatened to fall upon Adam was death, and death in all its forms—spiritual, physical, and eternal. On the day they disobeyed God, the first parents died spiritually; they began to die physically having become mortal; and they were at once subject to eternal death unless redeemed from it. As created, Adam and Eve seemed to have had before them the possibility of death, but were not subject to death. They were rather subject to life with the prospect of ever closer conformity to the One in whose image and likeness they were made. The immortal body which these beings possessed before their sin was such only in a relative sense. It was subject to that which did actually eventuate. It has been held by some that, had Adam stood the test, he would have become immortal in the absolute sense. He would have put on, it is claimed, a spiritual body; but there is no clear assurance of such a prospect. It is certain, however, that, had the test been withstood, it would not have returned again. Its pressure was not to have remained as a constant experience until the first parents were broken down. The prohibition concerning the specific tree and its fruit seemed not to have disturbed them until it was accentuated and made the point of attack by the tempter. The stress of the moment was not the prohibition itself, but the tempter’s use of it. The mental process through which Eve passed is more fully disclosed than that through which Adam passed. She had observed the tree and was aware of the divinely imposed restriction placed upon it, but

quite suddenly she saw that it was beautiful to the eye, that it was good for food, and that it offered an avenue into greater wisdom. These new impressions were but for the moment. Had they been resisted, the test would have passed forever. The experience of these two parents is not a norm or pattern of temptations which beset fallen humanity, whose experience is that of a ceaseless stress and trial with the depressing consciousness of many failures and defeats.

There yet remains the urgency to consider the great *protevangelium* declaration which fell as a word of hope from the lips of Jehovah at the conclusion of the judgment pronounced upon the serpent, and beyond the serpent to the incarnate tempter himself. A literal bruising of a serpent's head and a corresponding injury to the heel of a man will not fulfill this prophetic expectation. The serpent, in this instance, is Satan himself and the "seed of the woman" is none other than the incarnate Christ of God. This abrupt extension of the divine judgment into universal and eternal realms lends encouragement to the belief that all that this narrative records is applicable far beyond the natural limitations which the simple story chronicles.

Chapter XVI

THE FALL

THE FALL, or lapse, of the first man must be contemplated in the light of that which preceded it—innocence, tempter, temptation—and that which followed it—spiritual death and depravity of those who sinned, spiritual death and depravity of the race, and physical death. These factors which preceded the fall have been attended in recent pages; the things which followed, though yet to be examined more fully under hamartiology, should be pursued briefly at least at this present juncture.

The extended doctrine concerning death is at once in evidence. God had warned the two parents that in the day they ate of the forbidden fruit "dying they should die." The penalty thus proposed was executed and death in its three forms was imposed upon them. (1) Spiritual death, which is separation of soul and spirit from God, fell upon them the moment they sinned; (2) physical death began at once its unavoidable process of disintegration and eventual separation of soul and spirit from the body; and (3) they became subject to the second death which is the lake of fire—the eternal separation of soul and spirit from God. Of the lake of fire, it is written that it is prepared for the devil and his angels. It was not prepared for human beings and they enter it only on the ground that they repudiate God and cast in their lot with Satan and his angels. Dr. Lindsay Alexander in his *System of Biblical Theology*, Volume I, has written a general account of the fall of man which is here incorporated:

> Let us now turn to glance for a little at the immediate effect of the temptation. And here it is interesting also to observe the process by which evil consummated its triumph over Eve. The narrative of Moses, brief as it is, may be viewed as an articulate illustration of the analysis of the Apostle John in his theory of evil as consisting of the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye and the pride of life. The woman, we are told, when she looked saw that the tree was good for food: there was the lust of the flesh, the craving of irregular appetite and lawless desire; and that it was pleasant to the eyes: there was the lust of the eyes, the inordinate love and desire of what is merely beautiful and attractive with the craving after the possession of what merely enriches and magnifies; and that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise: there was the pride of life, the unholy love of pre-eminence, the restless curiosity that would pry into what God has concealed, the ambition to grasp power above our due, and the impious assumption, if not of equality with God, yet of a right over ourselves independent of God. These three affections are the main sources and occasions of the evil

> which now predominate in the world; and we see they had all a share in bringing about the first sin that was committed on its surface. They saw the origin of evil in our race; and as they sat at its cradle, they have ever since nourished and fed it; nor shall it utterly perish until they have been entirely subdued, and man's whole nature has been restored to its pristine purity. There is another statement of the New Testament which receives an interesting illustration from the process by which Eve advanced along the path into which the tempter had drawn her. "Lust," says the Apostle James, "when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin." This is the genealogy of transgression; first there is the evil desire, and then by natural consequence from that the evil act. So was it with our first mother; she began with lust and ended with sin. She allowed a forbidden desire to be nourished in her heart, and this quickly developed itself into a forbidden deed. A deceived heart led her aside; a mind betrayed by Satan betrayed her in turn. And as lust leads to sin, so sin naturally tends to propagate itself. Hence no sooner had Eve herself sinned than she sought to draw her husband into the same snare. Adam, however, was not deceived as she had been. He followed her example, but it was with his eyes open. Whether it was mere thoughtless indifference, or a too yielding affection for his wife, or a sort of chivalrous feeling that he would share with her in the risks she had incurred, that moved him, we cannot tell; but certain it is that what he did he did fully aware of the evil of it and the consequence of it. In any case his sin was great. He preferred a brief indulgence to the claims of duty and of gratitude. Forgetful of God and His authority and His law, he looked only at the beautiful and smiling image, and listened only to the horrid words of the fair but fallen partner of his life. Thus was he drawn to follow her example and to partake of her sin. Then was man's first disobedience complete. Then was the ruin of our race accomplished. Then was the covenant broken and the curse incurred. Then was the image of God in man blotted and defaced. Then was discord produced between earth and heaven. Then did the bowers of Paradise, a moment before the abodes of stainless innocence, become the sorrowful scenes of guilt and passion and shame.—Pp. 195–96

In Book ix of *Paradise Lost*, Milton (cited by Alexander, *ibid.*) describes the reaction of nature to the sin of man—not unlike the reaction of nature when God's remedy for sin was wrought out at the cross—

> Earth trembled from her entrails, as again
> In pangs, and nature gave a second groan;
> Sky lour'd, and, muttering thunder, some sad drops
> Wept at completing of the mortal sin.

The great issues which eventuated with the first sin of the first man demand separate and attentive consideration

I. Spiritual Death and Depravity

A later investigation will demonstrate that both spiritual death and physical death, though so different in character and in the manner in which they reach Adam's posterity, originate alike in the first sin of the first man. Spiritually dead persons may be physically alive. The Apostle asserts that

the Ephesian believers were, before their salvation, “dead in trespasses and sins,” and that at that time of spiritual death they were walking “according to the course of this [*cosmos*] world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in [energizeth] the children of disobedience” (Eph. 2:1–2). Likewise, he also states, “She that liveth in pleasure [σπαταλῶσα, ‘self-gratification’] is dead while she liveth [ζῶσα]” (1 Tim. 5:6).

When Adam sinned his first sin he experienced a conversion downwards. He became degenerate and depraved. He developed within himself a fallen nature which is contrary to God and is ever prone to evil. His constitution was altered fundamentally and he thus became a wholly different being from the one God had created. A similar fall into degeneracy had been experienced before by the highest of all angels and by the angels who joined his rebellion against God. No other human being than Adam has ever become a sinner by sinning. All others were born sinners. Distinction is made at this point between sin as an evil act and sin as an evil nature. By a sinful act Adam acquired a sinful nature, whereas all members of his family are born with that nature.

By his sin Adam came under the domination of Satan. He literally surrendered to the evil one. The extent of this authority is not revealed and probably could not be, since it involves spheres and relationships which are beyond the range of human observation. Attention is called again to four New Testament passages: 2 Corinthians 4:3–4, in which it is said that those that are lost are under Satan’s power to the extent that their minds are blinded concerning the gospel of their salvation; Ephesians 2:1–2, where it is asserted that the unsaved are energized by Satan; Colossians 1:13, where it is declared that, when saved, the believer is translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love; and 1 John 5:19, where it is revealed that the whole *cosmos* world “lieth in” the wicked one, and this relationship is vital and organic and is comparable only to the truth that the Christian is *in Christ* as a new creation. These passages set forth the present relationship between unregenerate humanity and Satan; but they as certainly disclose the fact that it was into such a relationship that Adam was drawn at the moment he sinned. It could not be shown that the human family came into this relation to Satan at any subsequent time in human history.

Little, indeed, is recorded of Adam's history following his sin. The implication is that he lived the normal life of a fallen man of his time. Memory, however, served him faithfully and no doubt exercised a great influence in his life and his testimony to his posterity was equally effective.

The immediate change in Adam and Eve which their sin wrought is revealed in the record that they were ashamed, having discovered that they were unclothed. This incident in the narrative, like the *protevangelium* of Genesis 3:15, reaches into deeper realities which were foreshadowed in this initial experience of mankind. In its Scripture use, clothing is the symbol of righteousness. The shame which these two experienced was not between themselves but rather between themselves and God. They did not hide from each other, but they did hide from God. They had experienced a change in their very constitution which separated them from God. If they were at once to be expelled from the garden, it was because of the truth that they had first voluntarily broken their relation with God by hiding from His presence. Whatever may have been their own consciousness at that time, the faithful record of God's Word offers the undisputable evidence that they deemed themselves no longer worthy to meet God face to face. Much truth, likewise, lies hidden in the facts that they attempted to clothe themselves, which clothing was of no value; and that God clothed them with skins, which meant the shedding of blood. Thus another great doctrine of the Bible is enacted in type at least: "Without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22), and "being justified ['declared righteous'] freely ['without a cause'] by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24).

The Bible further teaches with complete unanimity that the race is depraved—apart from the saving grace of God—and it is equally evident that no time can be indicated when this came to pass other than the fall of man in the Garden of Eden. The claim that the unregenerate are totally depraved is resented by many and for want of a right understanding of its meaning. If, as viewed by men, it is asserted that there is nothing good in man, the statement is untrue; for, as man is quick to declare, there is no human being so degraded that there is not some good in him. If, on the other hand, as viewed by God, it is claimed that man is without merit in His sight, the case is far different. Depravity as a doctrine does not stand or fall on the ground of man's estimation of himself; it rather reflects God's

estimation of man. What the Bible avers on the fallen and depraved estate of man would not be written by man. He would have no sufficient perspective by which to form a worthy conclusion, nor would he thus abase himself.

Dr. Shedd's concluding remarks on depravity are to the point:

> The depravity or corruption of nature is total. Man is "wholly inclined to evil, and that continually." Westminster L. C., 25. Gen. 6:5, "God saw that every imagination of the thoughts of man was only evil continually." There can be but a single dominant inclination in the will at one and the same time; though with it there may be *remnants* of a previously dominant inclination. Adam began a new sinful inclination. This expelled the prior holy inclination. He was therefore totally depraved, because there were no *remainders* of original righteousness left after apostasy, as there are remainders of original sin left after regeneration. This is proved by the fact that there is no struggle between sin and holiness, in the natural man, like that in the spiritual man. In the regenerate, "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh," Gal. 5:17. Holiness and sin are in a conflict that causes the regenerate to "groan within themselves," Rom. 8:23. But there is no such conflict and groaning in the natural man. Apostasy was the fall of the human will, with no remnants of original righteousness. Regeneration is the recovery of the human will, with some remnants of original sin. Total depravity means the entire absence of holiness, not the highest intensity of sin. A totally depraved man is not as bad as he can be, but he has no holiness, that is, no supreme love of God. He worships and loves the creature rather than the creator, Rom. 1:25. —*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 257

Following the record of the fall of man, the text of the Bible is not pursued far until the evidence of universal death is discovered (cf. Gen. 5:5–31), and the solemn declaration: "And GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5). How in contrast this statement stands over against the original estimation of Jehovah, "And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1:31)! Writing by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, holy men have declared: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one" (Job. 14:4); "What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" (Job 15:14); "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51:5); "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.… Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" (Eccl. 7:20, 29); "Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the LORD, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away

backward. Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment" (Isa. 1:4–6); "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. … And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man" (Mark 7:15, 20–23); "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes" (Rom. 3:9–18); "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:19–21); "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (James 1:13–15).

From such a testimony, which might be greatly enlarged, the doctrine of *depravity* is drawn; nor can these Scriptures be explained otherwise. To this conception every line of the Bible is harmonious. It was this that called forth the saving grace of God in Christ Jesus. No more misleading or injurious word can be given the unsaved than to impress upon them that

they are lost only on the ground of their personal sins. If this be true, they are lost only to the degree to which they have thus sinned. Men are lost by *nature*—"by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3) —and there is deep significance, reaching far beyond the realms of personal wrongdoing, in the words of Christ, "Ye are of your father the devil" (John 8:44). Only the grace of God, proffered to the meritless, through the cross of Christ can avail, and that salvation contemplates not only the forgiveness of sins committed but the impartation of a new divine nature.

The experience of man is a confirming testimony to his sinful nature. Men expect little good from themselves or their fellow men; they avoid every relationship to God and even blaspheme His holy name; a child goes naturally in the ways of evil, but must be disciplined in the direction of good.

Writing of the depravity of human nature, Dr. Timothy Dwight states: "In truth, no doctrine of the Scriptures is expressed in more numerous or more various forms, or in terms more direct or less capable of misapprehension" (*Theology*, Serm. 29). So also Dr. Thomas Chalmers, "If it be through the blood of Christ, the blood of expiation, that all who get to heaven are saved, then does it follow universally of them who get to heaven as of them who are kept out of heaven,—inclusive of the whole human race, —that one and all of them have sinned" (*Institutes of Theology*, i, p. 385). Likewise, Dr. Pye Smith: "The Scriptures represent holiness of character in any of mankind as the *exception*, and as owing to *grace* which makes men 'new creatures' and 'all things new;' whereas the wickedness of extremely depraved men is put as affording fair specimens of human nature, because it is the spontaneous unchecked growth of our nature" (*First Lines of Theology*, p. 383). Observe, also, Dr. Lindsay Alexander's brief word: "The gospel is a call to the race as such to repent and return unto God. 'God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent' (Acts 17:30). But what need of universal repentance, except on the supposition of universal sinfulness? The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick; the Lord came to call sinners, not righteous persons, to repentance; and when, consequently, we hear Him addressing this call to 'all men everywhere,' we cannot doubt that in the view of heaven all men are sinners, and further, that unless this be admitted and realized, there is no just apprehension of the true nature and design of Christianity obtained" (*Op. cit.*, p. 205). The word of Aristotle is

equally as impressive: “There appears another something besides the reason natural to us which fights and struggles against the reason; and just as the limbs of the body when under paralysis are when they would move to the right are carried away to the left, so is it in the soul” (*Eth. Nicom.*, i. 11). So also Plutarch declaims: “Some portion of evil is mingled in all who are born; for the seeds of our being are mortal, and hence they share in causing this, whence depravity of soul, diseases, and cares creep upon us” (*De Consol. ad Apoll.*). The assertion of Kant is equally clear and forceful: “That the world lieth in wickedness is a lament as old as history, nay, as old as the oldest poetry. The world began, it is allowed, with good, with a golden age, with a life in Paradise, or with one still happier in communion with heavenly being. But this felicity, it is admitted, has vanished like a dream; and now man’s course is even with accelerated speed from bad (morally bad, with which the physically bad ever advances *pari passu*) to worse. … A few moderns have advanced the opposite opinion, which, however, has found favour only with philosophers, and in our day chiefly among pedagogues, that the world is progressively tending from bad to better, or, at least, that the basis of this lies in human nature. But this opinion assuredly is not derived from experience, if it is of moral goodness and badness, not civilisation, they speak; for the history of all times speaks decisively against it” (*Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, p. 1). G. L. Hahn says: “Profound observers of the human nature in great numbers since Kant have acknowledged the truth of the Biblical doctrine, that the root of man’s nature is corrupt, so that each feels himself by nature morally sick and unfree, and no one is able of his own strength to fulfil the divine law, though he acknowledges it to be good and inviolable” (*Lehrbuch*, p. 364; the above citations are from Alexander, *ibid.*, pp. 204–5, 212–13).

II. Physical Death

The separation of soul and spirit from the body, which experience is termed *physical death*, is in no way comparable to *spiritual death*, though they both originate in the first sin of the first man. Not a few have been confused with regard to these widely different aspects of truth; but the fuller treatment of this theme must be deferred here and resumed under

hamartiology. Suffice it to indicate that, though they originate at the same point or place, their experience is, obviously, altogether diverse. Those that in this life are spiritually dead are alive physically, while those that have died physically are alive spiritually, in the sense that they cannot cease to exist. In the end, spiritual death of this life, if not healed by redeeming grace, merges into unending second death, while physical death will yet be rebuked for all—saved and unsaved. “There shall be no more death” (Rev. 21:4), and “the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:26).

Conclusion

In tracing the vast field which the Anthropology of the Bible presents, consideration has been given to the origin by creation, the constitution and capacities of man, his temptation and his fall as well as the results of that fall upon himself and the race. This, with the doctrine of sin—next to be attended—becomes the background for the all-engaging theme of Soteriology.

Chapter XVII

INTRODUCTION TO HAMARTIOLOGY

THERE IS A justification for the fact that the two great doctrines—*sin* and *redemption*—go hand in hand. It is sin that has drawn out redemption from the heart of God, and redemption is the only cure for sin. These two realities, in turn, become measurements of each other. Where sin is minimized, redemption is automatically impoverished since its necessity is by so much decreased. The worthy approach to the doctrine of *sin* is to discover all that is revealed about the sinfulness of sin and then to recognize that God's provided Savior is equal to every demand which sin imposes. It is one of Satan's most effective methods of attack upon the saving work of Christ to soften the voice which is set to proclaim the evil character and effect of sin. Apparently not all who are known as teachers of God's truth are awake to this satanic strategy. It is too often assumed that it is wiser to leave this loathsome monster called *sin* to lurk in the dark, and to dwell on the more attractive virtues of human life. Sin is what God says it is, and here human opinion and philosophy must bend to the testimony of the Word of God in which He declares the true nature of sin. Opinions of self-flattering men are of little value in a matter which can be determined only by revelation.

Sin is likewise to be seen as opposed to holiness. The essential facts related to all distinctions between holiness and sin are supermundane in their character. There is nothing which in itself is more restricted to, or more grounded in, the very nature of God than holiness, and its opposite —evil— derives all its properties from the one and only fact that it is *unholy.* There is a legitimate field of research which contemplates sin in the light of its experimental, philosophical, and sociological effects; but the fundamental traits of evil, like its counterpart—holiness—are discovered only as they are given form and substance by virtue of their relation to the Person of God. What God *is* and what God *says* are the material out of which all moral and spiritual values are derived. Since God is revealed adequately only in the Scriptures of Truth, there can be little apprehension of the true character of either good or evil apart from that which it has pleased God to disclose in

the Bible. Every approach to this vast theme which is extra-Biblical must be speculative and therefore of little abiding value.

At the opening of his treatise on *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Dr. Julius Müller writes the following on the dark character of sin in this human sphere and the importance of knowing the revelation God has made:

> It requires no special profundity of reflection but only a moderate degree of moral earnestness to prompt us thoughtfully to pause before ONE GREAT PHENOMENON of human life, and ever and anon to turn towards it a scrutinizing look. I refer to the phenomenon of EVIL; the presence of an element of disturbance and discord in a sphere where the demand for harmony and unity is felt with peculiar emphasis. It meets us at every turn as the history of the human race in the course of its development passes before us; it betrays its presence in manifold forms when we fix our eyes upon the closest relationships of society; and we cannot hide from ourselves its reality when we look into our own hearts. It is a dark and dismal nightshade, casting a gloom over every department of human life, and continually pervading its fairest and brightest forms. They, indeed, make very light of their philosophical perceptions who fancy they can dismiss the greatest riddle of the world, the existence of evil, simply by forbidding it serious thought. They speak of the disagreeableness of reflections so studiously directed towards the dark side of life; they find that it is only "according to nature," that the more steadily you fix your eyes upon the darkness, the more immeasurable does it appear; and they advise us for our own sakes to turn away from the question of evil, because our troubling ourselves about it will be of no avail save to plunge us into gloomy melancholy. How gladly should we follow this advice if only Novalis were right in his bold promise,—which expresses the mind of Carpocrates the Gnostic, and that perhaps of Fichte also,—that, "if a man suddenly and thoroughly persuaded himself that he was moral, he would really be so." Were it true, that if a man with firm resolve shook off "that old and grievous delusion of sin," as a wild and empty dream, he would be free from sin, who would not in so easy a manner be released? But as the well-known device of the ostrich does not save it from the weapon of the hunter, so the mere shutting of our eyes to the reality of evil does not make it vanish, but delivers us only the more surely into its power. In order to be conquered, the enemy must first of all be known; and the very complaints of the disagreeableness of such reflections strongly witness how dangerous it is to shrink from them.—I, 28–29

In the investigation of the subject of sin, two general modes of procedure have been employed, namely, the *exegetical* and the *speculative.* The exegetical method is an attempt, by an induction from the Biblical testimony, to formulate the complete doctrine as set forth in the Scriptures. The speculative method is characterized by its attention to human philosophy and experience. The exegetical method is without question justified, and yet, even when attempting to formulate the doctrine from the Scriptures, it is essential to recognize the practical working of each Bible truth as it appears in human lives.

How vast is the sum total of the spiritual shadows of this universe—those in heaven and those on earth! The extent and character of the shadows will be computed only when He whose standards and valuations are infinite shall have completed all that He has decreed. These issues are immeasurable—immeasurable with respect to the quantity indeed, but even more immeasurable with respect to their hideous character— for sin is credited with having caused infinite tragedy both in heaven and on earth. But, beyond all this, sin must be identified as that which occasioned the greatest divine sacrifice and necessitated the payment of a ransom on no less terms than the lifeblood of the Son of God. Any human attempts to contemplate a theme so boundless will be restricted, on the one hand, to the only source of authoritative information—the Word of God—and expanded, on the other hand, by so much as it may please God to enlighten the mind. At best, man will but feebly react to the divine estimation of sin, and yet more hopeless must he be in his appreciation of the problem when he considers its presence in the universe, which universe is designed, created, executed, and consummated according to the free and sovereign will of the One who acts ever and only in the sphere of that which is infinitely holy.

The problem which sin creates is more than a mere conflict between good and evil in human conduct; it involves the measureless and timeless issues in the conflict between that holiness which is the substance of God's character and all that is opposed to it. It contemplates more than the loss and injury sustained by the one who sins. It intrudes into the sphere of the divine rights which, by the Creator's ownership, are vested in the creature of His hand. The ultimate triumph of righteousness over unrighteousness is assured and secured in the very nature and being of God, for an unqualified promise is made of an on-coming new heaven and new earth in which righteousness shall *dwell*. That long-anticipated hour will bring in the final banishment of all evil and demonstrate the rectitude of God both in His permission of sin in the universe and in every aspect of His dealing with it from its inception to its consummation.

There are fundamental features of the doctrine of sin which, in their outreach, extend beyond the range of the usual treatment of this theme. The evangelist rightly assumes that all men are ruined in the tragedy of sin and, without recognition of more extended issues, proceeds to proclaim the gospel of the saving grace of God. Of the theologian it is required that he

shall penetrate into the deeper problems of the origin and essential character of sin and deal with this doctrine not alone in its relation to man, but with its beginning and ending, in its relation to angels, and specifically in its relation to God. Though but briefly stated by way of introduction and yet to be considered more exhaustively, some of the deeper aspects of this doctrine are:

I. The Essential Nature of Sin

The holy character of God is the final and only standard by which moral values may be accurately judged. To the one who disregards God, there are no moral standards other than social custom, or the dictates of an uncertain and perverted conscience. And even these, it will be observed, though indirect, failing, and feeble, are, nevertheless, reflections of the standards of God. Sin is sinful because it is unlike God. The *Larger Catechism* (Westminster) declares: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of any law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature." However, inasmuch as the law of God may not incorporate all that God's character is and inasmuch as anything will be sinful which contradicts God's character, whether expressed in His law or not, this definition is strengthened when the word *character* is substituted for the word *law.* It is true that disobedience of God's law is sin, but it does not follow that sin is restricted to disobedience of law. Similarly, selfishness is sin, but sin is not always selfishness; and the love of money is a root of all evil, but all evil is not represented in the love of money. So, also, unbelief is sin, but sin is more than unbelief. Whether sin be viewed as the individual's share in Adam's sin, the sin-nature, the estate "under sin," or personal sin with all its varied features, it still draws its essential character of sinfulness from the fact that it is unlike God.

Divine record is given of three major demonstrations of the exceeding sinfulness of sin: (1) The first demonstration is the first sin in heaven, which caused the highest of all the angels to fall from his estate and with him a vast number of lesser angels to follow in his rebellion against God. This highest of angels became Satan the resister, the god of this world, and the prince of the power of the air. The lesser angels became the demons over whom Satan continues his determining influence, and these—Satan and his

hosts—are doomed without remedy to the lake of fire forever. Against what inconceivable light these beings sinned is not revealed, but there is provided no redemption for them; and, while Satan and the demons cease not to sin, their tragic fall in heaven and all that has followed both in heaven and on earth is due to the *first* sin committed in heaven. (2) The first sin of man is the second demonstration of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. This sin caused the natural head to fall and the race which he represented to fall in him. Directly or indirectly, this one sin has caused the immeasurable suffering, sorrow, and death of the race, and will be consummated in the eternal woes of all who are lost. (3) In His death on the cross, Christ bore the sin of the world, and the character of sin was there finally measured and its sinfulness revealed to angels and men. In the light of the forensic character of Christ's death, it is evident that had there been but one sinner in the world who had committed but one sin, the same divine requirements would have been imposed upon the One who took the sinner's place. Had God chosen to terminate sin in the world immediately after Adam's first sin and there to have provided a righteous ground for divine forgiveness and justification for that one sinner, the same awful burden would necessarily have been laid upon the only Substitute who could take Adam's place as was laid upon Him when He bore the sin of the world. This solemn fact is typically set forth in the shedding of blood that Adam might be clothed.

That God is Himself transparent holiness and in Him is no darkness at all is a fact which at once guarantees that, though in His inscrutable purpose He has permitted sin in the universe, He is in no way involved in its guilt. God is righteous in the absolute sense, the judge of all that is evil, and the executor of the penalty which His righteous judgments must impose. It may thus be restated that God is Himself the standard of holiness and His character is that which determines the sinfulness of sin.

II. The Derivation of Sin

The terms *evil* and *sin* represent somewhat different ideas. *Evil* may refer to that which, though latent or not expressed, is ever conceivable as the opposite of that which is good, while *sin* is that which is concrete and actively opposed to the character of God. It is difficult for the human mind to depict a time when there was not an opposite to good even though, for

want of beings who were capable of sinning, it could have had no opportunity of expression. But since God cannot err, sin could not come into existence until another form of being was created; and, apparently, following upon God's creative act, the highest of angels sinned, as did also the first man.

Since the conception of *evil* as a creatable thing is so difficult for the mind to grasp, the problem of its derivation is not easily solved. Indeed, little is revealed concerning the derivation of evil; however, the origin of *sin*, if reference be made to the first actual disobedience to the divine ideal, is recorded in the Scriptures and its guilt is there distinctly attributed to the one who sinned. Though both good and evil acquire their distinctive character from the essential and immutable perfection of God, He, being infinitely holy, could not create evil,though He might, for worthy reasons, permit its manifestations.

III. The Divine Permission of Sin

The presence of sin in the universe is due to the fact that God permits it. It must serve some justifiable purpose attainable in no other way else God would not have permitted it, or, having permitted it, He would now terminate it without delay. The divine purpose relative to sin has not been revealed, and, doubtless, the human mind could not comprehend all that is involved. Devout souls will continue to believe that, though no manifestation of sin is possible outside the permissive will of God, He is Himself ever free from the slightest complicity with the evil which He permits. When contending with Jehovah about Job, Satan recognized the sovereign permission of God with respect to evil when he said to Jehovah, "Put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face." In response to this challenge, Jehovah said to Satan, "All that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand." Thus under sovereign restrictions Job passed from the hand of God to the hand of Satan. But when the calamity fell on Job, by the declaration, "Thou movedst me against him, to destroy him without cause," Jehovah disclaimed any responsibility for the evil.

God has not been overtaken with unexpected disaster in respect to His holy purposes, nor is He now seeking to salvage something out of an

unforeseen wreckage. There is immeasurable evil in the world, but, without the slightest mitigation or sanctification of it, it is the part of faith to believe that somehow and somewhere it fulfills a necessary part of the ultimate purpose of Him who will with absolute certainty achieve those ends which are infinitely perfect. If the imagination of man could penetrate the past and picture God as confronted with ten thousand possible blueprints of which the plan for the present universe with all its lights and shadows, its triumphs and tragedies, its satisfactions and sufferings, its gains and losses, was but one, the voice of faith would say that the present universe as planned and as it is being executed and will be executed to the end, is the best plan and purpose that could be devised by infinite wisdom, executed by infinite power, and will be the fullest possible satisfaction to infinite love. God could not devise anything more worthy of Himself than that which is now in process. For want of perspective and understanding, the finite mind, in the midst of and observing the surrounding spiritual darkness, would eliminate every shadow from the picture; but the issues are greater than the sphere of human observation and the ultimate triumph which is yet to be will glorify God with a glory otherwise unattainable, and in this glory others will share. On the other hand, God permitted sin in spite of His holy hatred of it, and in spite of His own anticipation of the fact that it would not only bring untold suffering and eternal ruin to His creatures whom He would love, and in spite of the fact that it would cost Him the sacrifice of His own Son. Beyond the present tragedy of sin is the final triumph of good.

The devout mind cannot but contemplate the problem of the divine permission of sin, though the sum total of all its reasonings is inadequate to form a final answer to the question. The problem, it should be remembered, extends to the angelic spheres and makes inquiry as much about why the defection among heavenly beings should have been permitted as it does about why the fall should have come to the earthly creation. There is, however, a redemptive purpose with its unsurpassed glories developed through the sin of man; yet the Scriptures reveal no redemption for the fallen angels. They are said to be consigned without hope to the lake of fire (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10); and, as the Word of God is silent on the problem of the reason for permission of sin in angelic spheres, that aspect of the subject offers no field for discussion. In all contemplation of the question of

the divine permission of sin in the earth, there are two facts which abide, and to these the mind must cling without wavering: (1) sin is everywhere and always exceedingly sinful, and God's condemnation of it is never diminished for He cannot be lenient toward sin; and (2) God is Himself holy and perfect in all His ways. "In him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man" (James 1:13).

The following are some of the reasons which have been advanced for the divine permission of sin:

1. The Divine Recognition of the Creature's Free Choice. It is evidently the purpose of God to secure a company of beings for His eternal glory who are possessed of that virtue which is the result of a free-choice victory over evil. Indeed, He will have wrought in them by His own power both to will and to do of His good pleasure; but as certainly as the choice of evil on man's part becomes the ground of guilt and judgment which God does not share, so certainly the choice of good on the part of those who are saved is ever the ground of God's commendation and reward, and they will stand before Him eternally identified as those who by their own choice elected to walk with Him. But it should be observed, man cannot make choice between good and evil unless evil exists.

2. The Specific Value of Redeemed Beings. According to the Scriptures, God is not revealed as One who seeks to avoid the issues which arise because of the presence of sin in the universe. He could have created innocent, unfallen beings possessing no capacity to err; but if He desires redeemed souls purified by sacrificial blood and purchased at infinite cost, the expression of such love and the exercise of such sacrifice are possible only when sin is present in the world.

3. The Acquisition of Divine Knowledge. The creatures of God's hand must, by a process of learning, attain to that knowledge which God has possessed eternally. They can learn only by experience and revelation. Even Christ, on the human side, was made perfect through suffering, and though He were a son, yet learned He obedience through the things which He endured. There is no intimation in any of these Scriptures that there was the slightest taint of evil in Him, or that He needed to learn the deep reality of

sin. On the other hand, man must learn concerning both good and evil. He must realize the sinfulness of sin if he is to attain in any degree to the knowledge God possesses; but he cannot attain to such knowledge unless sin exists as a living reality which is ever demonstrating its sinful character.

At this point it is reasonable to inquire, How far in the experience of sin and its consequences must humanity go in order that the knowledge of sin may be attained? The answer to this question is not easily formed. It is evident that man learns the reality of sin both from the suffering which it inflicts and from the revelation concerning the judgments God imposes upon those who sin. If man is to learn his lesson well, the suffering cannot be diminished or the judgments of God be reduced. We conclude, therefore, that if man is to attain to the knowledge of good and evil, there must be evil in the world with all its tragic effects as well as the prospect of divine judgment for sin.

4. The Instruction of Angels. From certain Scriptures (cf. Eph. 3:10; 1 Pet. 1:12) it is possible to conclude that angels are observing men on the earth and learning important facts through the present experience of human beings. It would be as necessary for angels to learn the truth regarding that which is evil as it is for them to learn the truth regarding that which is good, but the acquiring of the knowledge of evil through human experience must be denied the angels unless evil is permitted as an active principle in the universe.

5. The Demonstration of the Divine Hatred of Evil. It is evidently of measureless importance for God to demonstrate His hatred of evil. The Apostle declares that God was "willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known" (Rom. 9:22); but no judgment, wrath, or power in relation to sin could be disclosed apart from the permitted presence of active sin in the world.

6. The Righteous Judgments of All Evil. Far beyond the mere details of the expression of sin is the essential fact of the *principle* of evil which, if it is to be judged by God, must, evidently, be brought out into an open demonstration of its actual character. Such a demonstration could not be secured with sin existing as a hypothetical issue. It had to become concrete and prove its unlikeness to God. As has been observed under satanology, the

creature's proposal must always be put to an experimental test; and Satan's purpose to construct a *cosmos*, such as now exists, is being tested to the end that it may be judged in all its veritable wickedness. What the judgment and complete disposition of every form of evil will mean to the absolute tranquillity of yet future eternal ages, is but partially declared in the Word of God. That reality which was anticipated in the divine mind in eternal ages past and that has wrought such ruin in its experimental demonstration in time, by righteous judgments will have been outlawed from God's presence and from His creation forever.

7. The Manifestation and Exercise of Divine Grace. Finally, and of the greatest import, there was that in God which no created being had ever seen. The angelic hosts had seen His wisdom, His power, and His glory, but they had never seen His *grace*. They had no conception of the goodness of God to the undeserving. They may have seen something of His love, but love and grace are not the same. God might love sinners upon whom, for want of redeeming, reconciling, and propitiatory sacrifice, He was in no way righteously free to bestow His benefits. By one marvelous act of mercy in the gift of His Son as a sacrifice for sinners, He opened the way for the exercise of His *grace* toward those who, because of their sin, deserved only His *wrath*. But there could be no exercise of divine grace toward the sinful and undeserving until there were sinful and undeserving beings in the world. Thus it is declared that the revelation of divine grace in the ages to come with all its marvelous import (Eph. 2:7) demanded that there should be objects of grace, and this, in turn, demanded the permission of sin in the world. This same truth is presented again in a slightly different form and from the human side by Christ. He, when speaking to Simeon concerning the woman who had bathed His feet with her tears, said, "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little" (Luke 7:47).

Thus, though it is impossible for a creature to understand how a holy God could permit sin, either in heaven or on earth, it is evident that the realization of His greatest purposes necessitates its permission. The entire problem is illustrated to a limited extent in the experience of a Christian who has sinned. He first admits that God, who could have hindered the sin, did nevertheless permit it. He likewise recognizes that he has profited in the

ways of understanding and experience by the sin; and, finally, he admits that God, though permitting the sin, is in no way complicated with its guilt and wickedness.

Preparatory Remarks

In approaching an investigation of the doctrine of sin as now contemplated, certain unusual features of this treatment should be mentioned:

(a) The usual treatment of the doctrine of sin, as set forth in theological treatises generally, is to restrict the discussion to the one aspect —personal sin—though some have given attention to the fact of a sin nature. This thesis will undertake a sevenfold investigation, covering what is believed to be the complete Biblical revelation.

(b) It will be observed that while the origin of sin is usually traced no further than the first sin of man, in the Garden of Eden, this work traces it back to the initial sin in angelic spheres.

(c) A clear distinction is drawn in this treatment of the doctrine between the *transmitted sin nature*, which is spiritual death, and *imputed sin*, which is the cause of physical death.

(d) The entire division entitled *Man's Estate under Sin* (Chapter XXI) represents a line of truth which is quite foreign to theological discussions. The importance of this aspect of the truth regarding sin will be seen only in the light of a right understanding of the dispensational feature of the doctrine of grace.

(e) It is admittedly unusual to introduce into the discussion of the doctrine of sin the cure which God has provided. Discourse on the cure of sin belongs to the field of Soteriology and under that head these salvation truths must yet have a fuller treatment.

(f) The order in which these main divisions of the doctrine of sin are taken up is with due consideration of certain reasons why they should appear under a different arrangement. It is obvious that, since the two realities—*the sin nature* and *imputed sin*—are each derived from the one original sin of Adam, they should be examined in succession; but the order between the treatment of the sin nature and personal sin is debatable, inasmuch as in the experience of humanity (excepting One) since the fall,

all have sinned personally as a natural fruit of their inborn sin nature. Over against this, is the more primitive truth that the sin nature is itself the result of one personal sin. This primary fact determines the order which is to be followed in this thesis.

(g) If in published systems of theology any worthy attempt has been made heretofore to distinguish the crucial distinctions which arise between the divine method of dealing with the Christian's sins and the divine dealing with the sins of the unregenerate, such writings have not been discovered. Had due attention been assigned to these distinctions, many of the misconceived and misleading Arminian notions would have faded into oblivion. By the exigencies of the case, certain truths which are germane to hamartiology will reappear under a different treatment when Soteriology determines the order of discussion.

The general sevenfold division and arrangement of the doctrine of sin to be pursued is:

(a) Personal sin and its remedy,
(b) The transmitted sin nature and its remedy,
(c) Imputed sin and its remedy,
(d) Man's estate "under sin" and his relation to Satan,
(e) The Christian's sin and its remedy,
(f) Punishment,
(g) The final triumph over all sin.

Chapter XVIII

Personal Sin

By the term *personal sin* is indicated that form of sin which originates with, or is committed by, a person. The designation includes the sins of angels as well as human beings. Under this division of the whole doctrine, that aspect of sin is contemplated which, because of human consciousness and experience, seems to men to be the one and only ground of divine condemnation of humanity. It is too often assumed that if personal sin is forgiven there is nothing more to be desired, whereas it is both reasonable and Scriptural to conclude that to deal with the root or tree is more important than to deal with the fruit; for so long as the root and tree are undealt with, the undesirable fruit must appear, and, in the case of a sin nature, assuredly does appear. Nevertheless, the doctrine of personal sin is of great importance, occupying, as it does, by far a larger portion of the Scriptures than all other phases of the sin question combined. This is the theme which contemplates all immediate human experience, and stains the pages of history with tears and blood. Again, the importance of this aspect of sin is seen when it is recognized that the first sin from which all other forms of sin are derived was itself a personal sin. From their personal sins, men must be saved, and according to their evil works men will be judged and condemned forever.

This division of hamartiology permits an eightfold analysis: (a) the origin of sin, (b) the sinful nature of sin, (c) general definitions, (d) general terms and classifications, (e) the divine remedy for personal sin, (f) original sin, (g) guilt, (h) the universality of personal sin.

I. The Origin of Sin

The familiar classification among theologians of the theories respecting the origin of sin includes the following: (a) that of *necessity*, (b) that of the Manichaean philosophy of duality, (c) that God is the Author of sin, and (d) that sin arises from the abuse of moral freedom. The theory of *necessity* proposes that sin is something over which God has no authority, and is without foundation. The Manichaean doctrine—advanced by Mani who was born about 215 A.D.—is that there are two deities, one good and one evil, and that, owing to the influence of these, two opposing principles have

always been present in the universe, which accounts for light and darkness, soul and body, good and evil. This theory, likewise, fails for want of foundation. The conception that God is the author of sin is an unguarded stressing of the doctrine of the divine decree. Over against this is the truth that, throughout the Bible, men are held responsible for their evil conduct whatever may have been the divine anticipation respecting all that is in the universe. It is therefore clear that in angelic realms, as in that of humanity, sin arises from the abuse of moral freedom.

Beyond this fourfold classification is the more extended and complex aspect of hamartiology which recognizes three origins or distinct beginnings of sin. These are: (a) its eternal anticipation in the foreknowledge of God, (b) its first concrete enactment in heaven by an unfallen angel, and (c) its first concrete enactment on earth by an unfallen human being.

1. The Eternal Anticipation of Sin in the Foreknowledge of God. While the truth that God foreknew the oncoming reality of sin does not constitute a beginning, in the sense that it presents no enactment of sin, His foreknowledge does enter largely into this phase of the doctrine of sin. That form of Dualism which contends that two opposing principles—good and evil—have existed from all eternity, and that they are both primary and essential—the one as fully as the other—cannot be received. A digression at this point into either the ancient or the more modern dualistic philosophies is uncalled for. Suffice it to say that, while in the permissive will of God there has arisen a kingdom of darkness into which are gathered fallen angels and fallen human beings and which sets itself against God, that kingdom has not existed forever and its end is clearly predicted when it shall have wrought that which was in view when it was divinely permitted to run its course. In other words, the Bible assigns to evil a transitory character—recording its beginning, its course, and its end. Sin in *anticipation* and sin in *action* are two widely different ideas, and no more can be asserted regarding the eternal aspect of evil than that God foreknew and permitted it. On a plane too vast for human understanding—involving angelic spheres as much or more than human spheres—what may be termed the *principle* of evil was granted its experimental demonstration, that it might be judged with that finality which will silence every voice among created beings and

bring those hosts who have not existed forever and who as yet know not the worthiness of divine holiness into complete rapport with their Creator, unless, indeed, they, because of their repudiation of Him, shall be banished from His presence forever.

Revelation concerning the holy character of God precludes the thought that any form of sin could have been an active reality before finite beings were created and when the Godhead alone existed. The creation of angels, and later, of human beings, at once generated a possibility for evil to become an existing fact; and such it became through the fall of angels and through the fall of humanity. In such an eventuality, God is neither surprised nor defeated. His determination to give existence to them for an eternity to come included, as well, the purpose to test and judge vast moral issues the consummation of which will demonstrate His infinite holiness as well as His glory and grace. He who in every exemplification is proved to be holy, just, and good, may be trusted implicitly in realms which lie beyond human comprehension.

Not only does reason aver that God both foreknew and designed the program which creation is now executing, but it as clearly contends that God foresaw every form of evil from all eternity. In that sense, and in that alone, evil existed before creation was consummated. That evil existed in the foreknowledge of God is proved by those Scriptures which indicate that redemption was eternally in the mind and purpose of God, and none more forcibly than Revelation 13:8 wherein it is published that Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the *cosmos*. Whenever the *cosmos* had its inception—even in the form of a divine anticipation—a redeeming Lamb was a major feature of the divine intention. May it not be better said that, apart from the achievements of the redeeming Lamb, no *cosmos* would have been permitted? Is it not true that this universe, so vast indeed, is *redempto-centric?* No redemption is in view which merely rescues for their own sake unfortunate beings fallen in sin. If that were all, the reason for their fall would be difficult to conceive. Their redemption is for His sake. God has an eternal purpose, and to His glory it may be said that His purpose provides eternal felicity to all who welcome His grace. Such benefit, however vast, does not exhaust all that is in the eternal purpose of God.

Under this general division of this theme, which contemplates the divine foreknowledge of evil, it is logical that consideration be given to the

comparative realities of good and evil. No more exhaustive or clarifying treatment of this theme has been found than that by Dr. Julius Müller in *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (I, 412–17). Though this quotation is extended, it is too valuable not to be introduced here:

> We must call special attention to the supposed independence of the evil principle in relation to the good, by which Dualism stands or falls. Good … is quite independent of evil; it is the nature of good to reveal itself in contrast with evil, since evil has made its appearance in the world. But good has no need of evil for its self-realization; love would be eternally the same, and ever conscious of its own nature, though there were no hatred. Evil, on the other hand, is so far dependent upon good that it comes into existence only as a contrast thereto. As opposition implies something which is opposed, evil presupposes good, and is conceivable only as a departure or fall therefrom. If evil be regarded as wholly primary and original, it cannot in any true sense be called evil or "that which ought not to be." This dependence of evil upon good is still more apparent when we recollect that evil as an antithesis is nothing more than a perverted abstraction and separation of one essential element in our conception of moral good,—the elevation of self-love into a principle of action. Not only, therefore, is moral good perfectly intelligible of itself and by means of itself, but evil, on the other hand, can be understood only by means of good; *bonum index sui et mali*, an expression analogous to Spinoza's fine saying, *"verum, index sui et falsi."*
>
> No one can fairly taunt us here with tacitly admitting that metaphysical conception of good which our former investigation led us to reject:—That good, the positive negation and denial of which makes evil evil, is by no means bare "reality," but is the inmost essence of moral good, love. We cannot recognize evil as in the depths of our moral consciousness we feel it to be—not only something unreasonable, vain, and worthless, but as fearful and loathsome, a continual spring of innumerable ills—while we look upon the eternal being from whom man in evil turns away merely as "absolute substance," "real existence," and so forth. It is the very centre of the doctrine of Christianity concerning God, that He who is absolute existence and who contains in Himself the source of all reality, is at the same time PERSONALITY and LOVE. Recognizing thus that in evil man opposes the holiest love by the alienation and enmity of his will, the peculiar clearness of our moral consciousness regarding evil, our deep horror in the contemplation of it (which is wanting only where conscience is seared) is adequately explained: now at last the feeling of shame, repentance, and remorse of conscience, find their adequate solution. If God were not Love, there might indeed be badness and worthlessness, but there could be no EVIL.
>
> Evil, therefore, as the antithesis of good, is directly dependent upon good; and from this general view of the true conception of it, we see how originality can in no true sense be attributed to it. Its dependence upon good, however, has another, a positive aspect. In order to realize itself in our earthly life, and attain the arbitrarily chosen goal of its endeavours, evil must in some way or other link itself to good, and recognize and fulfil some of its demands in all their authority. Evil has in itself no uniting or concentrating power; it can only produce an inwardly hollow semblance of unity, an ever vanishing appearance of fellowship. Not only does it separate and isolate its servants, but it brings them into collision with each other by the continual clashing of selfish interests, so that if evil had ever the sole dominion over human life that "state of nature," as Hobbes calls it. "*bellum omnium contra omnes*" would ensue. The powers enlisted in the service of evil would lay aside their inner strifes and would

unite only against the good, and when it was vanquished would return again to their internal conflicts; and it is nothing more than this combination that Christ refers to when He speaks of the βασιλεία τοῦ σατανᾶ, Matt. 12:25, 26. But evil would always be in its own way in such circumstances, its inward pain would break through every veil of earthly satisfaction, the innumerable woes and oppressions by which the wicked, as the unconscious instruments of God's righteous punishment, torment one another, would wholly occupy their existence, and thus the present life would become a hell to sinners. Man's sensuous wants compel him to seek the fellowship of his fellow-men, though reason and God's law have lost their influence upon him; and in order to gain possession of and enjoy that for which he strives in sin he must subordinate his will to certain regulations of society. These regulations themselves, however, are the carrying out of the principles of justice in human relations, and have their deepest objective ground in love.

We thus discover this remarkable fact, that evil in our earthly life is obliged to submit to some extent to the law of good, if it is not to destroy its own subjects and instruments. As the essence of evil is selfishness, which implies separation and isolation, all organized society forms a strong bulwark against its overwhelming power, and the very worst abandonment to evil has to contribute something to maintain this bulwark. Thus every band of robbers who have given up all honest intercourse with the rest of the world, and have declared open war against the laws of the state, has to some extent re-established these laws within itself, so as to put some restraint upon the destructive power of evil among its members. Thus, too, in our own day, we have seen how demoniacal rebellion against all heavenly and earthly majesty, when once it has attained dominion, will prosecute its own laws of utterly limitless arbitrariness against individuals, even with fire and sword. Driven by its own inner discord, evil is ever bearing witness to the conserving power of good in society; and must, equally with good, become serviceable to that power for the punishment of disorder and crime. Even when the wicked unite together in avowed hostility to good, they must at the very outset submit to certain things which are included in any adequate conception of good, if only the most abstract and formal, such as order, and obedience to a common law. Evil, I say, has in itself no productive or formative power; it cannot give itself any complete or historical reality in forms and arrangements of human life peculiar to itself; it cannot attain supremacy in any sphere of society, save by resorting to principles which have their origin in good. In connection with this there is a phenomenon already referred to which is very striking and strange, namely, that evil never manifests itself openly and above board in human life, it always tries in one way or another to conceal itself, John 3:20. *Evil does not venture to be itself;* it incessantly shuns itself, and hides hypocritically beneath some outward appearance of good. This is the usual occasion of so-called "white lies," in which the dependence we have been speaking of evil upon good is strikingly illustrated. The lie which thus in a cowardly way disowns itself, really acknowledges the good as alone true and right, and itself as that which ought not to be, which has only an assumed existence. The moral foundations upon which all society rests thus restrain the most confirmed villain who has quenched the last spark of shame within him, and who no longer heeds the inner voice of conscience. Even the mightiest and proudest tyrant finds himself compelled, from prudential considerations,—provided the principle of his capricious despotism has not become utterly senseless and absurd,—to assume the mask of not seeking his own interests, but the general good, the glory, peradventure, or the well-being of the people.

If, therefore, we must recognize the power of holiness in the control which the Divine government exercises over even what resists it, and by which it completes itself in its main outlines amid the discord of selfish interests and passions, how can we maintain the dualistic

notion of an independent principle of evil? In virtue of the conditions to which the divine purpose submits in the history of our race, evil may indeed hinder and retard the realization of that design, but it cannot wholly thwart it. We have seen in the preceding chapter how thoroughly the disturbing power of evil has penetrated the earthly development of the human race; but however severe the conflict in which we are engaged, there is ever present and visible to the eye of God the final triumph of the good.

If we examine the inner variance of evil still more closely, and follow it a step further, we shall find it not only in the higher sphere of society generally, but in the inner life of the individual. Passion strives with passion, one affection counteracts another; man, while slavishly dependent on the various objects of desire, never finds that rest and satisfaction which he seeks in the service of sin. He cannot attain these even by a total surrender to any one passion; for—apart from the impossibility of fully satisfying it—it can never attain sufficient strength perfectly to free him from the calls of other impulses striving after unbridled freedom. The two fundamental tendencies of sin which we have already referred to —pride and the supremacy of fleshly lust—are precisely those which stand in the most striking contrast and mutual hostility to each other. Whoever gets between these two currents is restlessly driven hither and thither by them; when he frees himself from the one, the other seizes him. In a condition of greater cultivation this alternation in the service of sin becomes a secret play of arbitrary will. Man learns the miserable art of turning now to the one side and now to the other, now to pride and now to sensuousness. The virtuous soarings into which he rises from the degradation of sensuousness serve only to excite and strengthen his humbled self-consciousness, and he relinquishes the pleasures of lust in order to recreate himself with the efforts of his pride. Rightly recognizing the fact of this inner variance of evil, modern education, by alienating itself from that Christian principle upon which alone true self-love and noble self-reliance rest, frequently adopts the plan of conquering sins of self-degradation and abandonment in youth, by the passionate stimulus of pride and ambition; and thus, alas! it has done nothing more than drive out the devil by Beelzebub the prince of the devils.

Goodness, on the contrary, is ever in harmony with itself; its several parts, its manifold endeavours, and the acts in which it realizes itself, mutally strengthen and confirm each other: whatever violates the ideal of good, cannot, according to the unholy principle of the end sanctifying the means, be confirmed and advanced by that ideal. Evil is at variance not only with good but with itself; good has but one enemy, evil; but evil has two enemies, *good and evil.* This contradiction of evil with itself has, in addition to its moral and psychological import, a peculiar metaphysical aspect. Evil has, indeed, no existence independently of God the absolute good, but it strives after it; and as we have seen, it is nothing more or less than this departing from the living God, this panting after independence apart from Him. When the creature surrenders himself to evil he practically denies his creation by God, he does not want to have his existence in God, but he will live, behave, and gratify self, as if he had life in himself and were his own lord. How would it be were God to permit evil in the creature to attain its end? were He to separate Himself from man, as man does from Him? The moment such an emancipation of the sinful creature from God were realized he would sink into nonentity, for he could not exist a moment save in the hands of God, and as His *mancipium*, be his will otherwise good or evil. Evil does not possess in itself any substantial being, but as the *Formula Concordiae*, following Augustine and opposing Flacius, explains, it exists only so far as it cleaves to some being in the form of a depraved nature or tendency; and therefore, by its efforts after separation from God (which is the true conception of it) it clearly involves itself in a self-destructive contradiction. If it succeeded, it would not only destroy its basis of good, but it would annihilate itself. The parasitic plant endeavours to extract all the juices

from the organic body of the tree, appropriating them to its own depraved and poisonous development; but in attaining the end of its efforts it works its own destruction.

Over against this conclusive statement by Dr. Müller, is another truth which must not be overlooked, which is, that when sin takes the form of actual occurrence or performance, it is a positive force in itself. The sense in which sin is negative must be restricted to its relation to God and to His original creation. This essential aspect of truth is well stated by Francis J. McConnell in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia:*

> Very often sin is defined as the mere absence of goodness. The man who sins is one who does not keep the Law. This, however, is hardly the full Biblical conception. Of course, the man who does not keep the Law is regarded as *a sinner*, but the idea of transgression is very often that of a positive refusal to keep the commandment and a breaking of the commandment. Two courses are set before men, one good, the other evil. The evil course is, in a sense, something positive in itself. The evil man does not stand still; he moves as truly as the good man moves; he becomes a positive force for evil. In all our discussions we must keep clearly in mind the truth that evil is not something existing in and by itself. The Scriptures deal with evil men, and the evil men are as positive as their natures permit them to be. In this sense of the word sin does run a course of positive destruction. In the thought, e.g., of the writer who describes the conditions which, in his belief, made necessary the Flood, we have a positive state of evil contaminating almost the whole world (Gen. 6:11). It would be absurd to characterize the world in the midst of which Noah lived as merely a negative world. The world was positively set toward evil. And so, in later writings, Paul's thought of Roman society is of a world of sinful men moving with increasing velocity toward the destruction of themselves and of all around them through doing evil. It is impossible to believe that Romans 1 conceives of sin merely in negative terms. We repeat, we do not do full justice to the Biblical conception when we speak of sin merely in negative terms. If we may be permitted to use a present-day illustration, we may say that in the Biblical thought sinful men are like the destructive forces in the world of Nature which must be removed before there can be peace and health for human life.—IV, 2800

It may therefore be concluded that evil had no actual existence before sin was committed by the creatures whom God had called into being, and who by His design had the capacity to sin through a resisting of His will. Such capacity is of necessity restricted to the creature; for if sin be defined as independence of God and that which is contrary to God, it follows that God could Himself sin only as He became independent of Himself and as He contradicted Himself. Such ideas are not only absurdities, but are wholly foreign to One in whom only infinite holiness dwells. The facts with which Systematic Theology must deal are that some angels have fallen in sin with no revealed promise that there is redemption for them, while other angels abode in their first estate and are ever going on in the progress which the

divine purpose assigned to them. An additional fact is that humanity in its entirety (excepting One) has fallen in sin and for them a perfect redemption is provided which, it is clearly revealed, will be received by some and rejected by others. Thus *evil*, and its manifestation, *sin*, became a reality only as they were made such by the creature's perversion of the will of God. Evil has no original substance in itself. It is spiritual insanity and must, in due time—as divinely determined—come to its end. That it will exist forever as a memory as it existed forever in anticipation could hardly be questioned.

2. The First Concrete Enactment of Sin in Heaven by an Unfallen Angel. As has been intimated, it is noticeable that the great majority of the works on Systematic Theology have been satisfied to trace the origin of sin no further than to the fall of man in Eden. It is true that human sin began in Eden, but, though Adam merely re-enacted that sin which before had been committed in heaven, the essential character of sin is to be determined, to a large measure, by the sin of the first angel rather than by its reproduction by the first man.

A convincing proof that the Bible is a supernatural book is found in the fact that without hesitation or uncertainty it discloses conditions which antedate human history and as freely penetrates into and unveils the ages to come. Its message is not restricted to the field comprehended by human observations, but treats of other parts of the universe as familiarly as it treats of the earth. Among its disclosures concerning other spheres and the dateless past, a revelation is given of what appears to be the first sin that was committed in the universe. That sin, we are told, was committed in heaven and by the highest of the angels, and, after having wrought its tragic results in those realms, was, upon the creation of man in the Garden of Eden, suggested to and re-enacted by unfallen Adam. It is stated in Romans 5:12 that "by one man sin entered into the world," thus revealing the truth that man was not the first to sin, but was rather the medium through whom that form of sin which was already wrought in heaven secured entrance into earth. A reasonable approach to an understanding of the truth regarding the first sin to be committed in heaven is to consider (a) the person who first sinned, and (b) the nature of the first sin.

a. The Person Who First Sinned. The exceedingly sinful character of the first sin in the universe is largely determined by the exalted character and position of the first sinner. In the contemplation of this being and the circumstances under which he sinned, the natural discernment of man will help not at all. It is altogether a matter of revelation. This revelation distinguishes important differences between the estate of man and the estate of the angels. Among these differences we note that the divine method of securing a race of beings on the earth was to create a man and a woman to whom God gave instructions that they multiply and replenish the earth, but the divine method of securing the uncounted hosts of angels was by a fiat of omnipotent, creative power. Of these heavenly beings thus created, Christ intimated that they never increase by propagation nor are they decreased by death. Though angels were evidently created before material things, since they appear to have beheld the creative work of God, there is no clear indication of where in the order of events the first sin occurred; however, the exalted person and position of the angel who first sinned as well as the precise nature of his sin are revealed. This disclosure is found in the following Scripture: "Moreover the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee" (Ezek. 28:11–15).

The person here addressed as "the king of Tyrus" is evidently of the angelic, or superhuman, order. This fact is abundantly disclosed in the text. It is possible that in a secondary sense this address applied to a human king in Tyrus, but as almost everything ascribed to this being is supernatural, none but one of the angelic creation could be first in view; and of the angels this peculiar description could apply to none but one—to him who by his sin became Satan. This the highest of angelic beings appears in the Bible

under about forty different titles, all of which are, like all titles in the Scriptures, revealing with respect to the person and character of the one designated.

Since Satan's crowning effort in the sphere of his relation to humanity in its present situation in the earth is the setting forth of the man of sin, it is significant that this passage is, in its context, preceded by ten verses which convey a divine message to "the prince of Tyrus," whose twofold blasphemous assumption is that he claims to be God, and that he sits in the seat of God. There is a clear identification here which relates this prince of Tyrus to Satan's superman, the man of sin, who is yet to appear, and of whom the Apostle prophesied saying: "And that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2:3–4; cf. Matt. 24:15; Rev. 13:5–8). That this "wicked one" has not yet appeared is evident from the fact that his brief career, when experienced, will be terminated, we are told, by the "brightness" of Christ's coming, and by "the spirit of his mouth" (2 Thess. 2:8). As a prince is related to a king, so this blasphemous person described in the first instance (Ezek. 28:1–10) is related to the one who is set forth in the text under consideration (Ezek. 28:11–15).

It is of greatest importance to note that it is Jehovah who addresses this mighty being as "the king of Tyrus," and who describes this one in all his supernatural characteristics. It is Jehovah also who is here pictured as lamenting over this great angel. The thought expressed by the word *lamentation* is that of extreme anguish accompanied by the beating of the breast. Such, indeed, is the attitude of Jehovah toward this fallen angel. There is infinite pathos in every word which describes the measureless exaltation and honor conferred on this angel in view of his subsequent repudiation of Jehovah. A feeble illustration of this lamentation on the part of Jehovah over this angel is to be seen in David's lamentation over Absalom: "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" (2 Sam. 18:33).

Similarly, Jehovah declares this great angel to be the "sum," being "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," and that he has "been in Eden the garden of God," and that every precious stone was his covering. Though Satan did appear in the Eden described in Genesis (and this no king of Tyrus ever did)

it is probable, considering the details set forth in this passage, that reference here is to the primal Edenic glory of the earth before it became "without form and void." Continuing this description, Jehovah states that this being was created with marvelous capacities, and, by the use of specific imagery, implies that he was a diadem of praise to his Creator. He is also said to belong to the order of the cherubim, which company of the angels seem charged with the protection of the holy presence of God (cf. Gen. 3:24; Ex. 25:18–22; 2 Sam. 6:2); but of this being it is revealed that he was, as protector, or cherub, placed upon the "holy mountain of God," which, according to Old Testament symbolism, refers to the seat or throne of God's government in the earth (cf. Isa. 2:1–4). The climax of this important Scripture is reached when the declaration is made that this being was perfect in all his ways from the day he was created until iniquity was uncovered in him. This passage thus discloses the exalted character of a heavenly being and indicates the fact of his sin. The context goes on to add some light concerning the sin itself and the judgment of God that must eventually follow.

The identification of this being may be thus restated: He was the sum, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. He had been in Eden the Garden of God. His covering was that of precious stones. Tabrets and pipes were in him from his creation. He was of the Cherubim and appointed of God as guardian over His holy mountain. He had walked up and down midst the stones of fire. He was perfect in his ways from the day of his creation. Thus the most exalted and heavenly among created beings is described, and of him it is also revealed that iniquity was found, or uncovered, in him. The proof that this has reference to Satan, the highest of angelic beings, is disclosed in the fact that, so far as revelation goes, this description could apply to no other.

b. The Nature of the First Sin. The Prophet Isaiah sets forth by the Spirit of God the precise nature and detailed features of Satan's sin. We read: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of

the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High" (Isa. 14:12–14).

Again the identification is not difficult. The address is to one who is here designated as Lucifer, son of the morning, which title relates him to the highest of the angels and the greatness of his power is disclosed in the context. There he is said to be the one "which didst weaken the nations, that made the world a wilderness, that destroyed the cities thereof," and "that opened not the house of his prisoners" (cf. Isa. 61:1). That Isaiah is viewing these stupendous achievements of this being from the end of that career and that he is seeing the full and final outworking of all divinely permitted evil, is indicated by the fact that Lucifer is, in this passage, declared to be "fallen from heaven" and "cut down to the ground," which judgment is yet future in the experience of Satan (Ezek. 28:16; Job 1:6; Luke 10:18; Eph. 6:11–12, R.V.; Rev. 12:7–9). It is equally clear that to this hour Satan's permitted program of evil in the world is not yet fully accomplished.

The sin which Lucifer committed includes five particulars and these are expressed under five assertions of his proposed independence of God. He used the impious phrase *I will* in each declaration. The peculiar evil character of the words *I will* under these circumstances is disclosed in the fact that these words belong primarily to sovereignty. This is demonstrated in the great unconditional covenants God has made with men. The phrase *I will* is, more than any other which language can exhibit, the sole prerogative and solemn right of Deity. When uttered by God the phrase *I will* is in no way abnormal. However, there is a secondary use of this phrase which may be sanctioned—even on the lips of a creature. Having yielded to the will of God, it is becoming of him to say, *I will* do the will of God. Such a use of these words only emphasizes the truth that God's will is supreme; but as these words of sovereign intent fell from the lips of the first sinning angel, there was no element of submission expressed or intended. They represented an assumed independence wholly unbecoming to a creature. Though it be a small creature with a small purpose—as is true in the case of each and all of those who comprise the mass of humanity—if he be opposed to or independent of God, the very basis of all sin is manifest. These words, coming from Lucifer, were more ominous since, by the greatness of his position, he purposed no less than the production of what has come to be

the *cosmos* world system. These five uses of the phrase *I will*, which appear in Isaiah 14:12–14, must be carefully considered.

An extended exposition of these verses has been presented earlier in the work under Angelology. The present treatment of these vital statements will, therefore, be brief.

"I will ascend into heaven." This bold purpose expressed in these words will be understood only in the light of the truth that there are three heavens. The angels have their rightful abode in the second heaven. Lucifer's responsibility as guard to the throne of God required him to do service in that higher realm where God dwells. The ambition of Lucifer is thus seen to be a most impious and willful attempt to a residence above the sphere allotted to him.

"I will exalt my throne above the stars of God," which phrase expresses the purpose on Lucifer's part to secure a dominion in angelic spheres. Little may be known of the issue involved or of the extent of this purpose. The intention has been realized under divine permission since Satan is now at the head of a kingdom of evil spirits (Matt. 12:26).

"I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north." This assertion is somewhat obscure. However, the understanding of three words used seems to lend some light. The *mount* is the throne of God, the *congregation* is Israel, and the *sides of the north* may be a reference to the crucifixion which occurred on the north of Jerusalem and to the earthly authority over Israel which belongs to Christ as Redeemer and King. In such an interpretation it may be seen that there was a purpose in Lucifer to secure an earthly throne. That such a throne now exists is declared in Revelation 2:13 (note that here the word *seat* should be *throne*).

"I will ascend above the heights of the clouds." In this declaration there is an attempt in view to secure some of the divine glory which is symbolized so constantly through the Bible by the clouds.

"I will be like the most High" is the consummation of all that has gone before. This is Lucifer's supreme purpose concerning which the other *I will's* are but particulars. In this assertion the whole essence of sin lies concealed. It is independent action outside of, and opposed to, the purpose of God. Of Satan Christ said that he "abode not in the truth" (John 8:44), and by so much implied that to depart from the will of God is to enact a lie. Over against this, the truth consisted in that divine purpose and appointment

for this being, immeasurable in its privilege, eternal value, and glory. Lucifer chose his own course of independent action evidently determined to move into the third heaven, to gain authority on earth, to usurp the divine glory, and to be like the most High. Later Scripture revelation discloses this satanic ambition to be—so far as earth is concerned—the present *cosmos* world system, over which Satan is now prince (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11), and, in this age, its god (2 Cor. 4:4). God has evidently permitted the purpose of Satan to be put to an experimental test to the end that it may be judged more perfectly. What Lucifer was, and could have been, in the will of God constituted the *truth* in which he abode not. What he has wrought is *the lie*, and Satan is the author of it. That lie was hid in his heart from the beginning. The future judgments that will fall on the *cosmos* world are clearly predicted in the Word of God, as also the tragic end of Satan, and all associated with him, in the lake of fire. With all these revelations in view, it is as puerile to talk of a converted *cosmos* world as it would be to talk of a converted devil. Each reaches its determined end with all the certainty of infinity.

Too much importance cannot be attached to the truth that Lucifer's first sin—a willful ambition against God which proposed the *cosmos* world system—is the norm or pattern of all sin. All human beings acting independently who are not concerned to fulfill the divine purpose for them are re-enacting this same sin, and their destiny is that of the devil and his angels (Rev. 20:10–15), unless they come under the saving grace of God.

3. The First Concrete Enactment of Sin by a Human Being on Earth. Should an error be adopted as the major premise in a sequence of closely related themes, there is little hope that the entire succession of thought would not be characterized by deviation from, if not contradiction of, the truth. There is scarcely another phase of divine revelation which is more germane to the right understanding of all doctrine than that of *sin.* Practically all heretical systems of thought base themselves upon misconceptions of sin, and these must, therefore, of necessity be saturated with error. An attempt to enumerate in full these misconceptions would be inconsistent with the purpose of this thesis. However, in this connection it may be observed that to underestimate the true character of sin is (1) to disregard the explicit terms employed in the Bible to set forth the exceeding

sinfulness of sin, thus causing God to seem to be untruthful; (2) to contradict, to a greater or less degree, the holy character of God; (3) to vitiate even the right conception of human guilt; (4) to disregard the sanctity and authority of the Word of God; (5) to cause the unavoidable divine reprobation of sin to seem to be an extreme and unwarrantable judgment; (6) to render the great facts of redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation to appear to be uncalled for; and (7) to dismiss from consideration the only sufficient reason for the death of Christ.

It is true, as before stated, that sin is sinful because of the fact that it is unlike God, and that a thing which is evil will be demonstrated to be such when compared with the holy character of God. It is equally true that sin calls for judgment because it is an outrage against the Person and law of God; and, since God is infinite and His goodness unbounded, sin is infinite and its evil character is beyond all human computation. Sin inflicts not only an immeasurable injury upon the one who sins, but is more specifically characterized by the injury it inflicts upon God, the Creator's rights being disregarded, His holy law broken, and His property being damaged through sin.

The far-reaching effect of the first human sin is to be discovered in its movement along two widely different channels—the *sin nature*, and *imputed sin*, which subjects are to be attended in their proper place and order. Discussion now centers upon the first human sin itself. The record of the first human sin is found in Genesis 3:1–19. Having specifically prohibited the eating of the fruit of one tree and having given warning that the penalty for disobedience would be death, God thus placed Adam and Eve on probation. The issue was fully comprehended by them and apparently they, when left to themselves, did abstain from eating of the fruit which was prohibited. It was when the tempter appeared that they were induced to disregard God. The details of this sin and the influences leading up to it have been recited in a previous section of Anthropology. The essential fact, which cannot be restated too often, is that, in his temptation, Satan proposed to the first parents that they adopt the precise course he had himself espoused and pursued, which was to assume independence of God by departing from His will and purpose. Short-sighted ambition doubly blinded by unholy pride was willing to exchange the perfection of estate and destiny which the infinite love, wisdom, and power of the Creator has

designed, for the wretched warfare of a self-centered life with its eternal agonizing experience in death. Evidently the whole truth was not displayed before these human beings. They were told that they would be like *Elohim* (Gen. 3:5), but only in one respect—their eyes would be open and they would know good and evil. They were as created, experiencing the good; as fallen they would experience the evil. They had nothing to gain but rather everything to lose. The creature, whether angel or human, is by creation not only the property of the Creator by rights more vital than any other, but, as created, the creature is wholly dependent on the Creator. This relationship was blessed indeed before the fall and engendered no offense. By repudiating God through disobedience, Adam and Eve embarked upon a tempest-tossed, shoreless sea without compass, rudder, or helm. Such a course could only lead to ignominious failure and to the final judgments of the One whom they had rejected and abjured. The truth that sin is insanity is thus fully demonstrated.

In the last analysis, there are but two philosophies of life. One is to be conformed to the will of God which is the original divine arrangement, the other is to forsake the Creator and renounce His authority and purpose. In respect to the latter philosophy, it may be said that there is probably no pride so despicable as that which resents the authority of the Creator and which presumes to devise a program of life and achievement which is a substitute for the original plan and purpose of God. One philosophy is satanic, and this hideous fact is not changed even though the whole human race has embraced the satanic ideal. Appearing in the Garden, Satan brought no great volume elucidating his philosophy. Having led up to his ignoble proposition with such strategy as only Satan can command—he appealed to natural desires, he belittled sin, he attacked the character of God by intimating that God is untrustworthy and unloving—he proposed a likeness to *Elohim.* The translation “Be as gods” is most misleading. The original text says, “Be as *Elohim.*” The satanic philosophy is expressed perfectly in these brief words and it leads on, regardless of a moment of satisfaction of self and pride, to the lake of fire, and the same end is announced for all, angels or human beings, who adopt and pursue this course to its bitter end.

Satan’s purpose did not consist merely in rejecting God; he was designing a vast *cosmos* world system in which he proposed to utilize and misappropriate the elements which belong to God’s creation, which, in

themselves, are *good.* Satan creates nothing. No step in the satanic *cosmos* project was more essential than that he should secure the allegiance of humanity. The issues at stake in the Garden of Eden were, in respect to Satan's career, such as would determine his realization of his whole undertaking. He must gain supremacy over man or fail completely. Little did Adam and Eve realize that, so far from attaining independence, they were becoming bondslaves to sin and Satan. From that time forth Satan was to energize them and their children to do his will (Eph. 2:1–2; Col. 1:13; 1 John 5:19). From such an estate only the regenerating power of God, made possible through the Redeemer, could rescue. As long as Satan is permitted to rule as the prince of the *cosmos*, it is probable that humanity will experience some sense of cohesion and security—something vague indeed—but when Satan is banished and his authority at an end the isolation and segregation of unregenerate human beings will result in terror and anguish for all eternity to come.

No extended investigation of the Scriptures is required to prove that sin originated in heavenly spheres and that man became the avenue or way by which sin gained entrance into the world (Rom. 5:12). It is also to be concluded that, though human sin may manifest its character in various ways, it is from one root and consists in a departure from the living God. It is this departure which precipitated the fall of man, and the same spirit of independence lives on to curse the race.

II. The Sinful Nature of Sin

In its fundamental character, sin is a restless unwillingness on the part of the creature to abide in the sphere and limitation in which the Creator, guided by infinite wisdom, had placed him. This unwillingness may be expressed in many ways, and these are sometimes thought to be the real nature of sin. In the general field of manifestation of sin, the fact is that it is a want of conformity to the character of God. The first sin of man was a personal sin, and, as before stated, resulted in a sin nature. In this the order in human experience is reversed, since, in the case of each of Adam's posterity, there is first a fallen nature and this engenders personal sin. Thus, as already pointed out, the sin nature and personal sin may each in turn be seen to be cause or effect.

The widest possible difference exists—amounting to no less than a contrast between things infinite and things finite—when God's estimate of sin is compared with man's estimate of sin; yet to an extent which is all but universal, sin is judged by men quite apart from revelation and on the basis of the natural human evaluation.

Since sin is negative to the extent that it has no standards of its own, but must derive its measurements from that which is positive or good, and since the holy character of God is the standard of that which is good, it follows that sin is as evil as it appears to be when viewed from the vantage point of the holiness of God. No fallen human being can ever attain to an understanding of the holiness of Gad, and, to the same degree, no fallen human being can attain to the right conception of the sinful nature of sin. When it is discovered that divine judgments for sin reach to eternity, as indeed they do, it ill becomes finite, fallen man to call these judgments into question.

III. Three Major Proofs of the Exceeding Sinfulness of Personal Sin

1. The Angelic Proof. One of the angelic hosts committed one sin, which sin in their own sphere men deem most commendable, namely, *unholy ambition,* and, as a result of that sin, that angel fell and became the eternal enemy of God and drew after him a vast company of the heavenly hosts, some of whom are bound in chains of darkness, and for whom there is no ray of hope through all eternity.

2. The Human Proof. One individual, the first of the human creation, committed one sin and that sin being apparently so innocuous men are prone to ridicule the thought that God would notice it at all; yet that one sin is, according to divine estimation, sufficiently evil to cause the degeneracy and depravity of the unfallen person who committed the sin, and to cause uncounted millions of his posterity to suffer in the flesh and die, and the vast majority of them to spend eternity in the realms of woe.

3. The Divine Proof. The Son of God suffered to an infinite degree and died on the cross because of sin. There was no other way whereby redemption could be secured. However, had there never been but one sin committed in this world, the same depths of suffering and death by the Son

of God would have been required as a righteous ground for divine forgiveness of that one sin and the justification of that sinner.

The study of the personal sins of those whose failure is recorded in the Scriptures will add much to the understanding of the doctrine of personal sins. Such a study should include the sins of Adam, Cain, Noah, Nadab, Abihu, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Aaron, Moses, Achan, Eli, Saul, David, Solomon, Peter, Pilate, Judas, Ananias, Sapphira, and Saul of Tarsus.

Having constructed an intricate machine composed of many parts, a man expects each part to remain in its place and fulfill the specific responsibility assigned to it. The separate independent action of one part would disarrange the whole. The creation is composed of many parts and under the present exercise of opposing wills is a confusion which God alone can correct. This He will do in His own time and way.

As there is no rational accounting for the universe—a system and order which embraces all regulations from the movement of the stars down to the laws which overrule all forms of life that exist—apart from the truth that God is the Designer, Creator, and Sustainer of all, in like manner all that enters into moral character derives its values from God. It should be no more a problem to recognize God as the ground source of things moral than of things physical or intellectual. Were there actually such a thing as a wandering star severed from all other forces and attractions, it would well serve to illustrate a created intelligence, fitted for a great purpose and sustaining far-flung relationships, as sundered from the Source of all its being and wantonly defying the elements of holy character upon which all moral values depend and from which all obligations arise. Indeed, Jude likens certain “ungodly men” to “wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever” (Jude 1:4, 13). As the necessity is laid on physical elements to abide under that mandate wherein they were placed by the Creator if they are to serve the end for which they were created, thus, and to a far more important degree, the necessity is laid upon moral beings to abide under the mandate wherein they were placed if they are to know the eternal fullness of life and experience which infinite love and wisdom proposed. Outside such a reasonable continuing, there can be only “blackness of darkness”; for apart from God no light exists, and man apart from God, having no power to generate light, is “full of darkness.”

Sin usually combines an immoral feature with the element of disobedience and what that means to God could not be fully revealed.

Again, the sinful character of sin is reflected in the penalties which are righteously imposed. The doom of Satan, the doom of unregenerate men, and all the suffering of this life bear their testimony, and it may be believed that any sin committed by any creature is as sinful in the divine estimation as those sins which, because of the position occupied by the sinner, brought ruin to uncounted multitudes of beings.

The utter independence of God on the part of the creature, whether it be angel or man, is the basic principle of evil. It manifests itself in manifold ways. The prophet declares: “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way” (Isa. 53:6). The wise man said: “In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin” (Prov. 10:19); “He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth” (Prov. 14:21); “The thought of foolishness is sin” (Prov. 24:9). And in the New Testament we read: “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23); “To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin” (James 4:17); “Sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4); and “The love of money is the root of all evil” (1 Tim. 6:10). Thus the Scriptures indicate the extensive and complex character of sin’s expression, but in every case, whether it be doctrine or human experience, the one original evil is found to be in the sphere of the creature’s relation to the Creator.

IV. General Definitions

In entering the extensive field of the definition of sin, a distinction arises at the outset between the state of heart which impels one to sin and the overt act of the sin itself. In the case of Adam who sinned without the promptings of a sin nature, it is evident that his act of disobedience was preceded and prepared by a consent of his will, and that, when he had thus determined his course, or was willing to disobey God, he had already sinned potentially. That attitude could be defined as a *state* of sin. It is to be noted that, had he been hindered against his will from the overt act of disobedience, he would, nevertheless, have been condemnable on the ground of his intention and willingness. In the case of Adam’s posterity all of whom inherit the sin nature which unceasingly excites to sin, a constant state of sin exists which

can be relieved only by the preventing power of the indwelling Spirit. Sin is therefore sometimes defined as a state of heart or mind. Much has been written on the subject of sin from a psychological approach, but such considerations are too often speculative and do not tend to develop the evil character of sin as it is set forth in the Bible. It may be admitted along with the speculative ideals that sin is an action of the will—either an overt omission or commission—but back of the will is the evil heart. Christ emphasized this when He said, "That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of man, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man" (Mark 7:20–23). The nature of fallen man is sinful whether it expresses its true character in overt acts or not.

Under the title *Modern Theories of Sin*, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (following Orchard) presents four theories which are here quoted, and, as they are clear, no comment on them need be added:

"(1) Theories which trace sin to the will of man (represented by Kant, Coleridge, and Müller).

"(2) Theories which regard sin as a necessity (represented by Schelling, Weisse, and Hegel).

"(3) Theories which seek to explain sin by confining it within the bounds of religion (represented by Schleiermacher and Ritschl).

"(4) Theories which seek to explain sin from empirical observation (represented by Pfleiderer and Tennant)" (*The Principles of Theology*, p. 170).

The general field of definition concerning *personal sin* may be comprehended in two aspects: (a) sin against God, and (b) sin against law. A patent distinction obtains between sin against God's Person—which sin may be indicated by such terms as *godlessness, defilement, selfhood*—and sin against God's moral government which is as properly expressed by such terms as *transgression, rebellion, lawlessness.* This twofold division seems to comprehend the whole field of definition, and the whole trend of man's obligation may be traced along these two lines of relationship. These two forms of duty, being interdependent, are inseparable. No relationship to God can be conceived that does not acknowledge His holy will or law, nor can

any authority be discovered in His holy will or law that does not ground itself in His holy Person. Man's relation to the Person of God is largely one of *state,* while his relation to the will of God is one of *action.* The general term for sin is ἁμαρτία, meaning that a prescribed mark or ideal has been missed. This mark or ideal is the essential character of God which is made known to man by God's revealed will or law. Attention may now be given to these two aspects of sin and in the order indicated above:

1. Sin Against God's Holy Person. Philosophers have long debated the question whether man is capable of originating a conscious distinction between right and wrong, whether the laws he makes for himself—though made through the medium of his limited understanding—are a reflection of his own ideals or whether they are derived from God. Theoretically, it is a question whether the voice of conscience—man's intuition about what is right and true—is directly or indirectly the voice of God, or whether conscience is to be recognized as a natural factor in man's being. Attention has been given to this subject in a previous section of this work and there it was asserted that conscience seems to stand over, or above, the other faculties of man's being as a monitor or judge—a voice outside the action of the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will; yet a voice which may be stultified if not silenced, or, on the other hand, may be stimulated to keen discernment. Has God created a delicate instrument which, within its own resources, is able to contend for that which is right, or is conscience the immediate voice of God speaking in the inner consciousness of man? One thing is assured, which is, that God is the original good and all that is good in the universe is derived from Him. The untenable idea that right is an eternal principle to which God subscribes, or the notion that right is what it is because God has arbitrarily assigned that character to it—that He could have as easily made evil good had He chosen to do so—need not be refuted here. Since God Himself is the eternal One, immutable in His infinite holiness, He subscribes to no principle as one who is subject to it. He is the Principle. What is good and true is not a law which governs God; He is the source of these virtues. He is in no sense the source of evil and untruth. Evil and untruth have no original source. There was a time when evil could have been contemplated only as a possibility; but good, like all the divine attributes, in its most exalted reality has the same eternal existence which

belongs to God. There was a time—if time it be —when evil was only an anticipation; there will yet be a time—if time it be—when it will be only a memory. Good is immutable from everlasting to everlasting.

The effect of sin upon God and of His attitude toward sin is displayed in the plan by which He saves the lost. Too little, indeed, is it realized by many who attempt to preach the gospel, that the grace of God which saves the lost is not mere big-heartedness or generosity on God's part. He could have saved souls without the sacrifice of His Son had that been the case. The death of His Son as a sacrifice is required only because God cannot compromise His holy character by making light of sin. It is the very structure of the gospel that God is infinitely righteous in His attitude toward sinners, which means perfect and eternal condemnation unless the demands of infinite holiness are righteously met. In other words, whatever is done to save the lost, must be done in such a way as to preserve untarnished the character of God. To some it has seemed a worthy conception of God when presented as liberal and magnanimous enough to waive His holy requirements, little realizing that to turn thus from His holy judgments would be to forfeit every vestige of that foundation of righteousness on which His throne rests, which undergirds His government, and sustains His immutable character. Should God save one soul from the condemnation which rests on that soul because of sin by softening the condemnation or by so loving the sinner that He surrenders or relinquishes one fraction of His holy demands against sin, that the soul might be saved, God, in turn, would be lost, His essential Being ruined by a compromise with sin, and Himself needing to be saved from dissolution. Such a truth has never been stated strongly enough, nor can it be, since language is incapable of expressing the hideous dishonor to God which lurks in gospel appeals that offer salvation based upon divine charity and not on the efficacious blood of Christ. If men had never preached any other message than that sin is so exceedingly sinful that it can be forgiven only on the ground of the shedding of the blood of one of the Godhead Three, and that this illimitable sacrifice is as much required for the cure of one sin of one individual as for the sins of many, a better realization of the divine attitude toward sin would no doubt obtain. God Himself must be, and is, *just* when He justifies the ungodly who do no more than to *believe* in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). Preaching anything less than this merits the unrevoked anathema assured in Galatians 1:8–9.

What to this point has been defended, is to the end that a most essential truth may be emphasized, i.e., that sin is against God. It affects God immediately and directly; and it affects the one who sins largely through the reaction which arises because of its primary influence upon God. In his blindness and wickedness the creature may assume that what he may do is no concern of God's, but such reasoning is only the hallucination which waits upon the insanity of sin. The supposition that the creature is free from responsibility and accountability to his Creator is the worst of delusions—second only to that irrational notion that God is not cognizant of the creature's sin, or that sin can be hid from God. Concerning the divine observation of the creature's sin, it is written: "For his eyes are upon the ways of man, and he seeth all his goings" (Job 34:21); "Shall not God search this out? for he knoweth the secrets of the heart" (Ps. 44:21); "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance" (Ps. 90:8); "For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord GOD" (Jer. 2:22). And two testimonies recorded in the Bible declare the truth that sin is directly against God. David wrote: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest" (Ps. 51:4); "And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son" (Luke 15:21). In addition to the condemnation which is imposed because of the sin nature, every personal sin must be, and therefore will be, weighed and judged on the basis of divine holiness. Quite dissimilar, however, is the relationship of the sinning Christian to God. He is subject to chastisement, but not to condemnation.

Beyond the offense which sin is to God's government, and beyond the injury it is to that which is the indisputable property of God, it, because of its immoral nature, outrages and insults the holy Person of God. He is infinitely pure and righteous. The prophet of old has said, "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity: wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he?" (Hab. 1:13), and the Apostle John has written: "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). So, also, the Apostle James declares: "Let no

man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man" (James 1:13). When the truth is considered apart from all relationships, there is no argument respecting the holiness of God; yet this is the very truth which measures the sinfulness of sin. It is the fact that God is transparently holy which lends meaning to such terms as *ungodliness*, *defilement*, and *impiety.*

If any unprejudiced attention be given to the subject at all, it will not be deemed unreasonable that the One who gives man his existence, who designs all that is best for man in time and eternity, who creates and arranges all that enters into man's environment and comfort, who exercises an unceasing providing and protecting providence, who at infinite cost prepares a remedy for man's sin and failure, who loves man with an infinite love, and desires man—even though fallen in sin—to be blessed with His richest blessings, should, being Himself pellucidly holy, be injured and offended by man's rejection of His Person, insult to His character, and rebellion against His holy will. Nor should any be amazed that, because of His immutable righteousness, He cannot condone sin but must demand that the price of redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation—which He alone could pay—should be included by man in his reckoning respecting what must enter into his salvation. It should not be counted strange that salvation is restricted to confidence in God to save through the Saviorhood of Christ, or that the rejection of Christ as Savior should be deemed the last and most iniquitous insult to God.

a. The Theory that Sin is Selfishness. Closely related to that aspect of sin which is against God, is the widely accepted contention that sin is selfishness, or selfhood in one form or another. This theory has claimed advocates in the early days of the church; it was argued by Dr. Julius Müller, whose work, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, has long been hailed by devout scholarship as the most complete and worthy treatment of this great theme; and it has been defended by later theologians—notably Dr. Augustus H. Strong. The real issue may be approached by the inquiry whether all sin is selfishness, or whether all selfishness is sin. The difference in these propositions is obvious and the issue should not be passed over without attention.

Extended argument has already been advanced in this work to prove that the very essence of sin, as it was first committed by the highest angel and

later by the first man, was an act both self-willed and self-seeking—a departure from that which, having been divinely purposed, was and ever must be God's truth. For this truth the lie was substituted, which included not only the repudiation of God but also the adoption of an antigod enterprise which is none other than the present *cosmos* world system. The beginning of sin, or the first sin, is naturally the mold or pattern of all sin; that is, what Lucifer did is, with respect to its vital nature, a model of all subsequent sin. In this connection, it has been noted also that the last sinner of the satanic program—the man of sin—will pursue the same unholy purpose. Of him it is written that he both "opposeth [God] and exalteth himself above all that is called God" (2 Thess. 2:4). While there is always a very wide field open for the multiplied manifestations of sin, sin is, in its essential nature, twofold: repudiation of God and promotion of self. Opposition to God and exaltation of self doubtless spring from the same self motive. It is true, as is often claimed, that self in all its forms constitutes an opposite to sacrificial love (it is identical with self-love). On this ground, it has been reasoned, and by none more effectively than Dr. Müller and Dr. Strong, that, since love is the first obligation in fulfilling the law—as it is said in Matthew 22:37–40, "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets"; and in Romans 13:10, "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (cf. Gal. 5:14; James 2:8)—failure to love must be the first all-inclusive sin. Perplexity must arise if no recognition be accorded to the difference which exists between sin as a state, or nature, and sin in its outworking, or manifestation. In general, objective love is a manifestation; but, even if it be considered as a state of heart, the unregenerate person needs more than a revolution in his emotions. He must be regenerated. He has no ability to reverse his emotions. In place of fulfilling the law by the exercise of love, he fulfills "the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph. 2:3). However, were he able, even by divine enablement—admittedly an impossible hypothesis—to exercise love, yet he would be lacking those great transformations which constitute salvation. In other words, if salvation from sin may be secured by espousing a life characterized by love—even divinely enabled—it is by

works; it arises in man; and to man be all the glory. If, as is usual, the problem be restricted to personal sins, even these are in some instances void of the element of self. No self-interest need be present in *malice, enmity toward God,* or in *unbelief.*

It may be concluded that the part of anything is never the whole of it. Love for God and man is not all there is of holy character, as love for self is not all there is of sin. Unselfishness in Christ did not exhaust His virtues, nor does selfishness in Satan exhaust all his iniquity. To the Christian it may be said that, though Christ emphasized love to a marked degree (cf. John 13:34–35; 15:12), He did not imply that love is all that is required. When He said, "Keep my commandments," He could hardly be thought to be referring to only one of them. Sin is any want of conformity to the character of God. It is true that "God is love," but He is vastly more; He is *truth,* He is *faithfulness,* He is *righteousness.* When the Bible declares that lawlessness is sin, that lack of faith is sin, that failure to do what is known to be good is sin, there is no implication that the exercise of love will correct these evils.

2. Sin Against the Law. The term *law* must, in the present consideration, be given a very broad meaning including every form of the revealed will of God whether it be (a) early communications preserved by tradition, (b) human conscience, (c) direct spiritual guidance, or (d) the written Word of God with its various age-applications. These forms of the law are best considered separately and in the order indicated:

a. Early Communications Preserved by Tradition. This aspect of law fills a large place in human history. It was apparently the sole governing rule over human life from Adam to Moses. It was that which determined the distinction between good and evil as recorded concerning the first parents; it was that which separated Cain from Abel; it was that upon the basis of which the antediluvians were judged and condemned; it was that which made subsequent Gentile peoples to be abhorrent to God; and it was that to which faithful Enoch, Noah, Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph conformed their lives. Jehovah declared to Isaac concerning his father Abraham who lived a full half a millennium before the giving of a written law, "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (Gen. 26:5). A similar expression that Abraham pursued "the way of Jehovah" (Gen 18:19, R.V.)

evidently recognizes the truth that a well-defined edict or mandate was abroad in all those centuries of early history. To what extent humanity has preserved these early requirements or impressions would be difficult to determine. Such recognition of right conduct and equity as the heathen exhibit must be, to a large degree, the manifestations of this original unwritten, yet divinely revealed, law of God.

b. Human Conscience. A return is made at this point to the contemplation of that mysterious faculty of the natural man, or within the natural man, which conforms not merely to that which *is*, but rather to that which *ought to be*—a faculty which so far transcends, in things moral, the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will, that it sits in judgment over them. The conscience, though acting as judge, does not essay to execute its decrees. Having declared what ought to be in that clearness which is commensurable with its competence, conscience must depend upon the spirit of man acting through his will to execute its decrees. In its broadest phase, this vital faculty of man's being which governs and yet does not execute its judgments, is the *moral law.* The law in its written form presents only a general statement of that which in principle is applicable to those to whom it is addressed. It cannot trace the specific obligations which arise in relation to the individual's peculiar and ever-changing circumstances. The conscience alone can guide in these details of life. Obviously, what is thus said applies to the unregenerate; for a different relationship and responsibility rests on the regenerate, who, being indwelt by the Holy Spirit, are privileged to be led of the Spirit. Over against this, or to be added to this, God has spoken with particular directness to Jews and with another particular directness to Christians with due consideration of their different spheres of relationship to Him; but all are, like the inner voice of conscience, only proclamations of the one moral law—that which proceedeth from God and is the affirmation of His holy nature. This conception of law does not necessarily presuppose evil in the individual to be corrected; it is primarily a positive directing, a pointing of the way, to those who otherwise would not know. Even human laws are to a large degree based on divine revelation and are usually accepted or rejected according to the conscience, or convictions due to conscience, of those to whom such authority is given. It has been true that human authorities have

sometimes confused their authority to act with their power to act, supposing that mere power determined that which is right; but the very resistance of such perversion argues strongly for the existence in men of the *moral law* as an innate sense of that which is right as in contrast to that which is wrong. Thus conscience, as a feature of moral law, coincides with all other forms of law and, normally, proclaims that which God requires. A violation of conscience, in so far as conscience asserts its authority, is sin.

c. Direct Spiritual Guidance. In this aspect of the divine will as revealed, the Christian alone is concerned. It is possible for the child of God to refuse the guidance which the Spirit proffers. A carnal life is a life lived in the flesh and in opposition to the mind of the Spirit, yet the word *carnal* applies to Christians (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1). This extensive theme must be reserved for its proper time and place.

d. The Written Word of God with Its Various Age-Applications. At this point in this thesis, the most common definition for sin is in evidence, namely, that sin is ἀνομία—a violation of law, or *lawlessness.* Using this word, the Apostle John declares that "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4). The question whether this is a complete or a restricted definition of sin has received some attention earlier when seeking to draft a proper definition of sin. There it was observed that any want of conformity to revealed law is not a broad enough conception; for much may be in the character of God that has not specific expression in any revealed law, just as, indeed, a lack of faith is sin, yet all sin is not a lack of faith; and to know good and not do it is sin, but not all sin is failure to do what is known to be good; and, again, to love money is a root of evil; but all evil is not included in the love of money. In the same manner, lawlessness is sin, but not all sin is a violation of some written code. Since the written law so nearly represents the whole of the divine requirement, great stress should be put on the searching truth that to transgress a law, which is addressed to one, is the most specific disobedience and compares with that disobedience by which angels and men have fallen. Question 24 of *The Larger Catechism* (Westminster) aims at the solemn truth regarding sin and the law. It reads, "*What is sin?"* and the answer is clear as far as it goes: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of any law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature."

No discussion of sin as against law will be true to the Bible that does not incorporate some exposition of 1 John 3:4–10. The deeper meaning of this passage will be understood only when a distinction between the sins of regenerate men and unregenerate men is kept in mind. Possibly no other passage of Scripture contributes more to the present theme than this. It is certain that few portions of Scripture have been subject to more varied interpretations. The passage sets up a distinction between sin with its source in Satan, and righteousness (in conduct—not conduct which generates righteousness as a ground of standing before God, but conduct which is prompted to deeds of rectitude because of the perfect standing in the divine righteousness imputed to all who believe) with its source in God. Though allusion has been made before in this general discussion to this passage, a more extended consideration of it is essential at this point.

Probably the key phrase in this context is, "Sin is the transgression of the law" (vs. 4), where the force of *is* amounts to *is equivalent to.* In the foregoing chapters of this volume, evidence has been adduced to demonstrate that sin began with Satan in heaven, he thus becoming the father or originator of it; and that sin is, in its essential character, a lawless departure from the purpose and will of God. The passage under present consideration is in accord with the most distinctive characteristic of sin, namely, *lawlessness.* The Apostle includes here *all* sin, not *some* sin. It is lawlessness against God and all that His holy character demands. If the interpretation were permitted that *some* sins only were in view, there would be provided an explanation, which some have *supposed* to be true, of the strong statements which follow in the context. Roman Catholic theology distinguishes here between *mortal* and *venial* sins. Augustine, Luther, and Bede, in harmony with the tenor of the Epistle, sought to restrict this form of sin to sin against brotherly love. Others have restricted it to *deadly* sin. However, the passage is clear in its declaration. It most evidently refers to *all* sin and not merely to *bad* sins as in contradistinction to *good* sins, and the passage as certainly asserts that the essential character of sin (as the Greek ἁμαρτία implies) is lawlessness—lawlessness, indeed, which is foreign to the Christian's redemption, new birth by the Spirit, and present position *in Christ.* In verse 5, "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin," the Apostle refers parenthetically to the ground of all saving grace. The unqualified declaration of verse 6,

"Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him," need not be softened by any modifications whatever. When abiding in Him, lawless sinning is excluded. Over against this, the lawless sinner neither seeth Christ nor knoweth Christ. Some have introduced here the explanation of the statement—that the one who sins neither sees nor knows Christ—by pointing out that the Christian's vision and understanding are dulled by the practice of sin, which truth could not be denied by any believer who knows from personal experience the effect of sin upon his own heart. To be observed, however, is the fact that the contrast in this passage is not between spiritual and unspiritual Christians, but is between the children of God and the children of Satan. The statement of verse 7, addressed to the "little children" of God, is exceedingly forceful and vital. It is there written: "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." The verse declares that the only one who practices righteousness is by his new birth a partaker of the imputed righteousness of God. He not only *does* righteousness, but *is* righteous according to his eternal standing in Christ. Similarly (vs. 8), he that practiceth lawlessness is of the devil.

At this point it may clarify that which follows in this context if citation first be made of the culminative statement in verse 10: "In this [the freedom to practice sin lawlessly] the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil." Verse 9 reads as follows: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Whatever specific qualities are in view under the phrase "doth not commit sin" (lit., 'doeth no sin'), are predicated of *all* who are "born of God." No portion of this context has been more distorted by torturing exposition than verse 9, yet the truth here disclosed is only the logical conclusion of that which has gone before concerning lawless sinning. There is no basis in this passage for the doctrine of sinless perfection on the part of some Christians which is not true of all Christians. It will be remembered that the Apostle has warned here against all such conclusions (1:8–10). Nor does the Bible teach here, or elsewhere, that Christians do not sin. It does teach, however, that the Christian retains his Adamic, carnal nature until the day of his death, and, apart from the enabling power of the Spirit, there will be sin in the Christian's life. There is a very important difference to be observed between the two phrases *not able*

to sin and *able not to sin.* The latter alone is within the divine provisions. The Bible also teaches that the Christian, being indwelt by the Holy Spirit, is possessed with a new standard of what is good or bad. His conduct either grieves, or does not grieve, the Holy Spirit. There is limitless suffering of heart in the path of the child of God who sins lawlessly. The Scriptures abound with illustrations of this suffering in the lives of saints whose history it records. David likened this heart suffering at the time of his lawless sinning to the waxing old of his bones through his roaring all day long, asserting that the heavy hand of God was upon him and that his moisture was turned into the drought of summer (Ps. 32:3–4). Paul, because of his failure to reach his spiritual ideals, testified that he was a "wretched man." It is to be concluded, then, that the true child of God cannot sin *lawlessly* without great suffering and that suffering is due to the presence of the divine seed or nature in him. This reaction of the divine nature against sin in the Christian, which could never be experienced by unregenerate men who have not the Spirit (Jude 1:19), constitutes a ground for distinction between those who are the children of God and those who are not. There are manifold other disclosures found in the Word of God which serve to emphasize the specific character of the Christian's sin. Some of these will yet appear in that which follows.

To a certain degree there is an element of indefiniteness about God's law as expressed through conscience and through the leading of the Spirit, but that element is not lacking in the law of God as it is embodied in the Scriptures of Truth. The written law appears in three major forms or divisions according to its application in three distinct dispensations. The first is known as the Mosaic system, or the Mosaic Law which was addressed to Israel only, and was in effect from Mt. Sinai to the death of Christ. The second is the heaven-high instruction to Christians who, being perfected in Christ Jesus, are called to walk worthy of their heavenly calling. The third system will govern in the yet future kingdom age and doubtless be extended as a rule of life for Gentiles who will share Israel's earthly blessings. The difference between these governing rules of conduct, the time of their application, and the penalties related to each will yet be treated with a degree of completeness under Ecclesiology. When thus attempting a panoramic view of God's times and ways of dealing with men, attention should be given, as before intimated, to the period between Adam

and Moses—a period which is identified as before the law (Rom. 5:13; cf. Gen. 26:5). To the same end, the truth should be observed that God addressed almost no instructions directly to Gentiles. Of them it is said that they "have not the law" (Rom. 2:14), and their estate is fully described also in Ephesians 2:12, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Yet, again, no rule of life is addressed to the unsaved of the present age—Jew or Gentile. To such God addresses warnings, as He does to the nations (Ps. 2:10–12), but His primary message to the unsaved is the invitation embodied in the gospel of divine grace.

A clear recognition of the important truth that the law of God presents various systems which belong to specific peoples of different ages is stated by Dr. Julius Müller:

> It is evident from the hints here given regarding the relation of the moral law to the consciousness of man, that its elevation to an ever-increasing clearness of subjective conviction depends upon the progressive development of the human spirit generally; and it also follows that it must be exposed to disturbance and darkening in individuals and nations, through the force of propensities and tendencies of the will that strive against it. Hence it comes to pass that a positive revelation of the moral law—a giving of the law—appropriately finds its place in the series of God's historical revelations to man. The Law of Moses is clearly in its moral precepts nothing more than a republication of the moral law in its intrinsic truth, suited to the wants of the Israelites; and, in order to preserve the knowledge of it in the midst of the darkening and perverting influence of human wilfulness and sin, it was necessary to have it committed to writing as an actual standard of appeal. But as the moral law was in this case embodied in a code, clothed with outward political authority and interwoven with ritualistic and civil laws, it had to accommodate itself both to the character and historical relations of the Israelites, and to the requirements of the stage of moral culture which the age had then reached. The exposition of it as a whole had therefore to be limited, and its moral principles are exhibited only in the broadest outlines. An unprejudiced consideration of the Mosaic law obliges us to allow that while it announces the eternal principles of true morality, and is ever calculated to beget the knowledge of sin and repentance, there is in the Christian Church, through the power of the pattern of holiness in Christ and of the divine Spirit, a far more developed and deeper knowledge of the law than could possibly have been given to the Israelites through Moses. —*Op. cit.,* I, 38–39

The written law does not serve to originate sin. It is stated in Romans 5:13 that "sin was in the world" before the Mosaic Law was given, though at that time, or until the law, sin was not imputed. In the light of all Scripture bearing on the period from Adam to Moses, the statement that sin was not then imputed must be interpreted as meaning that the specific

things which the law introduced and were thus definitely commanded became new ideals, the breaking of which became an overt act of disobedience. These new ideals, however, were not prescribed before the giving of the law and thus, in that earlier time, men were not charged with disobedience to commandments not yet given; but sin was in the world before the specific commands were given. The law which is “holy, and just, and good” (Rom. 7:12) does stir the reaction of the sin nature and by so much creates discord in the life. It is written, “But sin [sin nature], taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead” (Rom. 7:8). The Apostle also states, “Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression” (Rom. 4:15); “Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound” (Rom. 5:20).

To say that sin is lawlessness assigns a very wide field of application to it if all forms of law are considered, yet it is more extensive and complete to assert that sin is any want of conformity to the character of God.

V. General Terms and Classifications

Concerning the precise meaning of terms which belong to the doctrine of sin, the student of theology would do well to be informed. The term *sin* is peculiar and restricted in its application. On this point Dr. A. M. Fairbairn remarks: “ ‘Sin’ is a religious term, intelligible only in the realm of religious experience and thought. ‘Evil’ is a philosophical term, and denotes every condition, circumstance, or act that in any manner or degree interferes with complete perfection or happiness of being, whether physical, metaphysical, or moral. ‘Vice’ is an ethical term; it is moral evil interpreted as an offence against the ideal or law given in the nature of man: it is the blot or stain left by the departure from nature. ‘Crime’ is a legal term, denotes the open or public violation of the law which a society or state has framed for its own preservation and the protection of its members. But sin differs from these in this respect:—they may be in a system which knows no God, but without God there can be no sin” (*Christ in Modern Theology*, 10th edition, p. 452).

Personal sins may be classified somewhat accurately by the familiar Biblical terms employed in the Authorized Version of both Old and New Testament to designate them.

(1) *Transgression*, which is the stepping to one side, or the overstepping of those boundaries which God has marked off.

(2) *Iniquity*, referring to that which is altogether wrong.

(3) *Error*, that which disregards the right or goes astray.

(4) *Sin*, which is coming short, or missing the mark.

(5) *Wickedness*, the outworking and expression of an evil nature, depravity.

(6) *Evil*, with reference to that which is actually wrong, opposing God.

(7) *Ungodliness*, lacking any worthy fear of God.

(8) *Disobedience*, an unwillingness to be led or guided in ways of truth.

(9) *Unbelief*, failure to trust in God. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Unbelief appears as the one and only "besetting sin," which sin is universal. Men do not have individual and varied besetting sins. Each person is characterized by his failure to believe God (note Heb. 12:1–2, where the one reference to "the sin which doth so easily beset us" is set over against that faith of which Jesus is the Author and Finisher).

(10) *Lawlessness*, which consists in the persistent contempt of divine law and a breaking through all restraint to the end that self may be gratified regardless of divine admonition. The most illuminating passage—1 John 3:4–10—is rendered somewhat obscure by the translation of ἀνομία by 'transgression.' The discussion of this context develops the one aspect of sin which is lawlessness, as in contrast to that righteousness which impels the saved one whose new nature received from God cannot go in the ways of lawless sin. The unregenerate prove their lost estate by their ability to sin lawlessly without pain of heart—that suffering to which David referred when he said, "When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer" (Ps. 32:3–4). The child of God when sinning experiences the grieving of the Spirit of God (Eph. 4:30), which experience will keep him from that carelessness of soul termed ἀνομία—*lawlessness.* Therefore, according to 1 John 3:9, anyone born of God does not sin lawlessly. The presence of the divine nature precludes this. However, there is no reference in this passage to sinless perfection. Such perfection could not be in view at this point since what is here declared is said to be true in the case of *all* who are born of God, and not one of these is sinless before God. Similarly, the following verse (3:10) declares that this

ability to sin lawlessly is a marking off of children of the devil from the children of God.

Again, personal sins may be classified according to their general aspects.

(1) As related to the divine requirements, they are either *omissions* or *commissions.*

(2) As related to the object, they are against *God, neighbor,* or *self.*

(3) As related to compass, they are either *inward*—of the soul—or *outward*—of the body.

(4) As related to chargeableness, they are to *self* alone, or to *others* as being partakers in them (1 Tim. 5:22). There is probably no practice of sin which is harder to terminate than that which has drawn people into a partnership. The reason for this is clear. One cannot forsake the enterprise, as he might were he alone, without seeming to incriminate the other, or others, and to seem to be superior to the other, or others.

(5) As related to intention, they are *voluntary,* or *involuntary,* which latter may be due to ignorance, uncontrollable passion, or infirmity.

(6) As related to sinfulness, they may be *greater,* or *less.*

(7) As related to the subject, they may be that of the *unsaved,* or *saved.*

(8) As related to the divine penalty, some sins are at least *partially judged in this world,* while others are *judged in the world to come.*

(9) As related to divine forgiveness, they are *unforgiven,* or *forgiven.* A form of unforgiven sin is seen in the case of the unpardonable sin, which was committed only when Christ was here on earth, and which sin is not now possible, both because of the fact that Christ is not here as He was then nor is He in the same relation to the Holy Spirit, and because such a penalty as is imposed on those who committed the unpardonable sin sets up a direct contradiction of divine grace in salvation. There cannot be an unpardonable sin and a whosoever-will gospel at the same time.

(10) As related to their cause, they may be sins of *ignorance, imprudence, heedlessness, concupiscence, malice,* or *presumption.*

(11) As related to God as the Governor of the universe, sins are such as to call forth His *vengeance,* or such as to call forth His *longsuffering.*

VI. The Divine Remedy for Personal Sin

In a previous discussion the specific character of personal sin has been presented, and it was there pointed out that personal sin of whatever form is only the legitimate fruitage of the sin nature. However, the divine cure for personal sin, it should be observed, is of a wholly different character than the divine cure for the sin nature. Being by birth a partaker of the sin nature, there is no personal guilt charged against the individual because of that nature, though there is condemnation on the ground of the inherent unlikeness of that nature to God. On the other hand, both guilt and condemnation are attributed to the individual because of personal sin. The divine cure for personal sin is twofold, namely, (1) forgiveness and (2) justification. It is recognized that the two themes—*forgiveness* and *justification*—belong primarily to Soteriology, and under that main division they are to be treated again. With some disregard for precise divisional boundaries it has seemed good to incorporate into this work some reference to the divine remedy for each major aspect of sin.

1. FORGIVENESS. In approaching the doctrine of the forgiveness of personal sin, three erroneous impressions, quite common indeed, may well be pointed out—one of which has to do directly with this subject. (a) In their treatment of the whole doctrine of sin, theological writers have too often restricted their discussion to the one theme of personal sin, which misleading practice has imposed incalculable limitations on the doctrine as a whole. (b) It is by many assumed that the forgiveness of personal sin is the equivalent of personal salvation. To such persons, a Christian is no more than a forgiven sinner, whereas, of upwards of thirty-three divine accomplishments which together comprise salvation, forgiveness is but one of them. (c) The distinction between divine forgiveness of the unsaved and that of the Christian must be clearly recognized, and will be so recognized in this treatment by reserving the discussion of that phase of the doctrine which concerns the Christian until a later division of this general theme is reached.

As an act of God, forgiveness is common to both Testaments, the English word *forgive*, in its various forms, being a translation of five Hebrew words and four Greek words. One of the Greek words is translated nine times by the English word *remission.* The underlying thought which the word *forgive* universally conveys when expressing the act of God is that of putting away,

releasing, or pardoning. It is the taking away of sin and its condemnation from the offender, or offenders, by imputing the sin to, and imposing its righteous judgments upon, Another. Covering all generations of human life on the earth, no statement could be more conclusive than that found in Hebrews 9:22, “And without shedding of blood is no remission.” In the period covered by the Old Testament records, we find the word *forgive* used only of God in His dealing nationally or individually with Israel and her proselytes. Gentile standing before God preceding the death of Christ is described in Ephesians 2:12 wherein it is declared that they were without Christ, without commonwealth privileges, without covenant promises, without hope, and without God in the world. There is but little Scripture bearing upon the forgiveness of the sin of Gentiles in the days before Christ. Some Gentiles, we are told, did offer sacrifices, and their forgiveness is thus implied. To Israel, whether as a nation or as individuals, divine forgiveness was an act of God which was based on and followed the offering of sacrifices (national—Num. 15:24–25, and individual—Lev. 4:31), though, being a people related to God by covenant based upon sacrifices, they were at times both nationally (Num. 14:11–20) and individually (Ps. 32:1–5) forgiven on the ground of confession of sin. When forgiveness was extended on the ground of confession, it was, as in the New Testament (cf. 1 John 1:9), made righteously possible only as based on sacrificial blood. Herein is seen the major distinction which exists between divine forgiveness and human forgiveness. At best, human forgiveness can do no more than to pass over, waive, or abandon any and all penalty that exists. In such forgiveness the injured party relinquishes all claim to any form of satisfaction which otherwise might be demanded or imposed upon the offender. Such forgiveness, so far as it ever exists, is only a voluntary gratuity in which the offended party surrenders all claim to compensation. On the other hand, divine forgiveness is never extended to the offender as an act of leniency, nor is the penalty waived, since God, being infinitely holy and upholding His government which is founded on undeviating righteousness, cannot make light of sin. Divine forgiveness is therefore extended only when the last demand or penalty against the offender has been satisfied. Since no human being could ever render divine satisfaction for his sins, God, in measureless mercy, has provided all the satisfaction, even divine propitiation, which the sinner could ever need. This is good

news. The following from Dr. Henry C. Mabie is well stated: "God Himself, as Carnegie Simpson in his book, 'The Fact of Christ,' has so strongly shown, '*is* the moral law, *is the ethical order,* ' in a sense that no man, no earthly father is. While among men, and particularly men as forgiven sinners, 'forgiveness to others is the first and simplest of duties, with God it is the *profoundest of problems.*' If He as the world's moral Governor, even with the profoundest fatherly love, forgives, He must do it in a way that will *not legitimize sin* on the one hand, and as will *win the heart* to penitence and faith on the other" (*The Divine Reason of the Cross,* p. 130).

Under the Old Testament order, the value of the divinely provided and efficacious sacrifice of Christ was accepted in anticipation and symbolized by the shedding of blood. In due time God justified that expectation, and all His acts of forgiveness which had been based upon those offerings were proved to have been righteous by the bearing by Christ of those sins which were previously forgiven (Rom. 3:25). As a verification of the fact that, in the old order, sacrifices preceded divine forgiveness of the offender, we read the following statement four times in Leviticus, chapter four: "And the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him" (vss. 20, 26, 31, 35). Correspondingly in the New Testament, divine forgiveness is invariably based on the one sacrifice for sin which Christ has made. But one passage need be cited: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1:7). If question be raised here concerning the fact that before His death Christ forgave sin, it should be remembered that such forgiveness preceded and was therefore in anticipation of His death. Being Himself the sacrificial Lamb that was to be slain who would elect to bear all sin, He said of Himself, "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" (Mark 2:10). However, it should be observed that divine forgiveness, being based as it is upon the perfect satisfaction which the death of Christ supplies, can be, and is, as perfect and complete in character as is the work of the Substitute on which it is based. Thus, according to Colossians 2:13, divine forgiveness is seen to reach to "all trespasses"—past, present, and future—for the one who is saved. The perfection of this transaction and the extent of it are said to be such that the believer is now on a peace footing with God—"We have peace with God" (Rom. 5:1)—and "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ

Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). Such unqualified forgiveness belongs only to the Christian's perfect *standing*, being "in Christ Jesus." As a counterpart of this, there yet remains to be considered, as it will be in Chapter XXII, "The Christian's Sin and Its Remedy," the important divine method of dealing with those sins which the child of God commits after he is saved and the fact that he is wholly forgiven through the blood of Christ, being perfectly accepted in the Beloved.

Though, on the divine side, the freedom to forgive sin is always secured, directly or indirectly, through the blood of Christ, the requirements on the human side vary to some extent with the different ages of time. During the period between Abel and Christ, forgiveness was made, on the human side, to depend on the presentation of a specified sacrifice. During the present age, it is made to depend, for the unsaved, on faith in Christ; but for the saved, who are already under the value of Christ's blood, forgiveness is made to depend upon confession and is impelled by the fact that God has already forgiven (Eph. 4:32). But during the coming age divine forgiveness is, on the human side, made to depend upon a willingness of the offender to forgive those who have sinned against him (Matt. 6:14–15). The two principles—forgiving to be forgiven, or forgiving because forgiven—cannot be harmonized; nor is such an effort required since they belong to different ages and represent two widely diverse divine administrations.

It may be concluded, then, that divine forgiveness of sin in whatever age or under whatever conditions, though varying in the requirements on the human side, is always based upon the sacrifice of Christ and consists in a removal of sin in the sense that it is no longer charged against the sinner, but is charged against his Substitute. No better word can be found to express this removal of sin by forgiveness than that employed in Romans 11:27 concerning the yet future divine dealing with the sins of the nation Israel: "For this is my covenant with them, when I shall take away their sins."

2. JUSTIFICATION. The words *just* and *justify* often occur in the Bible and are usually related directly or indirectly to *justice* as an element of human character. According to Scripture usage, to be just or justified may mean no more than to be free from guilt or innocent of any charge. With respect to their characters, the Old Testament saints are described upwards of thirty

times as “just” persons, and it is under that designation, it would seem, they are to appear in the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22–24). Speaking to those who were still under the old order and by the parable of the lost sheep, Christ refers to one hundred individuals of whom ninety and nine were “just persons,” needing no repentance (Luke 15:3–7). In like manner, by his good works man may be justified in the eyes of his fellow men. This is the distinctive teaching of James 2:14–26. However, of far greater import is that justification of man by God, which justification is based on the imputed righteousness of God. Of the Old Testament saints, Abraham is said to have attained unto imputed righteousness (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:1–4), and David declares the man to be “blessed” unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works (Rom. 4:6; cf. Ps. 32:1–2). The Scriptures thus record the fact that Abraham attained by faith unto imputed righteousness and implies that he was justified by faith since he was not justified by works. David wrote, “For in thy sight shall no man living be justified” (Ps. 143:2), and Bildad, who expressed the beliefs of the ancients, said: “How … can man be justified with God?” (Job 25:4). Though anticipated in the Old Testament, divine justification of men, as more fully revealed in the New Testament, is the highest consummating work, but one, of God for the believer, being surpassed only by that eternal glory which is to follow: “And whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:30). Though the precise features of this great doctrine are set forth in the Word of God, directly or indirectly, Romish perversions and Arminian unbelief have gone far in robbing multitudes of Christians of any adequate understanding of the benefits that justification affords them.

Imputed righteousness is secured by a vital union with Christ, while divine justification is a judicial decree of God which is based on, and is an acknowledgment of, imputed righteousness. There is a logical order — though not chronological, since each and every step is wrought simultaneously at the moment saving faith is effective—which leads to that consummating justification which is by divine decree. These steps are: (1) Upon believing, the individual enters actually and completely into the values secured for him by the death of Christ. This includes the remission of sins; but far more, indeed, since that death became the ground of divine justification. The precise rendering of Romans 4:25 is of surpassing importance as relating divine justification to the death rather than to the

resurrection of Christ. We read: “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” In all, three causes for divine justification are to be distinguished: (a) a *primary*— the sovereign love of God, (b) a *meritorious*—the substitutionary death of Christ, and (c) an *instrumental*—faith. The text in question is concerned only with the meritorious cause and is one of the few texts in the New Testament bearing on this phase of the truth (cf. Rom. 5:9, where justification is declared to be by the blood of Christ; and 2 Cor. 5:21, where imputed righteousness, the ground of justification, is said to be possible because of the fact that Christ, by His death, was made to be sin for us). “It is finished,” which phrase was on the lips of Christ when about to die, would be emptied of much of its meaning if it did not witness to the fact that the basis of divine justification is established forever. By a certain group of expositors, this passage (Rom. 4:25) is taken to mean that Christ’s death is the ground of our forgiveness, while His resurrection is the ground of our justification. It is thus assumed that as sin caused Christ’s death, so justification necessitated His resurrection. On the contrary, as passages cited above imply, divine justification is based only on the death of Christ, who having secured the foundation for justification by His death, rose from the dead; for “it was not possible that he should be holden of it” (Acts 2:24). Bishop Moule stated it thus: “We sinned, therefore He suffered: we were justified, therefore He rose” (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges—Romans*, p. 98). This interpretation preserves the grammatical form, both phrases being of the same construction. It is obvious that none are actually justified until they believe, but *provisionally* the righteous ground upon which they could be justified when they do believe was secured once for all by Christ in His death. Therefore, that work being wrought, He rose from the dead.

Continuing the enumeration of the steps in their logical order which lead to divine justification, we note: (2) that the believer is, by a twofold ministry of the Spirit—namely, regeneration, by which a divine nature is imparted to the believer, which is the indwelling Christ; and the Spirit’s baptism, by which the believer is placed in Christ—so vitally and eternally related to Christ as Substitute that all that Christ is and all that He has done are imputed to the child of God. What Christ is, when reckoned to the believer, becomes the basis of his divine justification; what Christ has done becomes the basis of his divine forgiveness.

The doctrine of divine justification has ever suffered from, and at times has been all but lost by, the unwarranted supposition that it is synonymous with divine forgiveness. Though closely related as measureless benefits to the Christian, these benefits, since they point in opposite directions, are far removed the one from the other. Even the *Shorter Catechism* (Westminster)—usually dependable for accuracy of doctrine—confuses these two divine undertakings. It declares that "justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone." Similarly, the theology of Rome states: "Not the mere remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inner man." The Arminians go even further by stating: "Justification is a remission of sins and a sentence of pardon." John Wesley asserted: "Justification is pardon—the forgiveness of sins." This is but a slight improvement over the Unitarian contention that justification is only a moral change. It is true that none are justified who are not forgiven; and, with respect to that forgiveness which accompanies salvation, none are forgiven who are not justified. But divine forgiveness, often repeated in the Christian's experience, is the *subtraction* of that which has been sinful, while once-for-all divine justification is made possible by the *addition* of that which is righteous. The act of accepting Christ as Savior is *one* act, yet it results in many specific benefits and among these are pardon and justification.

It is likewise essential to a clear understanding of the doctrine of justification that a distinction be observed between imputed righteousness and divine justification. That these two aspects of the believer's standing are closely related is evidenced by the fact that in the original Greek they are two forms of one and the same word. Imputed righteousness, which is that righteousness from God now reckoned to the believer because of the fact that he is *in Christ*—Christ being *made* unto him the very righteousness of God (cf. Rom. 3:22; 10:3–4; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Eph. 1:6; 2:13)—represents the unchangeable value which Christ becomes to all who are in Him. It is secured wholly by the believer's place in Christ and exists only by virtue of that relationship.

The letter to the Romans distinguishes four kinds of righteousness, namely, (a) God's own character (3:25; 9:14); (b) human character (10:3); (c) inwrought, or Spirit-empowered, righteousness (8:4); and (d) imputed

righteousness (1:17, etc.). The last-named is that which Christ *is* and which becomes the believer's by divine imputation or reckoning, being, as it is, the legitimate benefit accruing automatically to the one who is in Christ. That righteousness of God which Christ is never ceased to be *de facto* Christ's own, nor does it ever become *de facto* any part of the believer's own character. As the wedding garment is not the person who wears it, so imputed righteousness is the believer's standing or covering, and is not antecedently the believer's own righteousness. It is true, however, that the undiminished value of imputed righteousness endures as long as the merit of Christ endures, upon which it is made to stand.

On the other hand, divine justification is the decree, or public acknowledgment, on the part of God that the believer whom He sees perfected with respect to standing, being in Christ, is justified in His sight. Thus (3) the last step in the logical order of divine undertakings leading to justification is seen to be, not the creation and bestowment of righteousness which is secured only through the believer's relation to Christ, but rather the official divine *recognition* of that righteousness. The child of God is justified by virtue of the fact that God has *declared* him to be righteous. God does not, nor could He, legalize a mere fiction, much less a falsehood. The righteousness which is the basis of His justifying decree is no less than the *absolute* righteousness of God made available through Christ and is imputed to all who believe.

Concerning the legal, equitable character of imputed righteousness and the decree of divine justification, it should be observed that, of the five typical offerings of Leviticus, chapters 1 to 5—the burnt offering, typifying Christ offering Himself without spot to God to do the Father's will; the meal offering, typifying the evenness, balance, and perfection of Christ's character; the peace offering, typifying Christ as our peace; the sin offering, typifying Christ as the Sin-bearer; and the trespass offering, typifying Christ in relation to the injury which sin has wrought against God and His rightful possessions as Creator (cf. Ps. 51:4)—the first three of these are classified as "sweet savour offerings" and the remaining two are classified as "non-sweet savour offerings." By so much it is indicated that there was that in Christ's death which was a delight to His Father. It was a sweet incense to His Father. And, likewise, there was that in the death of Christ which was

abhorrent to His Father, and this was typified by the last two offerings which were non-sweet savor.

Considering these two groups of typical offerings more at length and in their reverse order, we observe: (a) that, because of the holy character of God and the moral impossibility of His looking upon sin with the least degree of allowance, His face was turned away from the Sin-bearer. It was then that the Savior cried, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” It may well be inquired *why* the adorable Second Person of the Godhead was nailed to a cross and forsaken of the First Person. Indeed, men have advanced many answers to this question. The Word of God advances only one answer, namely, the Second Person, as the Lamb of God, is substituting as an offering in the room and stead of a lost world. As a part of the value to God of this sacrifice, the Father is able to forgive the personal sins of all those who come unto Him by Christ Jesus. When thus based upon the death of Christ, the transaction becomes legal, for when pardoning even the chief of sinners God is in no way complicated with sin nor is He condoning unrighteousness. Every penalty which His righteous government must impose upon the sinner, having fallen upon a Substitute, is perfectly answered. (b) We likewise observe that when Christ offered His own perfections to the Father, as typified by the sweet savor offerings, a legal provision was secured whereby the merit of the Son of God might be imputed to the one whom He saves. Referring to the Father’s delight in this aspect of the death of His Son, we read in Hebrews 10:6–7—words spoken by the Son to His Father when the Son came into the world (vs. 5)—“In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come … to do thy will O God.” The contrast which is here presented should not be passed over inattentively. The word of the Son that He received a sacrificial body (vs. 5), implies that His sacrifice will be well-pleasing to His Father as former burnt offerings and sacrifices (note that He here relates His death to the sweet savor offerings) had not been. In that aspect of Christ’s death, typified by the sweet savor offerings, the Father’s face is not turned away, but in this He finds delight; for the Second Person then “offered himself without spot to God” (Heb. 9:14). If the question be asked why the Second Person of the blessed Trinity is on a cross offering His perfections to the First Person, it may be answered: Certainly He is not making that offering as a revelation to the Father, for every perfection of the

Son has been known by the Father throughout all eternity. It is rather that, since fallen man possesses no merit before God of his own, the Son, as Substitute, is offering His own perfect merit to the Father for him. Thus a legal ground is secured whereon God is free, not only to forgive according to the non-sweet savor offering type, but is likewise free to impute all the perfections of His Son according to the sweet savor offering type to the one whom He saves.

We thus conclude that divine justification is not a mere removal of personal sins by forgiveness, but it is rather a divine decree which declares the believer to be eternally clothed with the righteousness of God; it has no relation to the resurrection of Christ, but is based only upon His death. Justification is a divine act which is equitable to an infinite degree, and, though in no conflict with human reason, is knowledge-surpassing in its magnitude and glory. Divine justification is a bit of heaven's perfection brought down to earth. It is so harmonious to divine jurisprudence that God is said to be *just* when He justifies a sinner who does no more than to *believe* in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). Divine justification, being legally equitable, will be defended by God to the end of eternity. In fact, the same righteousness which once condemned the sinner will, when that sinner is justified, defend his perfect standing in Christ forever. The chief end of man, we are told, is to glorify God. This every created being will do, for God has created no being who will not contribute to His eternal glory. Each and every one will either demonstrate His grace in all its perfections (Eph. 2:7), or display His wrath (Rom. 9:22) in all the ages to come. Divine justification is a feature of the divine cure for personal sin. It extends, also, to every other aspect of man's unlikeness to God, and answers every challenge that could be brought against the one who is saved through faith in Christ.

VII. Original Sin

The term *original sin* carries with it at least two implications, namely, (1) the first sin of the race and (2) the state of man in all subsequent generations, which state is due to that original sin. The latter meaning of this term is assigned an entire section of the present main division of this discussion. The former meaning of the term is the one reason for the

introduction of this topic under *personal sin;* for the first sin of Adam, which wrought his ruin and that of the race, was a *personal* sin. Much has been written about the specific nature of that original sin which does not call for restatement other than to point out that every human sin is of the same nature as the original sin, and, were the one who sins placed as Adam was placed as the federal, unfallen head of a race, the commonest sin in human life would have in it the power to cause the fall of the one who sinned as well as the entire race which he represented. The obvious effect of the first sin serves as one of the best measurements of the evil character of all sin.

VIII. Guilt

The *New Standard Dictionary* (1913 ed.) defines *guilt* as "the state of one who has consciously disobeyed God and is therefore under the divine condemnation." From the theological point of view, this definition is defective. Sin is not a matter of *consciousness* of evil. Being, as it is, against God, and drawing its evil character from the fact that it is unlike God, sin is evil whether the sinner realizes it to be such or not. A distinction thus arises between *blameworthiness*, which must be tempered by extenuating circumstances, and *guilt*, which in its primary meaning refers to the historical fact that a certain sin was committed by a certain individual. No better illustration will be found of the mitigation which may determine blameworthiness than the experience of the Apostle Paul as a persecutor of the Church. He writes: "Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. 1:13). On the other hand, guilt, and sometimes blameworthiness, belong to the individual where his own estimation concerning himself would not coincide. Christ taught that a glance of the eye was equivalent to adultery (Matt. 5:27–28).

In its historical aspect, the guilt of sin committed will never be changed; it could not be transferred to any other person. God in grace may forget it and mention it no more forever, having removed all penalty and condemnation. The historical record remains unchanged. There is, however, an aspect of guilt, as related to theology, which considers it as an obligation to law. This may be discharged by punishment endured or transferred to

another who as substitute suffers the penalty for the guilty person. Christ bore our guilt, not historically, which would mean that He became the actual doer of the crimes of men, but in the sense that the sin of man is an obligation to divine justice. As Substitute, He died "the just for the unjust." In this undertaking He never *became* the unjust, but as the just He bore the burden which was ever the rightful portion of the unjust.

The problem of guilt because of the sin nature is one which has divided the two major schools of theology, the Calvinistic and the Arminian. This phase of this discussion appears in the following section.

It remains to observe that concerning guilt, even as an obligation to God, no sinner could ever discharge his own responsibility. Human effort or suffering will not avail in time or eternity. The obligation is too vast. This truth must be stressed constantly. It therefore follows that, apart from the perfect relief which is provided in Christ's forensic, substitutionary sufferings, the sinner must remain guilty before God in every sense of the word and for all eternity. On the basis of this truth, it is justly argued that, in respect to duration, the penalty continues forever, or as long as the unchangeable guilt endures. As long as the cause for penalty exists, there is reason for it to continue—the same reason which determined its infliction at all. The human mind dreams of a time when penalty will have been paid and relief earned by the sinner, but this is to assert that the sinner can pay the price of sin, which is never true. The *fact* of guilt and the *consciousness* of it are immeasurable realities. Carlyle, writing in his *French Revolution* (III.1:4), states regarding the reality of guilt:

> From the purpose of crime to the act of crime there is an abyss; wonderful to think of. The finger lies on the pistol; but the man is not yet a murderer; nay, his whole nature staggering at such a consummation, is there not a confused pause rather—one last instant of possibility for him? Not yet a murderer; it is at the mercy of light trifles whether the most fixed idea may not yet become unfixed. One slight twitch of a muscle, the death-flash bursts; and he is *it*, and will for Eternity be it; and Earth has become a penal Tartarus for him; his horizon girdled now not with golden hope, but with red flames of remorse; voices from the depths of Nature sounding, Woe, woe on him! Of such stuff are we all made; on such powder-mines of bottomless guilt and criminality—"if God restrained not," as is well said—does the purest of us walk? There are depths in man that go to the length of lowest Hell, as there are heights that reach highest Heaven—for are not both Heaven and Hell made out of him, made by him, everlasting miracle and mystery as he is?—Cited by W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 723

In the midst of the awful truth regarding the eternity of guilt and its consequences, no small comfort is accorded those who embrace that inexhaustible, immutable, and perfect salvation which the substitutionary work of Christ affords. Not only is there "peace with God" through our Lord Jesus Christ and a perfect relationship secured which is no less than a justification which God accomplishes to His own satisfaction, but He will remember against the saved one no more those sins with their guilt which He has taken on His own breast in the Person of His Son. Thus by forgiveness and justification even the historical aspect of guilt is relieved beyond comprehension for those who believe.

IX. Universality

That the entire race, except One, have been, and are, sinners by practice is the teaching of the Bible and is confirmed by every candid observation. Richard Watson cites five striking proofs of the universality of human sin. These are as headings in the extended discussion which he offers in his *Institutes* (II, 61–66).

> 1. That in all ages great, and even general wickedness has prevailed among those large masses of men which are called *nations.*
>
> 2. The second fact to be accounted for is, the strength of that tendency to the wickedness which we have seen to be general.
>
> 3. The third fact is, that the seeds of the vices which exist in society may be discovered in children in their earliest years; selfishness, envy, pride, resentment, deceit, lying, and often cruelty; and so much is this the case, so explicitly is this acknowledged by all, that it is the principal object of the moral branch of education to restrain and correct those evils, both by coercion, and by diligently impressing upon children, as their faculties open, the evil and mischief of all such affections and tendencies.
>
> 4. The fourth fact is, that every man is conscious of a natural tendency to many evils.
>
> 5. The fifth fact is, that, even after a serious wish and intention has been formed in men to renounce these views, and "to live righteously, soberly, and godly," as becomes creatures made to glorify God, and on their trial for eternity, strong and constant resistance is made by the passions, appetites, and inclinations of the heart at every step of the attempt.

The Scriptures bear an uncomplicated testimony to the sinfulness of man; even the sins of those who wrote the Bible are exposed. The Old Testament declares: "For there is no man that sinneth not" (1 Kings 8:46); "For in thy sight shall no man living be justified" (Ps. 143:2); "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" (Prov. 20:9); "For there is not a just man on the earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not" (Eccl.

7:20). With the same end in view, the New Testament is even more emphatic. The universal practice of sin is presupposed by Christ (cf. Matt. 4:17; Mark 1:15; 6:12; Luke 24:47; John 3:3–5). The preaching of the gospel is itself an implication that salvation is needed by all. Apart from redemption, man is wrong in the sight of God. Those who fail to receive the saving grace of God are in every instance condemned. The very universality of Christ's death indicates the truth that God sees a lost world of men for whom He gave His Son (2 Cor. 5:14–15). Many direct statements appear in the New Testament. A few only need be quoted: "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (Rom. 3:9); "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:19–20); "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23); "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" (Gal. 3:22); "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1 John 1:10).

The experience of personal sin is so closely related to the fact of the sin nature that any discussion of the one involves the other. Men have sought to modify the teachings of the Bible on the sinfulness of sin, and they have denied the doctrine of the sin nature; but none from the earliest of heathen philosophers to the leaders of modern thought have denied the universality of sin.

The truth relative to personal sin, though extended, is but a portion of the whole doctrine of sin; therefore this discussion advances to the transmitted sin nature.

Chapter XIX

The Transmitted Sin Nature

As every effect must have its cause, there is a cause or reason for the fact that personal sin is universal. That cause is the sin nature—sometimes styled the *Adamic nature*, *inborn sin*, *original sin*, or the *old man.* By whatever term it is indicated, the reference is to a reality which originated with Adam and has been transmitted from Adam to all his race. The effect of the first sin upon unfallen Adam was a degeneration—a conversion downwards. As an immediate result of that first sin, Adam became a different kind of being from that which God had created, and the law of generation obtained, which sees to it that reproduction by any living thing will be "after its kind." Of the Adamic nature which Adam gained by disobedience, John Calvin writes in his *Institutes*, II. 2:12: "Since God is the author of nature, how comes it that no blame attaches to God if we are lost by nature? I answer, there is a twofold nature: The one produced by God, and the other is corruption of it. We are not born such as Adam was at first created" (cited by W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 196). Adam's experience was unique beyond all other members of his race—save One. Adam became a sinner by sinning. Every other member of the race—save One—sins because he is a sinner by birth. In Adam's case a personal sin caused the sin nature; in the case of all other human beings—save One—the sin nature causes personal sins. The fact that sinners sin should create no surprise; and while this truth does not mitigate the sinfulness of personal sin, it is clear that God fully anticipates that where the root is evil the fruit will be evil also. Where the fountain is bitter the water will be bitter also. The divine reasonableness proposes to deal with the root that is evil and the fountain that is bitter. At once, when this aspect of truth is approached, deep and far-reaching problems—more or less metaphysical—are encountered. Nothing could be more useless than are those systems which propose to deal with sin's manifestations and not at all with the cause. It is the folly of treating symptoms without any effort to identify and correct the cause. In the *Expositor* (I–IX, 21), Dr. George Matheson says, "There is the same difference between the Christian and Pagan idea of prayer as there is

between the Christian and Pagan idea of sin. Paganism knows nothing of sin, it knows only sins; it has no conception of the principle of evil, it comprehends only a succession of sinful acts" (cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas in *The Principles of Theology*, p. 161). Another folly may be identified in the rationalistic notion that the Adamic nature may be eradicated through some so-called *second work of grace.* As is always the case, normal experience runs true to sound Biblical doctrine. Not only does the Bible lend no sanction to this eradication idea, but human experience contradicts it without exception. As Dr. Müller well says concerning a similar error, "This theory does not explain the real facts of our moral life and consciousness; it gives them the lie, and the facts avenge themselves by taking no notice of the theory" (*The Christian Doctrine of Sin,* I, 30). This phase of this general theme pertains wholly to the Christian life and experience and will be resumed under a subsequent division of this study. In fact, nothing belongs to this division—as it concerns the unregenerate—other than the general proofs which establish the truth regarding the sin nature as a vital part of every unregenerate person.

Since the sin of Adam merited the penalty of death, attention is again directed to that penalty in its three forms. Apart from revelation, men gain vague notions about the experience termed *death.* Revelation alone explains its origin, present universal sway, and its future termination. Death is an intruder into God's creation. As created, man was as immortal as the angels. The history is plainly written. God said to Adam concerning the forbidden fruit, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, 'dying thou shalt die.'" The death thus promised and afterwards executed in judgment, embraced spiritual death, which is the separation of soul and spirit from God; second death, which is the permanent form of spiritual death or eternal separation of soul and spirit from God; and physical death, which is the separation of soul and spirit from the body. Upon his repudiation of God by disobedience, Adam came at once into the experience of spiritual death. He was doomed to the second death, except he should be redeemed, and then he began the process of physical death, which process in due time came to its full completion.

As physical death is related to imputed sin (yet to be examined), spiritual death is related to the transmitted sin nature. This nature manifests itself along two lines—inclination to evil, by which it is usually identified; and depravity, which is the inability to do good in the manner which is pleasing

to God. Spiritual death is evidenced in both of these features, though, since death is so universally associated with cessation, it is perhaps easier to relate spiritual death with the incapacity to do good than to associate it with the inclination to evil. The truth to be stressed by which much confusion may be clarified is that spiritual death is not the cessation of any form of life. It is rather life to its full measure as separate from God. The state of spiritual death is well described with its activities in Ephesians 2:1–3: “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others” and Ephesians 4:18–19: “Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.”

Spiritual death and the sin nature are alike, then, in these respects that each manifests life in separation from the knowledge of God, from the life of God, from the power of God, and from the benefits of His grace. Spiritual death is a state. The sin nature is fallen man attempting to live in that state.

It remains to be seen that both spiritual death and the sin nature are transmitted *mediately* from parent to child in all generations. There is no apparent diminishing of the force and character of this perverted life. The last child born into the race is as affected with spiritual death and as saturated with the sin nature as was Cain who received his evil tendency immediately from his father, Adam.

I. The Fact of the Sin Nature

In seeking to analyze more specifically what the sin nature is, it should be remembered that it is a perversion of God’s original creation and in that sense is an abnormal thing. Every faculty of man is injured by the fall, and the disability to do good and the strange predisposition to evil arise from that inner confusion.

Dr. W. G. T. Shedd has written at length on the injury to the original man by sin and the peculiar characteristics of the sin nature. He asserts:

> Viewed as natural corruption, original sin may be considered with respect to the *understanding*. (*a*) It is blindness. Is. 42:7, "A light to open blind eyes." Luke 4:18, "Recovering of sight to the blind." Rev. 3:17, "Knowest not that thou art blind." 2 Cor. 4:4, "The god of this world hath blinded their minds." All texts that speak of regeneration as "enlightening." 2 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 5:14; 1 Thess. 5:5; Ps. 97:11, etc. All texts that call sin "darkness." Prov. 4:19; Is. 60:2; Eph. 5:11; Col. 1:13; 1 John 2:11; 1 Thess. 5:4; Eph. 4:18, "Having the understanding darkened;" Rom. 1:28, "Reprobate mind." Sin blinds and darkens the understanding, by destroying the *consciousness* of divine things. For example, the soul destitute of love to God is no longer conscious of love; of reverence, is no longer conscious of reverence, etc. Its knowledge of such affections, therefore, is from hearsay, like that which a blind man has of colors, or a deaf man of sound. God, the object of these affections, is of course unknown for the same reason. The spiritual discernment, spoken of in 1 Cor. 2:6, is the immediate consciousness of a renewed man. It is experimental knowledge. Sin is described in Scripture as voluntary ignorance. "This they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old," 2 Pet. 3:5. Christ says to the Jews: "If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin:" the sin, namely, of "not knowing him that sent me," John 15:21, 22. But the ignorance, in this case, was a willing ignorance. They desired to be ignorant.
>
> Another effect of original sin upon the understanding as including the conscience is: (*b*) Insensibility. It does not render conscience extinct, but it stupefies it. 1 Tim. 4:2, "having cauterized their own conscience." (*c*) Pollution. Titus 1:15, "Even their reason and conscience are polluted," or stained. Rom. 1:21, "They became vain in their reasonings," or speculations. The pollution of reason is seen in the foolish speculations of mythology. The myths of polytheism are not pure reason. The pollution of conscience is seen in remorse. The testifying faculty is spotted with guilt. It is no longer a "good conscience:" spoken of in Heb. 13:18; 1 Pet. 3:16, 21; 1 Tim. 1:5, 19; Acts 23:1; nor a "pure conscience:" mentioned in 1 Tim. 3:9. It is an "evil conscience": a conscience needing cleansing by atoning blood "from dead works," Heb. 9:14. Dead works, being no fulfilment of the law, leave the conscience perturbed and unpacified.
>
> Considered with respect to the *will*, original sin is: (*a*) Enmity. Rom. 8:6; James 4:4, "The friendship of the world is enmity towards God;" Deut. 1:26, "They rebelled against God;" Job 34:37; Is. 1:1; 30:9; 45:2; Ezek. 12:2. (*b*) Hatred. Rom. 1:29; Ps. 89:23; 139:21; Ex. 20:5; Prov. 1:25; 5:12; John 7:7; 15:18, 23, 24. (*c*) Hardness of heart, or insensibility. Ex. 7:14, 22; 2 Kings 17:14; Job 9:4; Is. 63:17; Dan. 5:20; John 12:20; Acts 19:9; Heb. 3:8, 15; 4:7. (*d*) Aversion. John 5:40, "Ye will not," ye are disinclined; Rev. 2:21. (*e*) Obstinacy. Deut. 31:27, "stiff-necked;" Ex. 32:9; Ps. 75:5; Is. 26:10; 43:4; Acts 7:51; Rom. 10:21. (*f*) Bondage. Jer. 13:23; Mark 3:23; John 6:43, 44; 8:34; Rom. 5:6; 6:20; 7:9, 14, 18, 23; 8:7, 8; 9:16; 2 Pet. 2:14.—*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 196–98

Following this exhaustive statement regarding the condition of the understanding and will as influenced by the fallen nature, Dr. Shedd writes with equal force on the question of the fallen nature and its guilt. This issue which has so divided the two major schools—Calvinists and Arminians—is

not only clearly stated by Dr. Shedd in defense of the Calvinistic view, but that which he has written serves to expose the shallow rationalism which the Arminian notion presents. Dr. Shedd declares:

> Original sin, considered as corruption of nature, is sin in the sense of *guilt*. … "Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and made subject to death, temporal and eternal." Westminster Confession, VI.vi. "Corruption of nature doth remain in those that are regenerated, and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin." Westminster Confession, VI.v. The Semi-Pelagian, Papal, and Arminian anthropologies differ from the Augustinian and Reformed, by denying that corruption of nature is guilt. It is a physical and mental disorder leading to sin, but is not sin itself.
>
> Corruption of nature is guilt because: (*a*) The scriptures do not distinguish between sin proper, and improper. 'Αμαρτία, as denoting the principle of sin, is exchanged with παράπτωμα, denoting the act of sin, and vice versa. Rom. 5:13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21. (*b*) 'Αμαρτία is the equivalent of ἐπιθυμία and σάρξ. Rom. 7:7, "I had not known sin, except the law had said, Thou shalt not lust." Rom. 8:3, 5. (*c*) The remainders of corruption in the regenerate are hated as sin by the regenerate himself, Rom. 7:15; and by God, who slays them by his Spirit, Rom. 8:13. (*d*) Evil desire is forbidden in the tenth commandment, Ex. 20:17. Compare 1 John 2:16. The tenth commandment … prohibits that internal lusting which is the chief characteristic of the corrupt nature. It is also forbidden by Christ in his exposition of the seventh commandment. Matt. 5:28. 1 John 3:15, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." (*e*) Corruption of nature is guilt, because it is the inclination of the will. It is "voluntary" though not "volitionary." It is conceded that the inclination to murder is as truly culpable as the act of murder. "The thought of foolishness is sin," Prov. 24:9. (*f*) Corruption of nature is guilt, upon the principle that the cause must have the same predicates as its effects. If actual transgressions are truly and properly sin, then the evil heart or inclination which prompts them must be so likewise. If the stream is bitter water, the fountain must be also. If the murderer's act is guilt, then the murderer's hate is. (*g*) If corruption of nature, or sinful disposition is not guilt, then it is an extenuation and excuse for actual transgressions. These latter are less blameworthy, if the character which prompts them and renders their avoidance more difficult is not self-determined and culpable. (*h*) If corruption of nature is not culpable, it is impossible to assign a reason why the dying infant needs redemption by atoning blood. Christ came "by water and blood;" that is, with both expiating and sanctifying power. 1 John 5:6. But if there be no guilt in natural depravity, Christ comes to the infant "by water only," and not "by blood;" by sanctification, and not by justification. Infant redemption implies that the infant has guilt as well as pollution. The infant has a rational soul; this soul has a will; this will is inclined; this inclination, like that of an adult, is centred on the creature instead of the Creator. This is culpable, and needs pardon. It is also pollution, and needs removal. (*i*) God forgives orginal sin as well as actual transgression, when he bestows the "remission of sins." The "carnal mind," or the enmity of the heart is as great an offence against his excellence and honor, as any particular act that issues from it. Indeed, if there be mutual good-will between two parties an occasional outward offence is less serious. "Suppose," says Thirlwall (*Letters*, p. 46), "two friends really loving one another, but liable now and then to quarrel. They may easily forgive the occasional offence, because their habitual disposition is one of mutual good-will; but should the case be the

> reverse—hatred stifled, but occasionally venting itself by unfriendly acts—how little would it matter though they should forget the particular offence, if the enmity should continue at the bottom of the heart." This illustrates the guilt of sin as a state of the heart towards God, and the need of its forgiveness and removal.—*Ibid.*, II, 198–200

Defining the sin nature, Melanchthon wrote that it is "the present disturbed constitution of our nature" (*Apologia*, Art. i, pp. 51, 53, cited by Müller, *op. cit.*, II, 268). Comparing fallen man with the animals, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (*Op. cit.*, p. 157) states, "The certainty and consciousness of this in man is a characteristic of him in relation to other animals, for of none else can it be said that they are out of harmony with the law of their nature."

Were it not for a secondary meaning of the word *nature*, it would not be a proper designation as it is now being used. A nature, primarily, is a thing created by God, such as the unfallen human nature which reflected the image and likeness of God. In its secondary meaning, the term *nature* designates the perversion, with its unholy dispositions, which the fall engendered.

Concerning the general unwisdom of discursion respecting the mere metaphysical aspects of the fallen nature, Dr. James Denney says, "It is a mistake, in all probability, in discussing this subject, to enter into metaphysical considerations at all; the question of man's inability to any spiritual good accompanying salvation is a question as to matter of fact, and is to be answered ultimately by an appeal to experience. When a man has been discovered, who has been able, *without Christ*, to reconcile himself to God, and to obtain dominion over the world and over sin, *then* the doctrine of inability, or of the bondage due to sin, may be denied; *then*, but *not till then" (Studies in Theology*, p. 85, cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas, *ibid.*, p. 164). And, having this same nature in mind under the term *depravity*, Dr. Denney points out, also, the important truth that the nature of fallen man is a unity and every part is injured equally. He states, "What it means is not that every individual is as bad as he can be, a statement so transparently absurd that it should hardly have been attributed to any one, but that the depravity which sin has produced in human nature extends to the whole of it. There is no part of man's nature which is unaffected by it. Man's nature is all of a piece, and that which affects it at all affects it altogether. When the conscience is violated by disobedience to the will of God, the moral

understanding is darkened, and the will is enfeebled. We are not constructed in water-tight compartments, one of which might be ruined while the others remain intact; what touches us for harm, with a corrupting, depraving touch, at a single point, has effects throughout our nature none the less real that they may be for a time beneath consciousness" (*Ibid.*, p. 83, cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas, *ibid.*, p. 165).

Added to those passages which have been cited earlier in proof of the universality of personal sin—most of which applies as fully to the sin nature—are uncounted passages which speak of moral evil as a characteristic, or distinguishing mark, not of individual or classes of men in certain localities, but of human nature as it is under all circumstances— excepting only those who are regenerate, of whom specific facts are revealed bearing on that nature. The unregenerate man is styled the *natural* man; certainly not natural in the sense that he reflects his original unfallen state, but natural, or soulish, in the sense that he, being perverted in all his ways, is true to the fallen racial condition which is ever the same. Only illustrative passages need be cited. These will serve to represent what is the invariable witness of the Bible concerning the estate of fallen man in the sight of God.

Genesis 8:21. "And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done." Strangely, this direct and conclusive estimation of fallen man is uttered by Jehovah in the midst of His promise of everlasting mercy. This evil state to which Jehovah refers, is not originated by each individual for himself; it was thus from the beginning.

Psalm 14:2–3. "The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one." This revealing passage is quoted by the Apostle in the midst of the extended indictment against the whole race which is recorded in Romans 3:9–19, and the Apostle's statement is of such importance that it too should be quoted in full: "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone

out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." While this and other passages name the various manifestations of the sin nature, they also imply the existence of that nature as the source of evil in man.

Psalm 51:5. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." Of all the Old Testament testimony, none is more convincing than this. In verse 3 David has confessed his great sin. In verse 4 he sees it as a sin against God alone, regardless of the fact that he had committed so great a crime against certain individuals and outraged the whole kingdom of Israel. Compared to this, however, in verse 6 he states that which is well-pleasing to God.

Jeremiah 17:5, 9. "Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD. The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" The divine estimation of fallen and degenerate man could hardly be spoken more clearly. In the one passage the declaration is made that man is, in character, opposite to Jehovah. In no sense is dependence to be placed on man. In the other passage, it is directly said that man is not moderately evil. As Jehovah sees him, he is "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." It is also indicated that, with all his vanity and baseless conceit, man does not know the truth respecting himself.

John 3:6. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." What Dr. Julius Müller has written as a comment on this passage is worthy of reprint. He says:

> As to the New Testament, with the older theologians and with some of our modern divines, John 3:6 has been regarded as the standard authority for the doctrine of man's inborn sinfulness: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Taken in connection with what precedes, this declaration of Christ clearly proves the fact of corruption attaching to human nature, seeing that He makes participation in His

> kingdom dependent upon a thorough renewal, wrought by the Holy Spirit. This universal necessity for a new birth (see John 3:3, 5, 1:12, 13; Tit. 3:5; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:3, 23), this beginning and development of a new life, implies not only that sin is already present in every human being, but that it has struck its roots deep into the nature which man inherits from his birth. In like manner, the Apostle Paul regards renewal in Christ Jesus as a universal law of human life, and describes it as the "putting off," or "death" of "the old man," Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:9, compare v. 3; Rom. 6:3–6. Attempted explanations of these passages, which really explain nothing—*e.g.*, that the old man is "the power of vice, confirmed by habit,"—do not require refutation.—*Op. cit.*, II, 276

Romans 1:18–8:13. In this context—too extensive for quotation—as is fitting in view of the truth that this epistle presents the central revelation concerning salvation from the sin nature as well as from personal sin, the corruption of the whole race is pictured more fully than elsewhere in the Bible. The passage should be weighed with this consideration in view.

1 Corinthians 7:14. Special attention is given to this text—partly because it contributes much to this general line of proof, and partly because it is but seldom employed in this connection. The passage reads, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the [believing] wife, and the unbelieving wife sanctified by the [believing] husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." The uncleanness mentioned is clearly the state at birth of every child except for the influence of even one Christian parent. The Christian parent does not remove the sin nature from the child, but the child is *set apart* as different by the Christian parent. If, however, the parent cannot remove the sanctified child's fallen nature, how certainly those who are unclean are under the power of that nature!

Ephesians 2:3. "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Direct and conclusive testimony is not wanting in this Scripture. It is a matter of *nature* which classifies the whole human family as "children of wrath"—as all are apart from the redeeming grace of God.

Galatians 5:17–21. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings,

murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." The Apostle here defines the works of the *flesh.* This term and its meaning have been developed previously at some length and must yet reappear under other aspects of doctrine. The ethical meaning of σάρξ, as used by the Apostle, carries it back to human nature and to its corruption. The works of the flesh are here set forth in contrast to the "fruit of the Spirit" (cf. vs. 18 with vs. 22). The works of the flesh have nothing to commend them. The conclusion of the matter is that man is by nature, as Jeremiah states, "desperately wicked."

Additional Scriptures bearing on man's fallen nature, which should be examined, are: Genesis 6:5; Job 11:12; 15:14, 16; Psalm 58:2–5; 94:11; 130:3; 143:2; Proverbs 21:8; Ecclesiastes 7:20; 9:3; Isaiah 64:6; Jeremiah 13:23; 16:12; Hosea 6:7; Matthew 7:11; 12:34; 15:19; 16:23; Luke 1:79; John 3:18–19; 8:23; 14:17; Romans 3:9; 6:20; 1 Corinthians 2:14; 3:3; Galatians 3:22; Colossians 1:13, 21; 2:13; 3:5–7; 2 Timothy 3:2; 1 Peter 1:18; 4:2; 2 Peter 1:4; 1 John 1:8; 2:16; 5:19.

II. The Remedy for the Sin Nature

Contemplation of the remedy for the sin nature at once involves issues wholly within that field of truth which belongs to the Christian and must, properly, be reserved for that division of this theme. The unregenerate may be told that upon becoming regenerate they will be accorded a twofold provision whereby the sin nature may be divinely dealt with. They may look on to such an experience the same as they may anticipate forgiveness and justification, though, since all that enters into the remedy for the sin nature so relates only to the problems of the Christian's daily life, the divine dealing with the sin nature is not at any time included in the offers which the gospel of the grace of God extends to the unsaved. On the other hand, the sin nature enters largely into the need of salvation which is represented by all the unsaved. No more misleading message can be given by sincere men than when the unsaved are told that they are lost because of their personal sins. To this they might reply that, since they had never been even one per cent as sinful as they might have been, they are only one per cent lost. Such reasoning naturally follows that form of preaching which bases

man's lost estate on the personal sins committed. Man is lost by *nature*—born a lost soul, with no hope apart from the redeeming blood of Christ. A much more weighty appeal is made when the need of salvation is made to reach to the root of all the evil ever wrought. The twofold remedy is (a) the judgment for believers of the sin nature by Christ on the cross, and (b) the gift of the indwelling Spirit as One who is able to give victory over every evil disposition. God has judged the sin nature for believers, else it could not be said, as it is, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1).

In conclusion it may be restated that at the beginning God declared concerning man that he was "very good," but after fifteen hundred years of human history, Jehovah said of man "that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5), and more than two thousand years later He said, "They are all under sin … there is none righteous, no, not one … there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Rom. 3:9–12). This contrast is as strong as language can make it. Theologians have differed on certain phases of the doctrine of sin, but there is a notable agreement among them concerning the universality of sin. This agreement may be accounted for on the basis of the fact that the Word of God is exceedingly clear in its testimony with respect to the sinfulness of man, and, also, on the fact that human observation so fully corroborates the Scriptures. The doctrine of depravity is often rejected through misunderstanding. This doctrine does not imply that there is no good to be seen in men as men observe each other; it rather asserts that, because of the fallen nature, God sees nothing in them which commends them to Himself. They are only objects of His grace. It is significant that the drastic indictments against the whole race which appear in the New Testament are quotations from the Old Testament, thus demonstrating that the Bible is a unit in its testimony on the doctrine of depravity. There are special privileges and covenants which are extended to the Jew, but, in the matter of sin and a divinely provided remedy, "there is no difference." As Dr. Timothy Dwight states, when writing of the universality of sin, "In truth, no doctrine of the Scriptures is expressed in more numerous, or more various, forms; or in terms more direct, or less capable of misapprehension" (*Theology*, Sermon 29). Added to this, it may be observed that the fact of universal human sinfulness and depravity is implied in the provision of a sacrifice for sin whether typical or

antitypical; in the Bible's emphasis upon the universal need of regeneration; in the disclosure that the human body is injured and, in the case of the saved, will yet be redeemed; and in the fact that "God … now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30).

From the original sin, as a fontal cause, far-reaching, universal results have been realized by Adam's posterity. The doctrine of original sin divides into two branches of truth which are, notably, quite unrelated other than that they proceed from the same source. One branch has to do with original corruption, which is spiritual death, while the other has to do with original guilt, with its penalty of physical death. Though the term *original sin* is more frequently used in reference to the former, it is, also, as properly a designation of the latter. The first division of the doctrine of original sin, which is original corruption, or spiritual death, contends that the whole race has inherited from its first progenitor a vitiated nature which is ever and incurably at enmity with God, being, in His sight, wholly depraved and spiritually dead, and is the root from which, as fruit, evil thoughts, words, and actions spring. The doctrine contends that Adam is the first and only member of the race who has become a sinner by sinning; all other members from the first to the last are born sinners and sin, not to *become* sinners, but because they *are* sinners. They do not die spiritually by sinning, but are born spiritually dead. The doctrine contends, likewise, that this fact of corruption in nature and spiritual death is the first and all-important ground of divine judgment upon the race; and that evil works, as wicked as they may be, are but the reasonable manifestation of that corrupt nature. Similarly, apart from the fact of the corrupt nature, it is impossible to demonstrate to the lost the need of the full saving grace of God. On the other hand, the full saving grace of God is needed in the salvation of the lost because of the fact that the whole being of man is depraved and spiritually dead. It is beside the point to argue that man is not to blame for the nature received by birth. Though born in poverty and ignorance, the individual is justified in doing what may be done to correct these limitations; but how much more is one justified in claiming God's relief from the lost estate in which he is born when it is remembered that God, in infinite love and at infinite cost, has provided that relief!

With various theories concerning man's lost estate this study, for want of space, cannot be concerned. The fact that a fallen nature received *mediately*

from Adam (a) is established by the Scriptures, (b) is observable in all history, and (c) is witnessed to by the consciousness of man, should terminate all argument. These evidences may be considered in their reverse order:

(a) Human consciousness of an evil nature or disposition is practically universal, extending to the earliest records of human experience. Aristotle declared, “There appears another something besides the reason natural to us which fights and struggles against the reason.” Kant said, “ ‘That the world lieth in wickedness,’ is a lament as old as history, nay, as old as the oldest poetry.” The Apostle Paul witnessed of himself, “The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.” Such, indeed, is the consciousness of all thoughtful men relative to themselves.

(b) The record of history which demonstrates the evil nature of man is inexhaustible. “Man’s inhumanity to man,” war, inquisition, murder, prostitution, slavery, drunkenness, cruelty, falsehood, avarice, covetousness, pride, unbelief, and hatred of God, all, and very much more, have their share in the history of the race.

(c) To those who are subject to God’s Word, the Scriptures are explicit and a final authority. The testimony of the Scriptures has been cited above.

Chapter XX

IMPUTED SIN

THE THEOLOGICAL meaning of the word *impute* is 'to attribute or reckon over something to a person.' It is usually vicarious in the sense that the thing attributed is derived from another. The nature of imputation is to be seen in the Apostle's word to Philemon concerning Onesimus, "If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account" (Philemon 1:17–18). Similarly, the same Apostle writes of the Gentiles, "Shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?" Two original words appear in the New Testament text which carry the idea of imputation— ἐλλογέω, used but twice (Rom. 5:13; Philemon 1:18), and λογίζομαι, used 41 times, 16 of which are in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Though a broad field in the selection of words is observable in the Authorized Version translation, the essential thought of imputation is always present. In the matter of man's relation to God, the Bible presents three major imputations: (a) imputation of the Adamic sin to the human race, (b) imputation of the sin of man to the Substitute, Christ, and (c) an imputation of the righteousness of God to the believer. Imputation may be either *real* or *judicial*. That which is real is the reckoning to one of that which is antecedently his, while judicial imputation is the reckoning to one of that which is not antecedently his. Had the trespass mentioned in 2 Corinthians 5:19 been imputed to those mentioned—as naturally it would have been—it would have been a real imputation. The trespasses were their own and the reckoning of those trespasses to them would have been no more than an official declaration of their accountability. Over against this, when the Apostle said "Put that to my account," he referred to a debt that was not antecedently his own.

An immature judgment will usually conclude that each of the major imputations, listed above, is judicial in character. Such unconsidered estimation of truth has characterized certain schools of theology, from which schools much misleading doctrine has arisen. It is not germane to the present theme of imputed sin to dwell upon the other two major imputations —except it be by way of illustration of the principle involved. Those imputations belong to Soteriology. It will be seen, however, that the

imputation of human sin to Christ is, since it could not be under any circumstances His own, a clear instance of judicial imputation. Likewise, the imputation of the righteousness of God to the believer, while it provides a ground so equitable that God is said to be *just* when He justifies those who believe on Christ, does not bestow upon the believer anything which is antecedently his own. This imputation is also easily identified as being *judicial* in character. However, in the case of the imputation of Adam's initial sin to each member of his race (Christ excepted in all such reckonings), there is a wide difference of opinion on the part of various schools of doctrine. The general theme of imputed sin is subject to subdivisions: (a) the scope of the doctrine of imputation, (b) theories of imputation, and (c) the divine remedy for imputed sin.

I. The Scope of the Doctrine of Imputation

The scope of the doctrine of imputation controversy centers upon the one most theological context in the Bible—Romans 5:12–21. This context is, in the main, an elucidation of the primary declaration set forth in verse 12. It therefore follows that any interpretation of verse 12 which is not harmoniously unfolded in verses 13 to 21 is proved by so much to be wrong. The worthy student of theology will spend much time on this portion of the Scriptures. It will not do to accept merely the findings of the best of men, but painstaking exegetical effort must be bestowed. Writing on this very point, Stearns, in his *Present Day Theology* (p. 321), suggests: "If you wish to know whether a man is a theologian, turn to his Greek Testament, and if it opens of its own accord to the fifth chapter of Romans, and you find the page worn and brown, you may safely set him down as a devotee of the sacred science" (cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas in *Principles of Theology*, p. 163). Upon this passage the greatest minds have been focused and to the best purpose. A rationalistic interpretation is dangerous here, as always. The question at issue is one of revelation, and that alone.

In further preparation for a right exegesis of Romans 5:12, it is important to observe that the one initial sin of Adam—properly styled *the original sin*, so far as humanity is concerned—is the main subject under discussion. As before stated, the original sin of Adam is the fontal source from which two widely different lines of influence proceed. The previous thesis has dealt

with the transmitted sin nature which is received *mediately* from generation to generation, which nature is so closely allied to spiritual death. The present objective is to trace the other line of influence arising from Adam's initial sin, which line is that of imputed sin and is the only reason assigned in the Word of God for the imposition upon the race of physical death. The first line of inference mentioned has to do with *corruption*, while the second, now in view, has to do with *guilt.* Added to the revelation that guilt is the portion of all, is the truth that the penalty—physical death—is imposed on each member of the race *immediately*, that is, directly from Adam to each individual without reference to intermediate generations. It is as though but two persons existed—Adam and any particular member of the race. To use a modern figure of speech, each human being stands related to Adam immediately and individually as by a *private wire.* A diagram may be drawn consisting of two lines starting downward from one point, which point may represent the Adamic sin. One of these lines is an arc bending to the right and the other an arc bending to the left and both converging again at one point, which point may represent the individual human being of any time or place as this twofold effect of Adam's sin reaches to every member of the human race. One line may be made to represent the Adamic nature—akin to spiritual death—which reaches the individual *mediately*, or by transmission from parent to child. This line may be divided in many sections which will suggest intervening generations between Adam and the individual person. The other line may be made to represent imputed Adamic sin which reaches the same individual *immediately*, or directly from Adam without recognition of intermediate generations. Though this personal relationship with Adam is shared by all in every generation, the isolated individual character of it is not lessened or confused in any instance. The Bible's answer to the question why each person is subject to physical death is that each one had his share in the sin that injured Adam himself and caused him to die physically, and they share the penalty, also. Physical death is not an inheritance, much less an infection which parents pass on to their children. It is a penalty for that form of impersonal, unconscious joint action with Adam in his disobedience.

Great confusion has resulted when the Adamic nature and its corruption is confounded with the idea of individual guilt and its punishment due to participation in that sin. It is not forgotten that the sin nature does engender

a form of guilt, but it is that which arises from a *state* of being while the guilt of the participation is due to *action.* Some writers who have entered into this difficult field of doctrine have taught, with attending disarrangement of vital truth, that the sin nature is the cause of physical death. The Scriptures lend little sanction to that impression.

Spiritual death is implied in Romans 5:12–21 (yet to be attended), but beginning with Romans 6:1, where the sin nature is seen to be in conflict with spiritual living and sanctification, spiritual death is altogether in view. Naturally, the sin nature and spiritual death are closely related here as always. To bear fruit unto that nature is to be in the way, or on the side, of spiritual death, whereas to be empowered unto good by the Spirit is to be in the way, or on the side, of life and peace (cf. Rom. 6:16, 21, 23; 7:5; 8:2, 6, 13). Of the hundreds of references in the Bible to death, but the merest fraction concern spiritual death. So great is the preponderance of texts which relate to physical death that multitudes of people are not aware of the truth as pertains to spiritual death. The central passage bearing upon physical death—which passage is intensely theological—is Romans 5:12–21.

This context, as has been noted, consists in a primary declaration, restricted to verse 12, while all that remains—verses 13 to 21—is explanatory. It is therefore reasonable that consideration be given first to the precise meaning of verse 12. Every school of theology which attends at all upon the Scriptures seeks by its own interpretation of this passage to justify its claims, or beliefs, concerning the reality of sin and death as well as of righteousness and life. Few portions of the Bible have endured a more varied treatment. It is probable that some degree of truth will be found in each attempted interpretation, and there may be some error in each; but the objective in every case is to eliminate the error and establish the truth.

The setting of this passage (5:12–21) is an important factor in the right evaluation of it. Preceding is the portion (3:21–5:11) with its message of justification by faith, and following is the portion (6:1–8:13) with its message of sanctification by faith. Both justification and sanctification are said to be based on the death of Christ. The intermediate portion, now being considered, is a consummation of that which goes before and a preparation for that which follows. In this passage the dark picture of sin and of its penalty, death, is presented in contrast to the marvelous glories of

righteousness and life. The two federal headships—that of Adam and that of Christ—are set side by side in their similarities and dissimilarities. The first Adam wrought the ruin of his race; the Last Adam wrought the eternal salvation and glory of His people. In the parallels in which these similarities and dissimilarities appear, there are many details. These, though of immeasurable importance, do not at any point change, but rather strengthen, the central theme, namely, what was lost in the first Adam is more than regained for those who receive the saving grace of the Last Adam. Many exceedingly valuable works, both expository and exegetical, are extant. Only a brief investigation of this passage is possible here.

Verse 12. Demonstrating that it is a consummation of the preceding section on justification (3:21–5:11), this portion opens with the connecting word *wherefore.* The thought is that, since the facts about justification are what they are, it follows that certain conclusions and added truths are in sequence. On the vital connection between these divisions of Scripture as implied in the word *wherefore,* Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas has written:

> The close connection of this section with that which immediately precedes it must be carefully noted. The first word "Wherefore" is literally "on this account," showing that the thought remains unbroken. Justification has been shown to be permanent (vers. 1–11), and the fundamental proof and guarantee of this is God Himself in Whom we boast (ver. 11). This primary reason is now elaborated in the section before us by pointing out that as man's connection with Adam involved him in certain death through sin, so his relation to Christ insures to him life without fail. Thus, these verses give us the logical centre of the Epistle. They are the great central point to which everything that precedes has converged, and out of which everything that follows will flow. The great ideas of Sin, Death, and Judgment are here shown to be involved in the connection of the human race with Adam, but over against this we have the blessed fact of a union with Christ, and in this union righteousness and life. This double headship of mankind in Adam and Christ shows the significance of the work of redemption for the entire race.—*St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* I, 202

The second word, *as,* is no less important since it indicates the first of a series of contrasts, which contrasts characterize this portion of the Scriptures. The two members of this comparison are justification through One Man over against ruin through one man. The *as* connects that which has gone before with the idea of sin entering by one man. It may be paraphrased: Wherefore as the case of justification is, being by one man, so the case of ruin is, being by one man. Such, indeed, is the substance of the more detailed argument which follows in the context.

The words, “as by one man sin entered into the world,” imply that sin had already had its manifestation in other spheres and that the one man, Adam, became the avenue or open door by which it entered into the *cosmos* world. But more is added, since the text goes on to state, “and death by sin.” Though a close relation exists between spiritual death and physical death—they both begin with the one initial sin of the first man and converge alike on each individual of Adam’s race—the reference in verse 12 is to physical death. It is possible that some reference is made before the end of this context is reached to death on so broad a scale that it may include both of its forms; but the meaning of the word in the primary statement is of physical death. The universal character of physical death requires no defense. Thus the Scriptures declare, “It is appointed unto men once to die” (Heb. 9:27), and it is no different message when the Apostle states here, “And so death passed upon [spread through] all men, for that all have sinned.” Since the aorist tense is used in the last clause and thus a single, historical act completed in the past is indicated, the phrase “all have sinned” is better rendered *all sinned.* The effort of language at this point is to say that each member dies physically because of his own part in Adam’s sin. Since one complete, single, historical act is in view, the words *all sinned* cannot refer to a nature which results from that act, nor can it refer to personal sins of many individuals. It is not that man became sinful. The assertion is that *all* sinned at one time and under the same circumstances. In like manner, the penalty—*death*—is not for pollution, which would indicate spiritual death, but for guilt, or for participation in an act; and that indicates physical death. The statement is clear, the issue being that all had a part in Adam’s initial sin. A parallel passage in that grammatical construction is the same as found in Romans 3:23, which is translated, “For all have sinned,” but the same correction is indicated and it may be better rendered *all sinned.* Without warrant, this passage is almost universally interpreted to mean personal sin. *The International Revision Commentary,* edited by Dr. Philip Schaff, gives the following, “A single historical act is meant, namely, the past event of Adam’s fall, which was at the same time virtually the fall of the human race as represented by him and germinally contained in him. … As regards the interpretation of the words, it may be insisted that ‘sinned’ is not equivalent to ‘became sinful.’ There remain two views: (1) As a historical fact, when Adam sinned all sinned, because of the vital connection between him and

his posterity. (2) When Adam sinned, all were declared sinners, he being the representative of the race. The objection to this is, that 'sinned' is not equivalent to 'were regarded as sinners.' It makes the parallel between Adam and Christ more close than the passage thus far appears to warrant" (*Romans*, VI, 81–82). Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown in their *Commentary* (Zondervan Pub. House, 1934) state concerning this same phrase, "Thus death reaches every individual of the human family, as the penalty due to *himself*" (*in loc.*). The construction is so demanding that exegetes are largely of one mind. Strangely, however, Calvin missed the force of the passage when he restricted it to a matter of being born in sin. It should be emphasized, also, that but one interpretation will carry through the remaining explanatory context, and that, naturally, the required rendering of the primary statement of verse 12. An *actual* imputation of the Adamic sin is denoted by the right rendering of the text. Whether it can be explained or understood is quite aside from the fact that the words declare an actual imputation with its attending individual guilt and penalty of physical death.

Dr. Charles Hodge (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1854 ed., pp. 167–68) states:

> The doctrine of imputation is clearly taught in this passage. This doctrine does not include the idea of a mysterious identity of Adam and his race, nor that of a transfer of the moral turpitude of his sin to his descendants. It does not teach that his offence was personally or properly the sin of all men, or that his act was, in any mysterious sense, the act of his posterity. Neither does it imply, in reference to the righteousness of Christ, that his righteousness becomes personally and inherently ours, or that his moral excellence is in any way transferred from him to believers. The sin of Adam, therefore, is no ground to us of remorse; and the righteousness of Christ is no ground of self-complacency in those to whom it is imputed. This doctrine merely teaches that, in virtue of the union, representative and natural, between Adam and his posterity, his sin is the ground of their condemnation, that is, of their subjection to penal evils; and that, in virtue of the union between Christ and his people, his righteousness is the ground of their justification. This doctrine is taught almost in so many words. in ver. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. It is so clearly stated, so often repeated or assumed, and so formally proved, that very few commentators of any class fail to acknowledge, in one form or another, that it is the doctrine of the apostle.

This, for the most part, is an acceptable and illuminating declaration; however, the impression could be gained from Dr. Hodge that there is not an actual responsibility resting on each member of the race sufficient to warrant the penalty of death.

The difficulty arising in almost every mind regarding what seems to be the apparent message of this verse is the universal inability to comprehend what is properly involved in a federal-headship relationship. Such inability is most natural since no other such relationship exists in the sphere of human experience generally. Adam contained the race in himself in a manner which is not true of any succeeding progenitor in his line. No other man stood first in the generations of humanity nor did any other receive a divine commission to this unique responsibility. There is a less perfect headship to be seen in the case of Abraham as progenitor of the one race Israel—the reality is traced only in Jacob's line. Yet, again, there is a perfect headship in the resurrected Christ over the New Creation. All typology in Adam respecting Christ is built on the fact of the two perfect headships. Abraham, however important in his relation to Israel, does not appear in this typology. Nevertheless, the most illuminating Scripture bearing on the fact of federal headship concerns Abraham. The passage not only implies headship, but declares that, when but seminally represented in the federal head, the offspring is divinely reckoned as having acted in the federal head. Reference is made to Hebrews 7:9–10, which reads: "And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." Levi, who in his own lifetime by divine arrangement received tithes, notwithstanding, paid tithes to Melchizedek when in the loins of his great-grandfather Abraham (Gen. 14:20). None would claim that Levi consciously or purposefully paid tithes to Melchizedek, yet God declares that he did pay tithes. Such is the divine estimation. Likewise, none will claim that each individual in Adam's race consciously or purposefully sinned in Adam; yet there can be no doubt that God reckons that each member of the race sinned in Adam's transgression. In 1 Corinthians 15:22 this statement appears: "For as in Adam all die," and this implies the same federal coaction as is asserted in the words *all sinned.* In reality, God sees but two men and each member of the race is either *in* one or the other. The unregenerate are *in Adam;* the regenerate are *in Christ.* Such inability to understand the outworking of this line of truth arises from the incapacity to fathom all that is asserted when it is said that some of the human family are *in Adam* and some *in Christ.* The mind can grasp the specified results, but cannot discern the deep reality which enters into a federal-head relationship. In the further development of the context—

Romans 5:12–21—it will be seen that, as declared by Christ (John 14:20) and elucidated by the Apostle Paul, measureless blessings flow out to the believer on no other ground than that he is *in Christ*, and by so much the principle of the federal-headship imputation is established and is acknowledged by all. That injury and disaster—even death—are the portion of the natural man on no other ground than the position *in Adam*, should, in the interests of consistency, be as freely acknowledged by all. To the same end, and concerning the third major imputation—human sin to Christ—it is said that "if one died for all, then were all dead" (2 Cor. 5:14). The sinner's share in the death of the Substitute is thus counted as the sinner's own death for himself (here the student may note that, though translations are not always satisfactory, certain passages declare that the action of Christ in dying as a substitute is referred to as though it were the very action of the sinner himself—Rom. 6:2, *We who died to sin;* 6:6, *Our old man was crucified with Him;* Col. 3:3, *Ye died;* and Eph. 4:22, *Ye did put off;* cf. Col. 3:9).

The principle of imputation is thus seen to be one in which certain realities are reckoned from one to another. The story is complete as represented in the three major imputations. Man's need is indicated in the imputation from Adam to his posterity; man's salvation is secured in the imputation of man's demerit to Christ; and man's eternal standing and felicity are established through the imputation of the righteousness of God to man when he is placed in Christ by the baptism of the Spirit. If the imputation of Adam's sin to the race be resisted, consistency demands that both salvation and standing shall be resisted also.

It is conceded that there are slight differences to be noted in certain particulars when these three major imputations are compared. These are largely developed by the truth that two are *judicial* imputations and one is *real.* No sinner is ever said to have acted consciously or otherwise in the imputation which flows out of Christ's death, or in the imputation which secures the standing of a perfect righteousness, but it is declared that in Adam's sin all his posterity sinned. This particular feature, involving some degree of participation on the sinner's part, not found in the other two, but strengthens the reality of the Adamic imputation.

It may be deduced, then, that the words *all sinned* assert that all humanity —save One—are divinely reckoned to have participated in Adam's sin and

that the penalty for that participation is, in each individual, physical death. It is natural to suppose from the Authorized English translation that the words *all sinned* refer to personal sin in each individual's life experience. So general is this tendency, regardless of translations, that the Spirit of God has led the Apostle to present conclusive proof that there is no reference here to personal sin. This proof is in the next two verses of the context.

Verses 13–14. "(For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." Bishop Moule, writing of the two uses of the word *law* as it appears in verse 13, states, "Both these words in the Greek are without the article. In spite of some difficulty, we must interpret the first of the Mosaic Law, and the second of Law in some other sense; here probably in the sense of the declared Will of God in general, against which, in a particular case, Adam sinned, and we 'in him'" (*Cambridge Bible, Romans*, p. 105). The phrase "Sin was in the world" indicates that the character of God was then, as always, that against which men sin, but as no elaborate written statement of God's requirements had been given, men were not held guilty of having broken that which did not exist. A very helpful illustration of this situation is to be seen in Christ's words to His disciples concerning the Jewish rulers, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin. … If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father" (John 15:22, 24). The Apostle continues with the words, "Nevertheless death reigned," which fact proves that death is not due to personal transgression of law in its revealed form; and death came, likewise, to those "who had not sinned" against law. Some expositors hold that the proof that verse 12 does not refer to personal sin is demonstrated in the fact that there was no law against which man might sin. Others hold that the evidence that personal sin is not in view is found in the truth that infants and incompetent persons died, as all others; yet these had not sinned willfully as Adam sinned. The latter argument, though conclusive, is not restricted to the age in question. Probably both interpretations are true and the evidence is complete that physical death is not the penalty for personal sin, but rather the penalty for participation, in the federal-headship sense, in

the sin of Adam. Verse 14 closes with the declaration that Adam is the figure (‘type’) of Him that was to come. A few make this to be the second advent, in which sense Christ is yet to come. It must be remembered that the first advent was a very vital hope and in the period in question. The Rabbis believed that the Last Adam is the Messiah. This the Apostle, no doubt, believed before he knew Christ as Savior.

Verses 15–19. “But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”

After having asserted the truth that Adam is a type of Christ, the Apostle goes on in this portion to enumerate certain parallels and contrasts between them. Comment has been made on these verses by Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas as follows:

> *Trespass and Gift* (ver. 15).—There is no need to regard vers. 13–17 as a parenthesis. It is much simpler and more natural to regard vers. 15, 16 as giving the details of the analogy mentioned in general terms in vers. 12–14, and it will be in every way clearer and more in harmony with the argument to adopt the interrogative form in these verses and render thus: “But shall not, as the offence, so also be the free gift?” If Adam is a type of Christ will there not be some correspondence between the fall of one and the free gift of the other? Surely they resemble each other in their far-reaching effects, for if by the lapse of the one the many connected with him were involved in death, it is much easier to believe that by the free sacrifice of One Man, Christ Jesus, God’s loving favour and His gift of righteousness abounded unto the many connected with Him.
>
> *Condemnation and Justification* (ver. 16).—Again we render by means of a question: “And shall not the gift be even as it was by one that sinned?” That is to say, Is there not also a correspondence between God’s gift and man’s ruin in respect of its being caused by the agency of one man? For indeed the free gift which led to the just acquittal of man was occasioned by many lapses; the judgment which led to condemnation was occasioned by one man’s single lapse.

Death and Life (ver. 17).—There is undoubted correspondence here, for if by virtue of that one man's single lapse the reign of death was established through the agency of the one man, it is much easier to believe that a reign of a far different kind (that is, more in harmony with God's heart) will be established through the agency of One Man, Christ Jesus.… Of course there are remarkable contrasts between the sin of Adam and the work of Christ, but the very contrasts strengthen the argument for the analogy which is the great point St. Paul wishes to emphasise. The first resemblance between Adam and Christ is that in both Fall and Redemption we have far-reaching effects, for in both "the many" are involved (ver. 15). The second resemblance is that in both the result is brought in through the agency of "one man" (vers. 16, 17).

Trespass and Righteousness (ver. 18).—Now various points of comparison are gathered up into one conclusion. We have on the one side as the cause one lapse, and the effect extending to all men for condemnation. We have on the other side as the cause one just sentence of acquittal, and the effect extending to all men for a justifying which carries with it life. These differences, however, only strengthen the argument for the correspondences, for grace is stronger than sin. If "the many" were involved in sin and death through the agency of the one man, Adam; "much more" may we believe that "the many" will be involved in righteousness and life through the agency of the One Man, Christ Jesus.

Disobedience and Obedience (ver. 19).—One point in the comparison is still incomplete. Adam's sin has not been contrasted with Christ's obedience, but with the cause of that obedience, grace (ver. 15), and with the result of it, a gift (ver. 17, 18). It is now shown that these effects were wrought by means of Christ's obedience, the exact contrast of Adam's disobedience, for as through the disobedience of the one man, Adam, the many connected with him were set down in the class of sin, so through the obedience of the One Man. Christ Jesus, the many connected with Him shall be set down in the class of righteousness. —*St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, I, 206–9

Verse 20. "Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

The two features consummated in verse 20, namely, *one man's disobedience,* and *one man's obedience* (each subject to imputation as this context declares), having alone been in view to this point, the Jew may reasonably inquire, If there is only a condemnation for Adam's sin and a justification in Christ, wherefore serveth the Law? To this it may be replied, that the Law entered ('came in beside,' as over and above the truth that men were already sinners) that the offense might abound, or be multiplied. The Law's reign began at Sinai and ended with Christ's death and resurrection. It is an *ed interim* dealing "till the seed should come." It is a temporary economy and should never be treated as the principal divine objective—as too often it has been treated. "The law was added" (Gal. 3:19). On the seeming unrighteousness of introducing that which at once increases the ground of condemnation, F. W. Grant writes: "'Law came in by the way that

the offence might abound:'—did that need? one might ask; was it not to add difficulty to difficulty—to make greater the distress that it could not relieve? So it would indeed seem, and not only seem, but so it really was: law, as we shall see fully in the argument of the seventh chapter, by its very opposition to the innate evil only arouses it to full activity and communicates to it new strength: 'the strength of sin is the law' (1 Cor. 15:56). This was indeed its mission; which if that were all, would be but disaster—a ministration of death and condemnation indeed! (2 Cor. 3:7, 9); but it came in by the way, says the apostle,—to fulfil a temporary purpose, in making manifest the hopeless condition of man apart from grace, when every command on God's part arouses the hostility of man's heart against it: 'the law entered that the offence might abound'!" (*The Numerical Bible, Acts to II Corinthians,* p. 223). But where sin was thus multiplied, grace did superabound. The disease was brought to the surface in overt acts. The two words translated *abound* are quite different in the original. Sin was multiplied, but grace superabounded.

Verse 21. "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

In closing this discussion, the Apostle again restates the contrast—sin reigned in death; grace reigns in life. Thus the last contrast is drawn and it is between *death* and *life*—the former through Adam, and the latter through Christ. As always in the Bible, the dark picture of sin is painted only that the glories of God's healing grace may more clearly be seen. The picture as drawn by Besser is, "*Sin, death, grace, righteousness, life.* These five stand thus: Grace rises highest in the middle; the two conquering giants, sin and death, at the left; the double prize of victory, righteousness and life, at the right; and over the buried name of Adam the glory of the name of Jesus blooms" (cited by M. B. Riddle, *Romans,* p. 88).

As an additional comment on this context, the remarks appended by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown in their *Commentary* (*in loc.*) and at the close of their illuminating exegesis of Romans 5:12–21 are reproduced here in full:

> On reviewing this golden section of our Epistle, the following additional remarks occur: (1) If this section does not teach that the whole race of Adam, standing in him as their federal head, "sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression," we may despair of any intelligible exposition of it. The apostle, after saying that Adam's sin introduced death in the

world, does not say “and so death passed upon all men for that” *Adam* “sinned,” but “for that *all sinned*.” Thus, according to the teaching of the apostle, “the death of all is for the sin of all;” and as this cannot mean the personal sins of each individual, but some sin of which unconscious infants are guilty equally with adults, it can mean nothing but the one “first transgression” of their common head, regarded as *the sin of each* of his race, and punished, as such, with death. It is vain to start back from this imputation to all of the guilt of Adam’s first sin, as wearing the appearance of *injustice*. For not only are all other theories liable to the same objection, in some other form—besides being inconsistent with the text— but the actual *facts of human nature*, which none dispute, and which cannot be explained away, involve essentially the same difficulties as the great *principle* on which the apostle here explains them. If we admit this principle, on the authority of our apostle, a flood of light is at once thrown upon certain features of the Divine procedure, and certain portions of the Divine oracles, which otherwise are involved in much darkness; and if the principle itself seem hard to digest, it is not harder than the *existence of evil*, which, as a fact, admits of no dispute, but, as a feature in the Divine administration, admits of no explanation in the present state. (2) What is called *original sin*—or that depraved tendency to evil with which every child of Adam comes into the world—is not formally treated of in this section (and even in ch. 7 it is rather its nature and operation than its connection with the first sin which is handled). But indirectly, this section bears testimony to it; representing the one original offence, unlike every other, as having an *enduring vitality* in the bosom of every child of Adam, as a principle of disobedience, whose virulence has gotten it the familiar name of ‘original sin.’ (3) In what sense is the word “*death*” used throughout this section? Not certainly as mere *temporal* death, as Arminian commentators affirm. For as Christ came to undo what Adam did, which is all comprehended in the word “death,” it would hence follow that Christ has merely dissolved the sentence by which soul and body are parted in death; in other words, merely procured the resurrection of the body. But the New Testament throughout teaches that the salvation of Christ is from a vastly more comprehensive “death” than that. But neither is death here used merely in the sense of *penal evil, i.e.*, “any evil inflicted in punishment of sin and for the support of law” (Hodge). This is too indefinite, making death a mere figure of speech to denote “penal evil” in general—an idea foreign to the simplicity of Scripture—or at least making death, strictly so called, only one part of the thing meant by it, which ought not to be resorted to if a more simple and natural explanation can be found. By “death” then, in this section, we understand the sinner’s *destruction*, in the only sense in which he is capable of it. Even temporal death is called “destruction” (Deuteronomy 7:23; 1 Samuel 5:11, &c.), as extinguishing all that men regard as life. But a destruction extending to the *soul* as well as the body, and *into the future world*, is clearly expressed in Matthew 7:13; 2 Thessalonians 1:9; 2 Peter 3:16, &c. This is the penal “death” of our section, and in this view of it we retain its proper sense. Life—as a state of enjoyment of the favour of God, of pure fellowship with Him, and voluntary subjection to Him—is a blighted thing from the moment that sin is found in the creature’s skirts; in that sense, the threatening, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” was carried into immediate effect in the case of Adam when he fell, who was thenceforward “dead while he lived.” Such are all his posterity from their birth. The separation of soul and body in temporal death carries the sinner’s “destruction” a stage farther, dissolving his connection with that world out of which he extracted a pleasurable, though unblest, existence, and ushering him into the presence of his Judge —first as a disembodied spirit, but ultimately in the body too, in an enduring condition—“to be punished (and this is the final state) with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power.” This final extinction in soul and body of all that constitutes

life, but yet eternal consciousness of a blighted existence—this, in its amplest and most awful sense, is "DEATH!" Not that Adam understood all that. It is enough that he understood "the day" of his disobedience to be the terminating period of his blissful "life." In that simple idea was wrapt up all the rest. But that he should comprehend its *details* was not necessary. Nor is it necessary to suppose all that to be intended in every passage of Scripture where the word occurs. Enough that all we have described is in the bosom of the *thing*, and will be realized in as many as are not the happy subjects of the Reign of Grace. Beyond doubt, the whole of this is intended in such sublime and comprehensive passages as this:

"God … gave His … Son that whosoever believeth in Him *might not* PERISH, *but have everlasting* LIFE" (John 3:16). And should not the untold horrors of that "DEATH"—already "reigning over" all that are not in Christ, and hastening to its consummation—quicken our flight into "the second Adam," that having "received the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, we may reign in LIFE by the One, Jesus Christ"?

II. Theories of Imputation

As might be expected, the context—Romans 5:12–21—has drawn out many interpretations of this teaching concerning *imputation.* Some have entered strange avenues of speculation. It is essential that the student shall be informed about the more general views men have advanced. The brief introduction to the study of Romans 5:12–21 and the summarization (abridged) of this great field of truth as given in the *International Revision Commentary*, edited by Dr. Philip Schaff, is appended here in full:

The universal dominion of sin and death over the human race is a fact, clearly taught by the Apostle here, and daily confirmed by our religious experience. This dominion extends in an unbroken line to our first parents, as the transgression of Adam stands in a causal relation to the guilt and sin of his posterity. The Apostle assumes this connection, in order to illustrate the blessed truth, that the power and principle of righteousness and life go back to Jesus Christ, the second Adam. However explained, the existence of sin remains a stubborn, terrible reality. Least of all can it be explained by the denial of the parallel, yet contrasted, saving facts which are prominent in the Apostle's mind throughout this section. The leading points which he asserts, and which therefore must enter into any consistent theory respecting his view of original sin, are: (1.) That the sin of Adam was the sin of all his posterity (see ver. 12); in what sense this is true, must be determined by the passage as a whole. (2.) That there is parallel and contrast between the connection of Adam and his posterity, and Christ and His people (see vers. 14–19). (3.) That this parallel applies to the point which has been so fully discussed in the previous part of the Epistle, namely, that believers are *reckoned* righteous (see vers. 12–18). (4.) That the connection with the two representative heads of the race has moral results; that guilt and sin, righteousness and life, are inseparably connected (see vers. 17–19).

The various theories may be reviewed in the light of these positions:—

I. The PANTHEISTIC and NECESSITARIAN theory, which regards sin as an essential attribute (a limitation) of the finite, destroys the radical antagonism between good and evil, and has nothing in common with Paul's views of sin or grace.

II. The PELAGIAN heresy resolves the fall of Adam into a comparatively trivial, childish act of disobedience, which sets a bad example. It holds that every child is born as innocent and perfect, though as fallible, as Adam when created. This view explains nothing, and virtually denies all the assertions made in this section. Its affinities, logically and historically, are with Socinianism and the multifarious forms of Rationalism. It, and every other theory which denies the connection with Adam, fails to meet the great question respecting the salvation of those dying in infancy. Such theories logically exclude them from the heaven of the redeemed, either by denying their need of salvation, or by rejecting the only principle in accordance with which such salvation, if they need it, is possible, namely, that of imputation.

III. The theory of a PRE-ADAMIC fall of all men, which implies the preexistence of souls, as held by Plato and Origen, is a pure speculation, and inconsistent with ver. 12 as well as with Gen. 3. It is incidentally opposed in chap. 9:12.

IV. The AUGUSTINIAN or REALISTIC theory holds that the connection between Adam and his posterity was such, that by his individual transgression he vitiated human nature, and transmitted it in this corrupt and guilty state to his descendants by physical generation, so that there was an impersonal and unconscious participation of the whole human race in the fall of Adam. There is this difference, however: Adam's individual transgression resulted in a sinful nature; while, in the case of his descendants, the sinful nature or depraved will results in individual transgression. This view accords in the main with the grammatical exegesis of ver. 11, but Augustine himself incorrectly explained "for that," as "in whom" *i.e.*, Adam. It accepts, but does not explain, the relation between genus and species. Like all other matters pertaining to life, it confronts us with a mystery …

V. The FEDERAL theory of a vicarious representation of mankind by Adam, in virtue of a covenant (*faedus*, hence "federal") made with him. It supposes a (one-sided) covenant, called the covenant of works (in distinction from the covenant of grace), to the effect that Adam should stand a moral probation on behalf of all his descendants, so that his act of obedience or disobedience, with all its consequences, should be accounted theirs, just as the righteousness of the second Adam is reckoned as that of His people. This transaction, because *unilateral* (one-sided), finds its ultimate ground in the sovereign pleasure of God. It is a part of the theological system developed in Holland, and largely incorporated in the standards of the Westminster Assembly. Yet here, too, a distinction has been made.

1. The founders and chief advocates of the federal scheme combined with it the Augustinian view of an unconscious and impersonal participation of the whole human race in the fall of Adam, and thus made imputation to rest on ethical as well as legal grounds. This view, which differs very slightly from IV., seems to accord best with the four leading points of this section, since it recognizes Adam as both federal and natural head of the race.

2. The *purely federal* school holds, that by virtue of the federal headship of Adam, on the ground of a sovereign arrangement, his sin and guilt are justly, directly, and immediately imputed to his posterity. It makes the parallel between Adam and Christ exact, in the matter of the imputation of sin and of righteousness. "In virtue of the union between him and his descendants, his sin is the judicial ground of the condemnation of the race, precisely as the righteousness of Christ is the judicial ground of the justification of His people." This view does not deny that Adam is the natural head of the race, but asserts that "over and beyond this natural relation which exists between a man and his posterity, there was a special divine constitution by which he was appointed the head and representative of his whole race" (Hodge, *Theology*, ii., pp. 195, 197).

VI. In sharp antagonism to the last view, most of the recent New England theologians have virtually rejected imputation altogether. They "maintain that the sinfulness of the

descendants of Adam results with *infallible certainty* (though not with necessity) from his transgression; the one class holding to hereditary depravity prior to sinful choice, the other class teaching that the first moral choice of all is universally sinful, yet with the power of contrary choice." In this view a nice distinction is made between natural ability and moral inability. When consistently held, it denies that "all sinned" (ver. 12) refers to the sin of Adam, taking it as equivalent to the perfect, "all have sinned," namely, personally with the first responsible act.

VII. The SEMI-PELAGIAN and kindred ARMINIAN theories, though differing from each other, agree in admitting the Adamic unity, and the disastrous effects of Adam's transgression, but regard hereditary corruption as an evil or misfortune, not properly as sin and guilt, of itself exposing us to punishment. Arminianism, however, on this point, inclines toward Augustinianism more than Semi-Pelagianism does. The latter fails to give full force to the language of the Apostle in this section, and to sympathize with his profound sense of the guilt and sinfulness of sin. The advocates of neither theory present explicit and uniform statements on this doctrinal point.

Those views which seem to keep most closely to the grammatical sense of the Apostle's words involve mysteries of physiology, psychology, ethics, and theology. Outside the revelation there confronts us the undeniable, stubborn, terrible fact, of the universal dominion of sin and death over the entire race, infants as well as adults. No system of philosophy explains this; outside the Christian redemption, the mystery is entirely one of darkness, unillumined by the greatest mystery of love. Hence the wisdom of following as closely as possible the words which reveal the cure, as we attempt to penetrate the gloom that envelops the origin of the disease. The more so when the obvious purpose of the Apostle here is to bring into proper prominence the Person and Work of the Second Adam. Here alone can we find any practical solution of the problem respecting the first head of the race; only herein do we perceive the triumphant vindication of Divine justice and mercy. The best help to unity in the doctrine of Original Sin will be by larger experiences of the "much more" which is our portion in Christ Jesus. Only when we are assured of righteousness and life in Him, can we fearlessly face the fact of sin and death in Adam.—Pp. 88–91

III. The Divine Remedy for Imputed Sin

The divine cure for that phase of the Adamic sin which is reckoned to all human beings by an *actual* imputation resulting in their physical death, appears in a sequence of divine accomplishments which are finally consummated in the complete disposition of death itself. Being a divine judgment which was imposed on the human race subsequent to creation, death is foreign to the first stage of the divine plan for this earth. As created, man was as enduring as the angels. Though some of the angels sinned, it has not pleased God to impose the sentence of death upon them. Their judgment is of another form. The first angel to sin was not a federal head of the angels, nor is there among them any procreation with its problem of heredity. Therefore, there could be no parallel experience with respect to

judgments from God for sin set up between the human race and the angels. It is to be observed, however, that as the divine cure for human sin extends to the earthly creation, death is now the lot of the creature as it is the lot of man. The Scriptures predict the coming day when death will be banished from the universe forever. The Apostle Paul declares that as a result of Christ's reign over the millennial earth, death, the last of the enemies of God's creation to be destroyed, will disappear forever (1 Cor. 15:26). Similarly, the Apostle John, when enumerating the things which, though characterizing the present order, will be absent from the final and future order, writes these emphatic words, "And there shall be no more death" (Rev. 21:4). After that time, it is implied, no living thing, including unregenerate individuals of the human race, being raised as indeed they will be, will have any promise of relief from their estate through death. Turning now to the various and progressive aspects of divine dealing with physical death, it may be observed:

1. The Death of Christ. The careful student of doctrine, when examining the Scriptures, soon becomes aware of the imperative need of discriminating between physical death and spiritual death, and in no aspect of this great theme is the human mind more impotent than when considering the death of Christ in the light of these distinctions. There could be no doubt about Christ's physical death, even though He, in His humanity, being unfallen, was in no way subject to death; nor was He, in His death, to see corruption (Ps. 16:10); nor was a bone of His body to be broken (John 19:36). On the other hand, Christ's death was a complete judgment of the sin nature for all who are regenerated, and He, as substitute, bore a condemnation which no mortal can comprehend, which penalty entered far into the realms of spiritual death—separation from God (cf. Matt. 27:46). In His death, He shrank back, not from physical pain, nor from the experience of quitting the physical body, but, when contemplating the place of a sin bearer and the anticipation of being *made* sin for us, He pleaded that the cup might pass. The death of Christ was wholly on behalf of others; yet, while both the physical and the spiritual aspects of death were demanded in that sacrifice which He provided, it is not given to man, when considering the death of Christ, to disassociate these two the one from the other.

2. The Keys of Death. Through His death and resurrection, Christ became possessed of "the keys of death." That He had not before His death wrested this specific authority from Satan is intimated in these words: "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14); however, after His resurrection and ascension He spoke from heaven saying, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death" (Rev. 1:18). The nullification on the part of the Son of God of this great authority which had been before accorded to Satan is in agreement with Christ's word that "all power is given unto me," and represents a transfer of authority which must mean much indeed to every member of this death-doomed race.

3. Death and the Unsaved. Whatever is available to the unsaved as a relief from sin and its judgments through the saving grace of God, they remain in the bondage of sin and under the sentence of death in all its forms until they are saved—if ever they are saved. Concerning physical death, the penalty for man's share in Adam's sin, they remain under death as a judgment; concerning spiritual death, they remain separate from God; concerning the second death, they are doomed to eternal separation from God. Great, indeed, is their need of the Savior!

4. Death and the Christian. This extended theme belongs to a later division of this thesis. It may be said, however, that, though death, as the only way of departure out of this world, continues even for the believer until the coming of Christ, its judgment aspect is lifted forever. Of Christians it is said, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1, R.V.), and for the Christian death is described as a sleep so far as the body is concerned, and as a departure to be with Christ so far as the soul and spirit are concerned.

5. Death in the Millennium. But one passage seems to bear upon this division of the doctrine of the divine cure for physical death within the thousand-year reign of Christ on the earth. In Isaiah 65:20 it is written and most evidently of the coming kingdom age: "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed." Obviously, physical death is much restrained in the age

of the glory of this earth. In like manner, it is in that same age that the reigning Messiah shall put down all rule and all authority and all power. “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:24–26). Thus the reign of so terrible a curse and so dreaded a foe, though permitted to continue its blight over even the redeemed and through all the ages, is finally banished forever by the irresistible authority and power of the Son of God.

Conclusion

Though both arise from the initial sin of Adam and alike converge on each member of his race, a crucial distinction must be maintained between the transmitted sin nature received *mediately*, and imputed sin received *immediately.* It will be noted, also, that both the sin nature and imputed sin are distinct from personal sin. In the one case, the nature to sin is not the act of sin, and in the other case, though men are held individually responsible and under the penalty of physical death for their share in what was, in Adam's experience, a personal sin, imputed sin is held in the Scriptures to be unlike personal sin and this unlikeness is demonstrated with extended argument. There yet remains in the field of universal conditions which are to be recognized in the whole field of hamartiology, the one category, namely, man's estate under sin.

Chapter XXI

MAN'S ESTATE UNDER SIN AND HIS RELATION TO SATAN

I. The Fact

THE PHRASE "under sin," as an English rendering, occurs but three times in the New Testament—"We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (Rom. 3:9); "But I am carnal, sold under sin" (Rom. 7:14); "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin" (Gal. 3:22)—and with far-reaching significance in each instance. Romans 3:9 and Galatians 3:22, having reference to the estate of the unregenerate, are germane to this division of the doctrine of sin. The force of this phrase may be seen when compared with the similar expressions, *under law* and *under grace* (Rom. 6:14). The word *under* as used in these passages does not imply merely that a system —sin, law, or grace—holds an inherent dominion over the individual; it rather implies that, in addition to dominion, there is a divine reckoning that the relationship is true. In the matter of supremacy, the reckoning of God is far more important than the mere force of circumstances growing out of any situation.

Man, who has been under condemnation for sin since the beginning of the race, is, in the present age (which is bounded by the two advents of Christ), under a specific divine decree of condemnation, and this condemnation is itself the necessary background for the present far-reaching offers of divine grace. Each of the three aspects of sin already considered has been seen to be universal in character, and man's estate "under sin" is no exception. In fact, it is this universal character which provides the basis for the understanding of the precise meaning of the phrase.

That the estate of man "under sin" is peculiar to the present age is disclosed in Romans 3:9, and by the declaration there set forth that unregenerate Jews and Gentiles are now alike in respect to their relation to God, being equally fallen and condemned under sin. Similarly, the Apostle declares that both Jews and Gentiles are now alike in the fact that the same

gospel of divine grace is offered to them and by this alone can they be saved. We read: “For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek [Gentile]: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever [Jew or Gentile] shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (Rom. 10:12–13; cf. Acts 15:9; Rom. 3:22). During the period from Abraham to Christ, which in the Scriptures is characterized by Jewish history, the Jew with ever increasing conviction asserted his superior position and importance over the Gentile, and with the fullest divine attestation as regards his superior position. The Israelites were and are God’s chosen above all the people of the earth (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 7:6–7; 10:15; Ps. 135:4). Of them the Apostle declares: “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. 9:4–5); but of the Gentiles he asserts: “That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12). Language could hardly serve to set forth a greater difference between two peoples than is indicated by these two passages. Such, indeed, was the divinely appointed difference between Jew and Gentile in the 2000 years between Abraham and Christ. On the basis of his place of privilege, the Jew, so far from being humbled by his blessings, had developed a national pride and arrogance toward the Gentile which prompted him to refuse to have any personal contact with a Gentile, or to enter his house, and he termed the Gentile a *dog*. Perhaps no Jew of his generation was more saturated with this unholy prejudice than was Saul of Tarsus; yet, under the transforming, illuminating power of the Spirit, Saul became Paul the “apostle to the Gentiles,” and the voice of God to declare the message—at that time more revolutionary than almost any other could be—that there is now “no difference between Jew and Gentile.” There is abundant prophecy announcing the fact that in the coming kingdom age the Jew will again and forevermore be divinely exalted above the Gentiles (Isa. 14:1–2; 60:12). It therefore follows that since in the past ages the Jew by divine authority and appointment held a position superior to the Gentile, and since in the ages to come he will again be exalted above all other peoples, this is the age,

unique indeed, when by divine authority and arrangement it is declared that there is “no difference between Jew and Gentile.” Jewish national and covenant standing before God is, for the present age, set aside. The Jew is not now urged to recognize his Messiah, but he is urged to believe on a crucified and risen Savior.

The common position of Jew and Gentile “under sin” may be defined as one wherein they are both absolutely condemned and utterly without merit before God. Immediately following the statement of Romans 3:9 that both Jew and Gentile are all “under sin,” the context goes on to define the condemnable condition of the entire race. It is written: “There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes” (Rom. 3:10–18). With the same all-inclusiveness, comprehending both Jew and Gentile, it is declared in John 3:18, “He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” In their vanity men are ever prone to imagine that their estate before God may yet prove to be to some degree acceptable. However, God declares that they are *already* condemned, which fact must take its course leading on to eternal woe unless, through grace, they are saved.

Two passages declare that the position under sin is due to a divine decree. It is written, “But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Gal. 3:22). Romans 11:32 presents a parallel statement: “But God hath concluded them all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all.” In each of these passages the position described is one which is there said to be due to a divine decree. In the former passage it is the Scriptures which are said to have concluded all under sin, while in the latter passage it is God who is said to have concluded all in unbelief. The word συγκλείω, here translated *concluded,* is in Luke 5:6 translated *inclosed* and in Galatians 3:23 it is translated *shut up* in the sense of being restricted to definite limitations.

These limitations, it will be observed, are, in each case in question, divinely imposed. As divine justification is the public declaration by God of the fact that the believer stands justified in His sight since he has attained to the righteousness of God, being in Christ, so to be under sin is to be not only without merit before God, but it is to be declared so by God In Galatians 3:22 man is said to be restricted by divine decree to the estate which is thus without merit in order that the promise which is by faith of Jesus Christ—salvation wholly and only through the merit of the Savior—might be given to those who have faith; and faith as here indicated is the antipodes of meritorious works. Similarly, in Romans 11:32 God is said to have confined all in unbelief, or that, again, which is the antipodes of faith, that they might thus become the uncomplicated objects of divine mercy. While these Scriptures emphasize the removal of special blessings which before belonged to the Jew, it is also true that the Gentile, like the Jew, is now under sin even though no previous blessings were his to be forfeited. God must remove from both Jew and Gentile every vestige of supposed human merit from the issue in order that the way may be clear for mercy to act apart from every complexity that arises when two opposing principles—faith and works—are intermingled. That this immeasurable privilege of attaining to all divine blessing on the principle of faith apart from human merit might be the portion of all—Jew and Gentile alike—they are all, and without exception, concluded under sin.

II. The Remedy

The remedy for this meritless and therefore hopeless estate is the saving grace of God through Christ in all its magnitude and perfections. This has been implied in the passages cited above. The two positions— under sin or under grace, with all that grace secures—are polarities as far removed the one from the other as the east is from the west, as holiness from sin, or as heaven from hell. All men have been placed under sin, these passages declare, to the end that the grace of God may be exercised in their behalf without complication or restraint. Though the benefit to man is knowledge-surpassing (not only is sin forgiven for the one who is saved, but he is justified *freely* without the slightest compensation to God—Rom. 3:24, and made to stand in all the perfection of Christ—Eph. 1:6; Col. 2:10), yet the

advantage to God in the salvation of a soul is even greater. To satisfy the love of God is a greater achievement than to bring measureless blessing to men. Thus the supreme objective in the death of Christ is discovered. Because of infinite love for lost men, the gratification of that holy desire to redeem—which is common to all three Persons of the blessed Trinity—constitutes the supreme reason for the divine sacrifice. That the Father's love might be manifested which would give His Only Begotten Son that men might be saved (John 3:16), that the Son might see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied (Isa. 53:11), and that by the Spirit many sons might be brought into glory (Heb. 2:10)—is of immeasurable import. There was that in God which could never before have been expressed, nor could it now be expressed apart from His redeeming grace. Angelic hosts and all created intelligences could have seen the power of God, the wisdom of God, and the glory of God as disclosed in creation; but, apart from the demonstration which sin and redemption have supplied, none could have conceived of the love and grace of God toward hell-deserving sinners. Thus it is revealed that salvation is provided and its priceless benefits secured not merely as an advantage to men, but as an even greater boon to the One whose infinite love is satisfied thereby. That the one who is saved might really be conformed to the image of His Son (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2) and be a faultless representation of His grace (Eph. 2:7), God reserves every aspect of salvation unto Himself. "Salvation is of the LORD" (Jonah 2:9; Ps. 3:8). Being, as it is, supernatural in its every phase, none but God could achieve it.

It may be concluded, then, that men are either lost, being under sin, which is to be meritless before God in the issues related to their salvation, or they are perfected forever in Christ by the saving grace of God, which salvation is divinely secured to all who believe.

To be without merit in relation to salvation is to be in possession of nothing which might be credited to one's account. It is according to human reason to suppose that a moral, cultured person would have something which God might accept and incorporate into His saving work, but such is not the case. To be under sin is not only to be hopelessly condemned because of the sinful state, but to be without merit, or utterly void of any good which might be credited to one's account. In Romans 11:32 the Apostle states that "God hath concluded them all in unbelief," which

unbelief, as has been seen from John 3:18, is the ground of the present condemnation of all men. It is probable that the first reaction of the human heart to this revelation, that God has now decreed that the good which men believe they possess will not accrue to their account to the slightest degree, is a feeling that God is unjust in rejecting even the good one may possess. Has not man become accustomed to a meritorious standing by home discipline in childhood, by the recognition of personal qualities in all the field of education, and by the advantages which are accredited to him in society and government because of a correct manner of life? The passage (Rom. 11:32) goes on to state, not only that God has concluded all in unbelief, which is condemnation, but that this is done in order "that he might have mercy upon all." Salvation by grace is according to a plan which is wholly within God and therefore cannot incorporate anything, even human merit, into its execution. It is a standardized whole, complete in all its parts, which proceeds from God and, being itself infinitely perfect, leaves no place for any human contribution. A bridge may be condemned when there is much in it of value, and the engineer may have to determine whether it should be merely repaired by adding support to its weak parts, or whether it ought to be torn away to make place for a wholly new structure. One thing is sure: if the old bridge is torn away, its good parts are not left intact to be incorporated into the new structure. The good is set aside along with the bad. Salvation by grace is a wholly new structure into which no human goodness may be incorporated. God has concluded all in unbelief, which is the wrecking of the first structure without regard to its relative worthiness, in order that His exceeding mercy, which provides a structure of infinite perfection, might be available to all. It naturally follows that if one persists in demanding that his own merit shall be credited he cannot be saved by grace, since God is not patching up imperfect structures. In the salvation of men, God has undertaken two stupendous purposes which render impossible the acceptance of any patched-up and imperfect structures. (a) It is declared that, through His saving grace, the believer shall be conformed to the image of His Son. This excludes any mere revising of the old creation. At this point neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but only a *new creation.* (b) Salvation has for its primary objective the demonstration before all the universe of beings the exceeding grace of God. It is true that men are saved "unto good works" (Eph. 2:10),

and that God loved them enough to give His Son that they might not perish but have everlasting life (John 3:16), but the highest divine motive in the salvation of men is that in the ages to come the grace of God may be demonstrated before all created beings. Were that salvation to incorporate any fraction of human merit, it would by so much be imperfect as a demonstration of God's grace. Thus, again, the very purpose of God in salvation precluded the mere patching up of an old structure or the salvaging of any part of it. It would be folly indeed to contend that a good life is not more beneficial to the state, to society, or the home than a bad life; but this question under discussion does not involve the state, society, or the home directly: it is a matter of getting sinners so perfected that they may enjoy the presence of God in heaven forever. Fallen man is condemned root and branch. He could be credited with nothing for the good that he imagines he possesses. Such supposed good, at best, would not be of the same quality as the perfection of Christ, nor is it required since Christ's merit supplies all that a sinner could ever need. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God" (2 Cor. 5:17–18. Observe the force of the word *all* in each use of it in this passage). Indeed, one thus saved has a new and superhuman obligation to live as one who is perfectly saved in Christ should live; but even Christian faithfulness, though full of blessing for the one who so lives, can add nothing to the new creation wrought of God.

It will be observed, however, that, since God is Himself infinitely righteous, He cannot accept anything which is not perfect in His own sight. He could not base the salvation of a sinner upon a mere fiction; He therefore bases it upon the merit of His Son whose perfection is, through infinite grace, rendered available for every sinner. The sinner, then, in the last analysis, is saved on a meritorious basis, but it is the merit of the One who is *made* unto him the very righteousness of God.

No misapprehension of gospel truth is more prevalent than the sentiment that the grace of God that saves the lost is an adjustable device which adapts itself to the varying degrees of human worthiness—that it requires less grace to save the moral individual than it requires to save the immoral individual. All such conceptions are based on the wholly erroneous idea that human merit or works combine with divine grace to the end that a soul may be saved. Resisting this very impression, the Apostle declared, "And if by

grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" (Rom. 11:6); "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:4–5).

Thus, it may be observed that the phrase "under sin" refers to an estate of man which is constituted by a divine decree and which has obtained in no other age than this, since by it Jews and Gentiles are alike leveled to the position of abject objects of divine grace to the end that they may be saved upon a wholly different principle than that of a divine recognition and acceptance of human merit. God undertakes and secures a *new creation* to the glory of His grace. Thus it is also seen that the reckoning of all in unbelief is a necessity if all human beings are to be placed before God as those whose meritorious structure has been torn away and who are now eligible to receive as a gift from God all that enters into the new creation. None but God can accomplish a new creation, and He can undertake it only as His Son has borne the demerit of sinners and offered Himself without spot unto God that His merit might be available to them.

The only attitude that a meritless person under sin could reasonably maintain toward so great and supernatural a salvation is to trust Another who is mighty to save to accomplish it *all*. This is saving faith; and no more is, nor reasonably could be, required of any unsaved person. Therefore, we read in Galatians 3:22: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."

III. The Relation of the Unsaved to Satan

The present relation of the unregenerate to Satan as described in the Bible and when added to the four aspects of sin already named, comprises a dark picture. No reference is made here to the eternal estate of those who die without the salvation which is in Christ. Little indeed are the unregenerate prepared to recognize their present relation to Satan. Satan is described as the one who deceiveth the whole world (Rev. 12:9; 20:3, 8); and the inability of the unsaved to discern the revelation regarding themselves is the result of this satanic deception. While there are many

passages of Scripture bearing on the present relation of the unsaved to Satan, four present this important body of truth in its main features:

Colossians 1:13, which reads: “Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.” In this Scripture it is revealed that God’s saving power is exercised to the end that those who are saved are “delivered … from the power of darkness.” Adam’s scepter of authority and dominion (Gen. 1:26–28) was evidently surrendered to Satan to some extent and has been held by Satan by right of conquest. Fallen man must be rescued from the power of darkness, which is the estate of all who are unsaved.

Ephesians 2:1–2. Writing of the former estate of those now saved, the Apostle states: “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh [energizeth] in the children of disobedience.” The classification, “the children of disobedience,” refers to Adam’s federal disobedience and includes all of the unregenerate as disobedient and energized by Satan (note the use of ἐνεργέω in both Eph. 2:2 and Phil. 2:13).

2 Corinthians 4:3–4, which states: “But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them,” discloses the fact that the unregenerate are restricted by Satan in their capacity to understand the gospel of Christ. The effectiveness of this blinding every soul-winner soon discovers.

1 John 5:19, which reads: “And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” A more literal translation develops the revelation that the unregenerate are now unconscious of their relation to Satan. They are as those who are being carried asleep in the arms of the wicked one.

Finally, the estate of unregenerate man may be summarized, (a) as being subject to death in all its forms, because of participation in Adam’s sin; (b) as being born in depravity or spiritual death and forever separated from God unless regenerated by the saving power of God; (c) as guilty of personal sins, each one of which is as sinful in the sight of God as the first sin of Satan or the first sin of Adam; (d) as under sin, in which estate all—both

Jew and Gentile—are now placed by divine decree and in which estate every human merit is disregarded to the end that the uncompromised saving grace of God may be exercised toward those who believe; and (e) as under the influence of Satan who is in authority over them, who energizes them, who blinds them concerning the gospel, and who deceives them concerning their true relation to himself.

The problem of relief from the immeasurable tragedy of sin is never solved by minimizing any aspect of sin; it is solved by discovering a Savior whose salvation is equal to every need for time and eternity.

Chapter XXII

The Christian's Sin and Its Remedy

No division of the Biblical doctrine of sin is more extensive or vitally important than that which contemplates the Christian's sin; yet, it will be observed, Systematic Theology, as set forth in written standard works and as taught in seminaries generally, does not recognize this feature of the doctrine. The loss to the theological student is beyond calculation, for when graduated and ordained to the ministry of God's Word he is at once constituted a doctor of souls and the majority of those to whom he ministers will be Christians who are suffering from some spiritual injury which sin has inflicted upon them. Indeed, what Christian, waging, as all Christians do, a simultaneous battle on three fronts—the world, the flesh, and the devil—is not often, if not almost constantly, in a state of spiritual injury? The soul doctor himself does not escape this conflict and sad indeed is his plight if he is so ignorant of the essential truths regarding the Christian's sin and its divinely provided cure, that he cannot diagnose even his own case or apply the healing to his own stricken heart! Though the pastor is a doctor of souls, his first responsibility to others is so to teach the members of his flock with regard to the whole subject of sin as related to the Christian, that they may themselves be able to diagnose their own troubles and apply intelligently to their own hearts the divine cure. The Bible proposes no intermeddling human priest or Romish confessional for the child of God. It does propose an instructed pastor and teacher and a worthy ministry on his part in that field of truth which concerns the spiritual progress, power, prayer, and potency of those of God's redeemed ones who are committed to his spiritual care. The blight of sin upon Christian experience and service is tragic indeed, but how much more so when pastor and people alike are ignorant about the most elementary features of the well-defined and divinely revealed steps to be taken in its cure by Christians who are injured by sin!

In approaching this great theme, it will perhaps tend to clarify this aspect of doctrine if the Christian's relation to each of the four major features of sin, which have just been pursued, is considered separately.

Because of its unlikeness to God, personal sin is always equally sinful and condemnable whether it be committed by the saved or the unsaved, nor is there aught provided in either case for its cure other than the efficacy of the all-sufficient blood of Christ. Unregenerate men "have redemption" through the blood of Christ; that is, the blood has been shed and its saving, transforming application awaits faith's appropriation. Over against this it is written of the Christian that "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). Most significant indeed is the use here of the present tense. It is while the Christian is walking in the light that he has both fellowship (fellowship which is with the Father and His Son, cf. vs. 3) and perpetual cleansing by the blood of Christ. The cleansing, it is evident, depends upon the walk—as does the fellowship—but all that the walk implies must be discerned if the doctrine involved is not to be distorted. To *walk in the light* is not to be sinless; that would consist in *becoming* the light. Walking in the light is responding to, and being guided by, the Light—and *God is Light* (vs. 5). In a practical way, it means that when the Light, which God is, shines into the heart and reveals sin or darkness that is there, it is judged and put away by His grace and power. This conception is in harmony with verse 9, that "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." The blood of Christ must be applied, and it is when the Christian confesses his sin to God. It must be observed, however, that while sin is always exceedingly sinful and its cure is by the blood of Christ alone, the divine reckoning and consequent method of remedial dealing with the Christian's sin, because of his background relationship to God, is far removed from the divine reckoning and remedial dealing with the sin of unregenerate persons who sustain no such relationship to God.

The divine forgiveness of sin for unregenerate men is available only as it is *included* in the sum total of all that enters into their salvation. At least thirty-three divine undertakings, including forgiveness, are wrought simultaneously and instantaneously at the moment the individual is saved and this marvelous achievement represents the measureless difference between those who are saved and those who are not saved. Deeply in error, indeed, and dishonoring to God are those current definitions which represent the Christian to be different merely in his ideals, his manner of

life, or his outward relationships, when, in reality, he is a new creation in Christ Jesus. His new headship-standing being in Christ, every change which is needed has been wrought to conform him to his new positions and possessions. Forgiveness, then, in its positional aspect (Col. 2:13), is final and complete, and of the Christian thus forgiven it may be said, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1). However, this is but a part of all that God accomplished in His salvation. Unregenerate men are not encouraged to seek the forgiveness of sin alone, or any other individual feature of saving grace. If they secure forgiveness, it must come to them as a part of, and included in, the whole divine undertaking. Forgiveness of sin and salvation are not synonymous terms. On the other hand, when sin has entered into the life of a Christian it becomes a question of sin and sin alone which is involved. The remaining features of his salvation are unchanged. This truth is well illustrated in Chapter XVIII in which the remedy for the personal sin of the unregenerate was seen to be both forgiveness and justification, that is, not only forgiveness which cancels the offense, but justification which secures a perfect standing before God. It is never implied that a Christian should be justified again after he is justified by his initial faith in Christ, but he must be forgiven as often as he sins. Thus, the terms of cure which are divinely imposed respectively upon these two groups—the saved and the unsaved—must be different, as indeed they are.

The difference between the divine method of dealing with the sins of regenerate men as in contrast to the divine method of dealing with the sins of unsaved members of the human family is a major distinction in doctrine which if confounded cannot result in anything short of spiritual tragedy for all concerned. The preaching of the Arminian notion that, having sinned, the Christian must be saved again, has wrought untold injury to uncounted millions; but even a greater disaster has been wrought by the careless and misguided preaching to unregenerate people of repentance as a divine requirement separate from believing, of confession of sin as an essential to salvation, and of reformation of the daily life as the ground upon which a right relation to God may be secured.

The Scriptures distinguish with great clarity the divine method of dealing with the sins of these two classes. In 1 John 2:2 we read: “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the

whole world." No consideration can be given here to the interpretation of this passage which is offered by the advocates of a limited-redemption theory. Without question, the passage sets up a vital contrast between "our sins," which could not refer to those of the mass of unregenerate human beings, and "the sins of the whole [*cosmos*] world," which classification as certainly includes more than the sins of the regenerate portion of humanity, unless language is strained beyond measure in the interests of a theory. This passage is a great revelation to unregenerate men. Because of Christ's death, God is now propitious toward them. But who can measure the comfort to the crushed and bleeding heart of a Christian when it is discovered to that heart that already the very sin so much deplored has been borne by Christ, and that, on the most righteous basis, the Father is now *propitious* toward the suffering saint—a propitiation so real and true that the Father's arms are outstretched to welcome the returning Christian who, like the Prodigal, makes unreserved confession of his sin? It will be remembered that, according to the infinite accuracy of the Scriptures, the Prodigal is kissed by the father even *before* any confession is made. Thus it is disclosed that the Father *is* propitious toward His sinning child even before that child can be supposed to have merited anything, either by repentance, restitution, or confession. How persistent is the thought that God's heart must be softened by our tears! And, yet, how marvelous is the assurance that Christ is already the propitiation for our sins!

Again, the first five chapters of the Letter to the Romans present the fact of the unregenerate world's position before God and set forth the ground of the gospel of God's saving grace, but chapters six to eight are addressed to regenerate men and have to do with the problem of a holy walk and the divine provisions thereunto. The sin problem as it concerns the believer is not in view in the first five chapters of Romans, nor is any phase of salvation as it concerns unbelievers to be found in Romans, chapters six to eight. Similarly, the hortatory portions of all the epistles are addressed to those who are saved. They could not be addressed to unsaved men since the issue between God and them is not one of an improved manner of life; it is rather the reception of the gift of salvation through Jesus Christ, which gift is conditioned not upon any manner of works or human merit but upon saving faith in Christ alone.

In the case of the Christian, as in contrast to the unregenerate, the field of possible sin is greatly increased. Having come into the knowledge of the truth, the Christian, when he sins, offends against greater light. Likewise, he sins against God in the sphere of that new relationship which exists between a son and his father. It will also be seen that the Christian, being a citizen of heaven, is normally called upon to walk worthy of that high calling (Eph. 4:1). That high standard is no less than the ideal of Christlikeness. It is written: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain" (Phil. 1:21); "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5); "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2:9). Such an ideal is wholly unknown to those who are unregenerate and who make up this *cosmos* world. It is not unreasonable that requirements which are impossible to human ability are addressed to the Christian since he is given the Holy Spirit whose power is ever available; but the range for possible failure is here, as in the instances cited above, wide indeed. That the manner of life which becomes the child of God is supernatural, is constantly implied in the Scriptures which guide him in his manner of life. It is written: "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5); "That ye should shew forth the praises [virtues] of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2:9); "Giving thanks always for all things unto God" (Eph. 5:20); "That ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called" (Eph. 4:1); "Walk in the light" (1 John 1:7); "Walk in love" (Eph. 5:2); "Walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:16); "Grieve not the holy Spirit of God" (Eph. 4:30); "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5:19). A greater responsibility of daily life and service, due to the exalted position which he occupies, implies that, in the usual experience, the Christian will need a constant recourse to divine forgiveness and to be restored by grace to divine fellowship. Recognizing this imperative need, the Word of God presents its extended teaching regarding the cure of the believer's sin—a doctrine which has no counterpart or parallel in the truth which belongs to the unregenerate.

Continuing the contemplation of the stress which is imposed upon the Christian because of his position and relationships, certain conflicts are

emphasized in the struggle which is common to all who are saved. It is generally and properly taught that the Christian's conflict is threefold, namely, (a) against the world, (b) against the flesh, and (c) against the devil. By this it is asserted that the Christian's solicitation to evil will arise from any or all of these three sources. It is of supreme importance, then, that the child of God be intelligently aware of the scope and power of each of these mighty influences. Only the most restricted treatment of these forces can be undertaken here, and that in the light of the fact that much has been written previously on these general themes.

I. The World

Of the three Greek words which in the Authorized Version are translated by the English word *world*, but one—κόσμος—presents the thought of a sphere of conflict. This word means *order, system, regulation*, and indicates that the world is an order or system, but in every instance—and there are many—where a moral feature of the world is in view, this *cosmos* world is said to be opposed to God. It is declared to have originated—in its plan and order—with Satan. He promotes it and is its prince and god. This *cosmos* system is largely characterized by its ideals and entertainments and these become allurements to the Christian who is in this *cosmos* though no part of it. These features of the *cosmos* are often close counterfeits of the things of God and in no place does the believer need divine guidance more than when attempting to draw a line of separation between the things of God and the things of Satan's *cosmos.* In their far-flung realities, the things of God are wholly unrelated to the things of Satan. It is at the border line that Satan confuses the issues. It is indeed true, as just stated, that the believer is *in* the world, but not *of* it. Taken out of the world system by the New-Creation relationship, believers are no longer any more a part of the world than is Christ; but Christ has sent them into the world even as the Father sent Him into the world, not to be conformed to it, but to be witnesses in it (John 17:18). One, and only one, plan is provided for a victory over the world. It is stated in 1 John 5:4, "And this is the victory that overcometh [lit., overcame] the world, even our faith." Reference here is not to a present vacillating faith; the past tense is used looking back to that faith which identified the believer with Christ. Thus the Apostle goes on to say, "Who is

he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Though there is a need that it shall be claimed as a present experience, the victory is *Christ,* and all in Christ are already equipped by the indwelling Spirit to be more than conquerors. The world presents a constant hazard to the child of God and his liability in the direction of that form of sin which is worldliness is ever a reality.

II. The Flesh

The recurrence of this subject at various points in an orderly system of doctrine is necessary and indicates its immense importance. In its moral significance, it denotes that which is the very structure of the being of the unregenerate man. It remains as a vital part of the regenerate person's being and abides and is the occasion of an unceasing conflict against the indwelling Spirit so long as there is life in the mortal body. Proof has been adduced that the flesh, in its moral significance, is incurably evil in the sight of God. From it all manner of evil thoughts, evil desires, and evil actions arise. It is only as the believer experiences the larger restraining power of the Spirit of God that he will be able to live above the incitements and proclivities of the flesh. It was subsequent to his experience of regeneration that the Apostle testified of himself, "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). He also asserted that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and that these are always contrary the one to the other (Gal. 5:17). He also enumerated "the works of the flesh" (Gal. 5:19–21). All this, it will be observed, is said to be the experience of regenerate persons. Galatians 5:16 discloses the one and only relief, "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." The passage is not an instruction to unregenerate persons, nor does it imply that the fallen nature, which is the evil principle in the flesh, will ever be eradicated. God is no more proposing eradication of the flesh than of the world or of the devil. The divine method is the same in each of these conflicts. The victory is gained by the superior, overcoming power of the Spirit.

III. The Devil

Closely related, indeed, are the Christian's three enemies—the world, the flesh, and the devil. Especially related are the world, or the satanic system, and Satan who is the "god" and "prince" of that system. However, the world and the flesh are impersonal influences, while Satan, the wisest of all created beings, is personal. He it is who exercises μεθοδεία—*circumvention of deceit, wiles*, or *artifices*—against the children of God. There is no conflict between unregenerate men and Satan; they are *energized* by him (Eph. 2:2). On the other hand, the Christian is in the center of the most terrible, supernatural warfare. It is described in Ephesians as a *wrestling.* The word implies the closest life-and-death struggle, hand to hand and foot to foot, of a tug of war. Nor is the uttermost device and power of Satan inspired by any enmity against regenerate men as such. His enmity is against God as it has been since his fall in the unknown ages past, and against the believer only on the ground that he has partaken of the divine nature. The "fiery darts" of the wicked one are aimed at God alone. To possess the priceless indwelling presence of the divine nature is to become so identified with God that His enemy becomes the enemy of the one who is saved.

Solemn, therefore, is the divine revelation that the wisest of all created beings, and the most powerful, is ceasing not to study the strategy by which he may snare the child of God, and, were it in his power, to bring that one to destruction. How unconcerned, unconscious, and ignorant Christians are! How ungrateful they are, because of their limited understanding, for the divine deliverance wrought in their behalf every hour of every day! Yet, how much of defeat, especially in the spiritual realm, is suffered by all who are saved because of their failure to wage their warfare in "the power of his might," who alone can give victory, and to "put on the whole armour of God"! No more vital injunction was ever addressed to the Christian than that he must "be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might." He must put on the whole armor of God that he may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil (Eph. 6:10–11 —on the meaning of *wiles* cf. Eph. 4:14). Faith, it has been seen, is the only way of victory over the world and the flesh, but it is equally certain and according to the Word of God that faith is the only way of victory over the power of Satan. How assuring is the word, "Greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4)! Even Michael the archangel, when contending with Satan, did not in his own

strength bring a “railing accusation” against him, but said, “The Lord rebuke thee” (Jude 1:9). True, James states, “Resist the devil, and he will flee from you”; but that is a word of admonition to those who have first submitted themselves unto God (James 4:7). Likewise, Peter declares in reference to Satan, “whom resist stedfast in the faith” (1 Pet. 5:9; cf. 2 Cor. 10:3–5; Phil. 2:13; 4:13; John 15:5).

Quite apart from human opinion or experience which is of a contrary nature, it must be concluded that, in his threefold conflict, there is nothing but defeat and failure in the path of the Christian should he not pursue the way of faith or dependence upon the Spirit of God. The child of God must “fight the good fight of faith.” His responsibility is not to war with his enemies in his own strength, but rather to maintain the ever triumphant attitude of faith.

IV. The Threefold Provision

In recognition of the believer’s conflict while in the world, God has, in marvelous grace, provided a threefold prevention against the Christian’s sin. If the Christian sins, it will be in spite of these provisions. These great requisites are a revelation found in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament.

1. The Word of God. The Psalmist states, “Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee” (Ps. 119:11), and in 2 Timothy 3:16–17 it is declared, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.” It is as His Word abides in the believer that he is in the place of spiritual achievement (John 15:7). There is little hope for victory in daily life on the part of those believers who, being ignorant of the Word of God, do not know the nature of their conflict or the deliverance God has provided. Over against this, there is no estimating the sanctifying power of the Word of God. Our Savior prayed, “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth” (John 17:17).

2. The Interceding Christ. Again, the Psalmist records, “The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want” (Ps. 23:1), and the New Testament revelation

of the interceding Christ is also broad enough to include His shepherd care. Little did Peter know of the testing that was before him or of his own pitiful weakness, but Christ had anticipated it all. He could say in assurance to Peter, "I have prayed for thee" (Luke 22:32), as in fact, He prays for all whom He has saved. It is probable that His High Priestly prayer recorded in John, chapter 17, is but the beginning of His prayer for "those whom thou hast given me," which prayer is now continued without ceasing by Him in heaven. On the ground of this unceasing intercession, the believer is assured of his security forever. In Romans 8:34 it is written that there is none to condemn since, among other efficacious forces, Christ "maketh intercession for us." In like manner, the writer to the Hebrews discloses the truth that Christ as Priest, in contrast to the death-doomed priests of the old order, will never again be subject to death. He therefore has an unchangeable or unending priesthood; and, because He abideth forever as a sufficient priest, He is able to save eternally (or as long as He remains a priest) those who come unto God by Him, since He ever lives to make intercession for them (Heb. 7:23–25). This guarantee of abiding endurance, based, as it is, upon the absolute efficacy of the interceding Christ, is final and complete. But, as has been seen, the intercession of Christ is ever a preventative against failure as well as a security for the children of God.

3. The Indwelling Spirit. The saints of the old order were reminded that it is "not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" (Zech. 4:6). So, as has been indicated before, every defense and protection as well as every victory for the Christian is dependent upon the power of the indwelling Spirit.

V. The Twofold Effect of the Christian's Sin

In its effect, the Christian's sin reaches into two spheres, namely, (a) himself and (b) God. There could be no question about the relative importance of these two results of the Christian's sin. That which is so evidently of least import will be considered first.

1. The Effect of the Christian's Sin Upon Himself. Though including in its realities all that is experiential, this phase of the doctrine of the Christian's sin is secondary, indeed, to the crucial and all-determining

aspects of the doctrine which are confronted when contemplating the effect of the Christian's sin upon God. The First Epistle by John is the portion of the Scriptures which records the damaging effect of the Christian's sin upon himself. In that Epistle, believers are contemplated as children in the Father's family and household, and the effect of sin on the child of God is there seen to be, not the dissolution of the abiding fact of sonship, but rather an injury to those normal experiences and relationships, exalted and glorious, which are wholly within the family circle. Inaccuracy of doctrine on this point cannot but impose immeasurable misconceptions of the truth, and the injury will be inflicted within the realm of the believer's experience wherein all spiritual suffering originates and thrives. The Apostle John enumerates at least seven distressing experiential penalties which together constitute the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself.

First, the light of God, which in normal conditions falls upon the believer's mind and upon his path, is turned to darkness (1 John 1:6). John dwells particularly upon the truth that the believer may walk either in the dark or in the light. As he walks in the light other realities are secured which enter into his spiritual blessing, but specifically the Apostle states that when walking in the light there is no occasion of stumbling (2:10).

Second, in 1 John 1:4 it is implied that sin in the Christian will result in the loss of joy. This joy is none other than the imparted, celestial joy of Christ (John 15:11; Gal. 5:22). The prayer of David in the midst of his confession of his sin was, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation" (Ps. 51:12). It is not the salvation but rather its normal, celestial joy which is lost when the Christian sins.

Third, the loss of fellowship with the Father and with His Son is inevitable for those among the children of God who walk in darkness. On the other hand, the riches of His presence is the experience of those who walk in the light (1:3, 6–7).

Fourth, the loss of the experience of imparted divine love will be the portion of those Christians who do not keep the Word of God and who love this world (2:5, 15–17; 4:12). The perfecting within the child of God of divine compassion is one of the greatest themes of this Epistle and the experience of that perfected love is supreme amid all spiritual ecstasy.

Fifth, the loss of peace, according to 3:4–10, is another penalty which the believer must suffer when he sins. This passage, previously considered,

states that the Christian cannot sin lawlessly without that anguish of heart which is the total loss of peace. It is on the ground of this reaction to sin on the part of the Christian, that he is to be distinguished from those that are unregenerate who sin lawlessly and without conscience (3:10).

Sixth, the loss of "confidence" toward God in the experience of prayer is also certain for the believer who sins (3:19–22). This, indeed, is serious, and is immediately the conscious experience of all who fail to do the will of God.

Seventh, the loss of "confidence" at the coming of Christ (2:28) is to be anticipated by Christians who sin. Either to have "boldness" (4:17) or to be "ashamed" at His coming are two possible experiences widely separated the one from the other.

The truth regarding the Father's discipline or chastisement of His unyielding child—a doctrine of great importance and its understanding is most vital to each Christian—could be introduced here with propriety. It is reserved, however, for the next chapter which deals with the divine punishment where some vital distinction may be drawn more at length between chastisement and punishment.

Other aspects of spiritual power and blessing which are sacrificed by the Christian when he sins might be named. All the gracious fruit and ministry of the indwelling Spirit are hindered when the Spirit is grieved because of sin. By all this it may be seen that sin is a tragedy of immeasurable proportions in the Christian's experience. The cure which is divinely provided is both natural, in view of the believer's relationships in the household of God, and explicit.

The responsibility resting upon the unregenerate man who would avail himself of the forgiveness of *all* trespasses and be saved is expressed in the one all-inclusive word—*believe,* while the responsibility resting upon the regenerate man who would be forgiven and restored to right relations with God is expressed in the one word—*confess.* These two words are each specifically adapted to the situation, relationships, and circumstances with which they are associated. Untold confusion follows when unregenerate men are told to *confess* as a condition of forgiveness and salvation, which confusion is equalled when a regenerate man is told to *believe* as a condition of securing a renewal of right relations to God. Hymnology is sometimes misleading at this point. By such hymns, words are put into the lips of the

unsaved which encourage them to conceive of themselves as wanderers who are returning to God. As a matter of fact, the unregenerate man has never before been in any favorable relation to God. When, as a part of his salvation, he is forgiven, it is unto a hitherto unexperienced *union* with God which abides forever; but when the Christian is forgiven it is unto the restoration of *communion* with God which may be broken again all too soon. The saints of all the ages have returned to the blessings of their covenant relation to God by the confession of their sin. This, however, is far removed from those terms upon which they entered the covenant at the beginning. The loss of the blessing within the covenant is different, indeed, from the loss of the covenant relation itself. In the case of a believer related to God by the New Covenant made in His blood, restoration to communion, as always, is by confession of sin to God. We read in 1 John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Similarly, in 1 Corinthians 11:31–32 it is stated that "if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world." Since confession and self-judgment refer to the same action on the part of the believer, these passages emphasize the same important truth. Confession and self-judgment are the outward expression of heart-repentance; and repentance, which is a change of mind or purpose, brings the sin-burdened Christian back into agreement with God. While practicing sin, he was opposed to the will and character of God; by repentance, expressed to God in the confession of sin and self-judgment, he returns to agreement with God. "Two cannot walk together, except they be agreed," nor can the Christian have fellowship with God who is Light and at the same time be walking in darkness (1 John 1:6). To walk in the light is not to *become* the light, which would mean attainment to infinite holiness. God alone is Light. Nor does walking in the light mean that one never does wrong. It is rather that when the searchlight, which God is, penetrates the heart and life and discloses that which is contrary to His will, the wrong thus disclosed is by a true heart-repentance at once confessed and judged before God. Assurance is given to the believer that when thus adjusted to the light (which is "walking in the light"), the sin is forgiven and its pollution cleansed by the blood of Christ. Both 1 John 1:8 and 10 are in the nature of a parenthesis. The word of assurance presented in 1:7 is continued

in 1:9 which states that, “If we confess our sins [which is adjustment to God who is the Light], he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” Confession of sin, it should be observed, is first and always to God and is to be extended to others only as they have been directly injured by the sin. So, likewise, this divine forgiveness and cleansing are not said to be acts of divine mercy and kindness, being wrought rather on the basis of absolute righteousness which is made possible through the fact that the penalty which the sin merits has fallen upon the Substitute—God’s provided Lamb. Since the Substitute has endured the penalty, God is seen to be *just* rather than *merciful* when He justifies the unsaved who do no more than to “believe in Jesus” (Rom. 3:26), and *just* rather than *merciful* when He forgives the Christian who has sinned, on no other condition than that he “confess” his sin (1 John 1:9). In forgiving the Christian who confesses his sin, God is “faithful” to His eternal character and purpose and is “just” in so doing because of the penalty which Christ has endured. The basis for this provision whereby the Christian may be forgiven and cleansed in the faithfulness and justice of God is found in the declaration which consummates this context (1 John 2:2), where it is said that “he is the propitiation for our sins.” Since this context is concerned only with the sins of Christians, the great aspect of propitiation for a lost world is mentioned here only incidentally. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the fact that Christ *is* the propitiation for *our* sins. By His death He has rendered God propitious and free to forgive and cleanse the Christian who confesses his sin.

It is evident that the divine forgiveness of the believer is household in its character. It contemplates, not the once-for-all forgiveness which is a part of salvation (Col. 2:13), but the forgiveness of the one who already and permanently is a member of the household and family of God. Vital union with God, which is secured by Christ for the believer, has not been and cannot be broken (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). This renewal is unto fellowship and communion with God. At no point in Christian doctrine is the specific and unique character of the present grace-relationship to God more clearly seen than in household forgiveness. The divine dealing with men under grace, like any complete economy of government, provides at least four essential features: (a) a setting forth of the manner of life which is desired—this is contained in the grace injunctions of the New Testament; (b) a penalty for

wrongdoing—this has been pointed out above under the seven warnings contained in the First Epistle by John; (c) a cure for the wrong with specific revelation of its terms—this has been seen to be a genuine heart-repentance expressed in confession of sin and self-judgment; and (d) a motive for right action.

Identification of the divinely conceived reason for right action under the governmental economy of grace is of supreme import since the motivating principle under grace is diametrically opposite to the motivating principles set forth in all legal systems of government. Under a legal system, a thing is done that standing and merit may be secured. The legal aspect appears in the form of a contract or necessity imposed. Under the grace economy, a thing is done in recognition of the fact that perfect standing and merit have already been secured through the imputed merit of Christ. This motive is gracious in character and void of all contracts or necessities. Earlier in this discussion it was demonstrated that the child of God, being in Christ, is justified before God forever, to which standing human merit could add nothing. True to the grace motive for right action and in accordance with his household relationships, which are the distinctive relationships under grace, the believer is directed to forgive those who injure him on the basis of the fact that God has already freely forgiven him. Of this we read in Ephesians 4:32, “And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you.” And again in Colossians 3:13, “Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.” This, indeed, is far removed from a system of divine dealing in which the blessing of forgiveness is made to depend, in the most absolute terms, on the offender’s forgiveness of others. As a feature of one legal system we read, “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses” (Matt. 6:14–15). It is a serious error when one, who through saving faith in Christ has been for Christ’s sake once-for-all forgiven all trespasses, assumes the attitude before God which implies that he is not forgiven until for his own sake or merit he has forgiven those who have trespassed against him. Doubtless both Ephesians 4:32 and Colossians 3:13 are not referring to oft-repeated household forgiveness, but rather to once-for-all forgiveness accompanying salvation. However,

Matthew 6:14–15, being Christ's own enlargement on a clause in the kingdom prayer which He taught His disciples, is often confused with household forgiveness. Of various distinctions to be observed between the kingdom aspect of forgiveness and household forgiveness, but three will be mentioned here:

First, in the one case (Matt. 6:12), forgiveness is made to depend to some degree upon *asking* for it, which implies that propitiation is not complete, or that God must be besought and persuaded to forgive. In the other case (1 John 1:9), forgiveness is made to depend on *confession*, which implies that God is wholly propitious and awaiting only that adjustment to His holy will which confession provides. It is doubtful in the light of 1 John 2:2 with 1:9 if a Christian is to ask for forgiveness for present sins any more than he was called upon to ask for once-for-all forgiveness when he was saved. When saved he was forgiven upon *believing*, and, being saved, he will be forgiven upon *confessing*. Both confessing and believing are efficacious and represent the uncomplicated human obligation in their respective spheres apart from human pleading since Christ is "the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2). No objection could be raised against the declaration that 1 John 1:1–2:2 is the central passage in the Scriptures on household forgiveness, and it is far from accidental and of more than passing significance that in this context neither by precept, nor by example, nor by implication is asking constituted any part of the believer's obligation when in need of forgiveness.

Second, the second indication that Matthew 6:14–15 is not to be classed as household forgiveness may be introduced by asking the usual hypothetical, abstract question, namely, Will God forgive a Christian who does not first forgive those who have sinned against that Christian? The answer need not be complicated. Unforgiveness in a Christian is a sin which calls for confession, and when it is confessed it is forgiven by God because it *is* confessed and not because the unforgiving Christian has merited forgiveness of the sin by a self-changed heart. In fact, no one is able of himself to command a forgiving spirit in his own heart which by nature is unforgiving. Tenderheartedness and longsuffering are divine characteristics which are secured not by human effort but by faith in the indwelling Spirit whose power and fruit are available to those who, having confessed all known sin including an unforgiving heart, are empowered unto every right

attitude before God. The principles and requirements set forth in Matthew 6:14–15 will obtain in the kingdom, but under grace relationships the deeper question is raised and answered: How may a heart of compassion be secured at all? The answer is that all sin must first be confessed and that a forgiving heart is then possible only through the enabling power of God.

Third, the place and importance of human merit is a feature which serves to demonstrate the fact that Matthew 6:14–15 is not household or grace forgiveness. The forgiveness required in this passage precedes and determines divine forgiveness and is therefore meritorious in character; whereas 1 John 1:9 suggests a situation in which all supposed merit is abandoned in abject confession of failure and grace reigns, based, as it must be, upon that propitiation which Christ is.

The confusion which may arise through failure to distinguish truths which differ is illustrated in the case of certain teachers who, in one instance, earnestly contend that, according to Matthew 6:14–15, no Christian will be forgiven who does not himself forgive, and, in another instance, as earnestly contend that the Christian, in conformity to the divine pattern, must not forgive those who have injured him until they are penitent. The logic of these positions is obvious: If a Christian can be forgiven only when he forgives and if he must not forgive until those who have injured him are penitent, then he cannot himself be forgiven of God for his own sins until *all* those who have injured him repent—a dubious prospect indeed, to say the least.

The obligation of a Christian toward his brother in Christ is on a plane so exalted that none could hope to attain to it by dependence upon his own resources, which dependence is the substance of the merit relationship. Who, indeed, could by unaided human strength comply with Christ's new commandment: "Love one another, as I have loved you" (John 13:34; 15:12)? Each Christian's obligation toward every other Christian is expressed in such terms as "longsuffering, forbearing one another in love" (Eph. 4:2); "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. 4:32); "kindness, … longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity [love], which is the bond of perfectness" (which is the goal of a spiritual life—Col. 3:12–14).

Such high standards cannot be attained or maintained apart from the power of the indwelling Spirit. If they are thus wrought of God, they are not based on merit, and Matthew 6:14-15, because it is based on merit, is, in the *light* of these standards, seen to be foreign to the divine administration under grace.

There are yet three important portions of the Scriptures to be mentioned bearing on the fact that God has always dealt specifically and constantly with the defilement of His covenant people. (a) In Numbers 19:1–22 the ordinance of the law of Jehovah provided for the sacrifice and burning of a red heifer and specified that the ashes of the heifer should be preserved, and, when mingled with water, and as occasion might arise, should serve for the cleansing by sprinkling of any in Israel who had become unclean. The ashes of the heifer preserved in a vessel and serving over a long period of time for cleansing became a type of the perpetual cleansing of the child of God by the blood of Christ (1 John 1:7, 9). (b) In Exodus 30:17–21 the record is given of Jehovah's commandment to Moses concerning the laver of brass which, by the appointment of Jehovah, stood at the entrance of the holy place and at this laver the priests were to bathe their hands and feet before each service in the holy place. Failure on the part of the priest to comply with this statute merited the penalty of death. The priest, though born to his office, being of the house of Aaron and of the tribe of Levi and having been completely bathed ceremonially by the high priest when inducted into his priestly service, was, nevertheless, compelled to observe the ceremonial bathing of his hands and feet—the members which contact the defilement of the world—before every service. The Old Testament priest is a type of the New Testament believer and the constant bathing on the part of the Old Testament priest typifies the constant cleansing of the New Testament believer who is born to his position by the new birth and is once and for all washed by the washing of regeneration (Titus 3:5; cf. 1 Cor. 6:11). (c) In John 13:1–17 the record is given of the bathing of the disciples' feet by Christ. By the use of the word νίπτω Christ distinguishes the bathing He was performing as a *partial* bathing and quite different indeed from the *whole* bath, to which He refers in verse 10 by the use of the word λούω. This partial bathing implies that these disciples, excepting Judas whom Christ dismisses from the company, were wholly bathed and had no further need in the way of cleansing save the washing of the feet. Similarly, this

partial bathing was unto the maintenance of fellowship as indicated by the words, “If I wash thee not, thou hast no part [μέρος] with me” (verse 8).

It may be concluded, therefore, that there has been a continual cleansing in addition to the once-for-all, initial cleansing which God has provided and prescribed for His people in other ages, and that, in the present age, a true repentance or change of mind with its outward expression, which is confession, represents the sole human responsibility; but, on the divine side, the forgiveness and cleansing of the believer is made possible only through the *propitiatory* blood of Christ.

2. The Effect of the Christian’s Sin Upon God. Far deeper in their import are the issues related to the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God than those related to the effect of the Christian’s sin upon himself. Rationalistic systems of theology have contended that, since God is infinitely holy, the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God must be that salvation is forfeited and the cure for that situation is a re-regeneration of the one who has sinned. Since so-called lesser sins are so constantly the experience of the believer, it has been necessary to attribute only to great and flagrant sins the power to unsave. Apparently the generous nature and forbearance of God is depended upon to pass over or forgive the lesser sins. However, the Word of God lends itself in no way to the support of the notion that some sins are good and some bad, or that God can forgive apart from the substitutionary work of Christ. Sin, even in its inoffensive form, is exceedingly sinful in the sight of God and, were it not for the efficacious blood of Christ, would have the power to separate a Christian from God forever. But since Christ’s sacrifice for sin extends to *all* sin, sin’s power to separate a believer from God is annulled, though, as has been seen, there may be for the believer because of his sin the tragic loss of fellowship with God, of celestial joy, confidence, and peace.

Having presented the effect of the Christian’s sin upon himself and having stated the human responsibility in the directing of its cure, the Apostle John goes on (1 John 2:1) to present the fact that there is also a divine remedy for the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God, but wholly apart from any human responsibility or cooperation. God alone can solve His own problem which the Christian’s sin creates in its relation to His holiness and governmental authority. The salvation which is offered through

Christ is eternal, which means that every aspect of possible condemnation that might arise will be anticipated and met. The Christian can cooperate in no way in the sphere of the provision of a righteous ground either for his salvation or safe-keeping. The one verse (1 John 2:1) presents a vast field of closely related doctrines. We read: “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not [be not sinning]. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” Five contributive aspects of truth are to be discerned in this verse:

First, “My little children.” By this salutation it is evidenced that the message is addressed only to the children of God. It must be emphasized that the safe-keeping which the passage reveals and the divine working to that end have to do only with those who are born again. There is an ever increasing company of professors of religion who, it would seem, may never have passed from death unto life. What this passage discloses applies only to those who are saved.

Second, “These things write I unto you, that ye sin not” (be not sinning). Reference is probably made in this clause to that which has gone before as well as to that which follows. As anticipated by the Apostle, the effect of this message upon true believers will be to deter them from the practice of sin. Eternal security for all who are saved is abundantly assured in the New Testament and nowhere more fully than in this verse, yet the doctrine is by many thought to provide a license to sin. In opposition to this rationalistic notion, the Apostle here presents the great fact of eternal security as a motive for not sinning, and the fact of eternal security when intelligently grasped by the believer has ever proved in practical experience to be just such a restraint.

Third, “If any man sin.” There can be little doubt that the Apostle is referring to the same limited group of those who are saved. The phrase “little children” which constitutes the salutation and the word “we” which follows give sufficient evidence that only saved persons are included in these benefits. The fact that Christians do sin is patent. The source of sin in the Christian, as has been observed, is the sin nature and the force of its tendency is seen in that the impulse to sin often rides over all restraint. God has provided three restraining factors—His Word (Ps. 119:11), His indwelling Spirit (Gal. 5:16), and the interceding Christ (Luke 22:31–32)—but He has also revealed that the child of God may, if he persists, disregard

to some extent these restraining forces. However, when the believer's will is in agreement with the will of God, these same divinely provided restraints become the very factors which enable the believer to live unto God.

Fourth, "We have an advocate with the Father." The designation, Παράκλητος, is used of both the Holy Spirit (John 16:7) and of Christ (1 John 2:1). When Christ referred to the Spirit as "another" Παράκλητος, He implied that He Himself was then to the disciples a true helper. However, His present ministry in heaven as Παράκλητος assumes a legal aspect. As Advocate He espouses the cause of another in the open court. Christ *defends* rather than prosecutes those whom He has saved. The scene is of a court in session. The Father is the Judge. In Revelation 12:10 it is stated that Satan ceases not day and night to accuse the brethren before God. The issue before the court is one of actual sin on the part of the child of God. Since God is infinitely holy, He must act in absolute righteousness toward all offenders. The accuser of the brethren is presenting no false charges. It should be observed that, as Intercessor, Christ contemplates and supports the believer in the sphere of the believer's weakness, immaturity, and ignorance; but, as Advocate, He confronts the most serious situation that could ever arise concerning a child in the Father's household. As Advocate He defends the believer when charged with actual sin. This He does *while* the believer is sinning and not sometime afterwards. The assurance is given that, if a Christian sins, he *has* an Advocate with the Father. It might be supposed by some that the Advocate is begging the Father to be lenient toward the offender; but God cannot be lenient toward sin. Likewise, it might be supposed that the Advocate is making excuses for the one He defends; but there are no excuses. In like manner, it might be supposed that the Advocate is able to confuse the issue and make out a case that would divert the natural course of justice; but that unworthy conception is answered in the very title which He gains as Advocate, which title is nowhere else applied to Him.

Fifth, "Jesus Christ the righteous," is the title which He gains as Advocate. Thus it is disclosed that the thing which the Advocate does, not only saves the offender from the holy judgments of God, but that defense is wrought upon a ground so equitable that the Advocate, because of His advocacy, is given the title, Jesus Christ *the Righteous.* This title does not refer to Christ's own holy character, which is righteous to an infinite degree;

it rather refers to the righteous basis upon which the offender is delivered by the Advocate—a deliverance wrought in full view of the unalterable demands of holiness and in spite of the truthful accusations of Satan. As Advocate in heaven and in behalf of a Christian who is sinning, Christ presents the evidence of His own death and proves the fact that He bore that sin on the cross. The removal of the penalty from the believer on the ground of the Advocate's having borne it is a transaction of unsurpassed equity.

There is no appeal that can be made to the child of God that he refrain from sin, which could be more effective than that which results from even a partial knowledge of all that his sin imposes on the Advocate in heaven. Such knowledge does not tend to carelessness, nor does the deliverance wrought by the Advocate lower the standards of the holy judgments of God. The child of God is preserved by the abiding, propitiatory value of the death of Christ. Here, as in the case of the divine freedom to deal with the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself, the effect of his sin upon God is also annulled by the fact that, as the context goes on to say, "He is the propitiation for our sins."

It may be concluded, therefore, that the cure of the Christian's sin is based upon that aspect of the propitiatory work of Christ which contemplates the Christian's sin, and, on that basis, the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself may be removed on no other ground than that he confess his sin; and that the effect of the Christian's sin upon God is cured by the same propitiatory work of Christ, but upon no human terms whatsoever, since Christ, as Savior, undertakes not only to *save* but to *keep* those whom He saves.

As a consummation of the specific theme, the Christian's personal sin, it may be restated that sin is as evil when committed by a Christian as when committed by the unsaved, that the Christian sins against greater light, against a more intimate relation to God, from a higher position, being in Christ, and against a more exalted standard of holy living which is no less than that which pertains to a heavenly citizenship and a manifestation of Christ's own character. It is also declared that the Christian is more beset than the unregenerate since he wages a conflict against the world, the flesh, and the devil. It has also been pointed out that the Christian has the divinely provided help which is contributed by the Word of God, the interceding Christ, and the indwelling Spirit. And, finally, the Christian's sin reacts

upon himself to his spiritual injury, which may be cured by confession of his sin to God, and it reacts against God, who, being propitious through the death of Christ for the Christian's sin, continues the Christian as His child through that infinite grace which provides a righteous satisfaction for every wrong.

VI. The Christian's Sin Nature

Though the *fact* of the sin nature has been attended at length in Chapter XIX, it yet remains to consider the divine remedy for that nature. That there is no provided remedy for it as pertains to the unregenerate would hardly be disputed. The whole divine revelation respecting the remedy is exclusively a message to believers. In approaching the truth respecting the remedy, a brief survey will first be given of the origin, character, and propagation of this nature.

As a faithful warning, God said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or, *dying thou shalt die* (Gen. 2:17). Though his physical death was delayed for centuries, Adam died spiritually on the day in which he disobeyed and repudiated God. The whole character of his being was abruptly changed; it was not merely that he was *charged* with the guilt of sin, but he was *changed* in every part of his being. He who was, in his creation, satisfying to his Creator became a degenerate and depraved man in himself, capable of generating only after his kind, and through fallen Adam a spiritually dead race has been propagated who are blighted by a death which is none other than separation of the soul and spirit from God. Indicative of this great change in Adam, he is seen hiding from God, as a confession of his own change of heart, and, likewise, the record is given of a divine expulsion from the garden, with other penalties, as an expression of the judgment of God. No longer did God come down and walk with Adam in the cool of the day. This spiritually dead condition, which is termed a fallen, or Adamic, nature, is transmitted without diminution from father to son throughout all generations.

That Christians are wont to sin and do sin is observable on every hand. This is equally true of those who, through erroneous teaching, have been encouraged to profess that they have attained unto sinless perfection. In arriving at an understanding of the problem of the source from which sin

proceeds in a Christian, and the issues involved in its cure, it is essential to recognize the meaning and force of three terms which are employed in the New Testament:

1. "Flesh" (σάρξ). On the precise meaning of this term, Bishop Moule writes:

> In New Testament usage, on the whole, this word bears in each place (where its meaning is not merely literal) one of two meanings. It denotes either (a) human nature as conditioned by the body; (e.g. ix.3, 5, 9; 2 Cor. 7:5, &c. &c.;) or (b) human nature as conditioned by the Fall, or in other words by the dominion of sin, which then began, and which works so largely through the conditions of *bodily* life that those conditions are almost, in language, identified with sinfulness. … In the *first* connexion "the flesh" may bear a neutral, or a holy, meaning; (John 1:14;) in the *second*, it means a state which is essentially evil, and which may be described with practical correctness as (1) the state of man unregenerate, and (2), in the regenerate, the state of that element of the being which still resists grace. For manifestly (see Gal. 5:17) "the flesh" *is* an element still in the regenerate, not only in the sense of *corporeal* conditions, but in that of *sinful* conditions. But, in the latter sense, they are no longer *characterized* by it; they are not "fleshly," because the *dominant* element is now not "the flesh," but the renewed will, energized by the Divine Spirit.—*Cambridge Bible, Romans,* p. 140

The life impulses and desires are called "lusts of the flesh." "Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16, R.V. See also, Eph. 2:3; 2 Pet. 2:18; 1 John 2:16; Rom. 13:14). That the Bible use of the word *lust* is not limited to inordinate desires is evidenced by the fact that the Holy Spirit is said to "lust against the flesh," according to the next verse in this context (see, also, James 4:5). The Scriptures are still more explicit concerning the breadth of the meaning of this word. Reference is made to "fleshly wisdom (2 Cor. 1:12), "fleshy tables of the heart" (2 Cor. 3:3), and "fleshly mind" (Col. 2:18, cf. Rom. 8:6). The Apostle does not say that either his body or nature are "fleshly"; he says, "I am carnal" (fleshly, Rom. 7:14), and "In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). The unregenerate self is, within itself, hopelessly evil and condemned; but it is subject to the present control and ultimate transformation provided for in the grace and power of God.

Into this whole "natural man" a new divine nature is imparted when the individual is saved. Salvation is more than a *change of heart.* It is more than a transformation of the old. It is a regeneration or creation of something wholly new which is possessed in conjunction with the old nature so long as

the child of God is in this body. The presence of two opposing natures (not two personalities) in one individual results in conflict. “The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other” (Gal. 5:17). There is no hint that this divine restraint upon the flesh will ever be unnecessary so long as the Christian is in this body; but the Bible bears a clear testimony that the believer may experience an unbroken “walk in the Spirit,” and “not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” To secure all of this, no removal of the “flesh” is promised. The human spirit, soul, and body abide, and the victory is gained over the “flesh” by the power of the indwelling Spirit.

2. “Old Man” (παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος). Similarly, Bishop Moule begins his study of this word in Romans thus: “Cp., for illustrative passages, 7:22; 2 Cor. 4:16; Eph. 3:16, 4:22, 24; Col. 3:9; 1 Pet. 3:4. In view of these the word ‘*self*’ in its popular use (‘a man’s true self,’ &c.) appears to be a fair equivalent for ‘*man*’ here. Meyer here gives ‘*unser altes Ich, ’* (‘our old Ego’). Here the Apostle views the Christian before his union to Christ as (figuratively, of course,) *another person;* so profoundly different was his position before God, as a person unconnected with Christ” (*Ibid.*, p. 114).

This term is used only three times in the New Testament. Once it has to do with the present *position* of the “old man” through the death of Christ (Rom. 6:6). In the other two passages (Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 3:9–10) the fact that the “old man” has been put off forever is made the basis of an appeal for a holy manner of life.

In Romans 6:6 it is written: “Knowing this, that our old man is [was] crucified with him.” There can be no reference here to the *experience* of the Christian; it is rather a cocrucifixion “with him” and most evidently at the time and place when and where Christ was crucified. In the context this passage follows immediately upon the statement concerning the individual’s transfer in federal headship from the first Adam to the Last Adam (Rom. 5:12–21). The first Adam, as perpetuated in the believer, was judged in the crucifixion of Christ. The “old man,” the fallen nature received from Adam, *was* “crucified with him.” This cocrucifixion, it will be seen, is of the greatest importance, on the divine side, in making possible a true deliverance from the power of the “old man.”

In the second passage in which the term “old man” is used, the fact that the old man is already crucified with Christ is the basis for an appeal: “That ye [did] put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye [did] put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4:22–24).

In the third passage the position suggests again the corresponding experience, “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him” (Col. 3:9–10). *Positionally* the “old man” has been put off forever. *Experimentally* the “old man” remains as an active force in the life and can be controlled only by the power of God. There is no Biblical ground for a distinction between the Adamic nature and a “human nature.” Unregenerate people have but one nature, while those who are regenerate have two natures. There is but one fallen nature, which is from Adam, and one new nature, which is from God. The “old man,” then, is the Adamic nature which has been judged in the death of Christ. It still abides with the Christian as an active principle in his life, and his experimental victory over it will be realized only through a definite reliance upon the indwelling Spirit. The “old man” is a part, but not all, of the “flesh.”

3. “Sin” (ἁμαρτία). The third Bible word related to the *source* of evil in the child of God is “sin.” In certain portions of the Scriptures, notably Romans 6:1–8:13 and 1 John 1:1–2:2, there is an important distinction between two uses of the word “sin.” The two meanings will be obvious if it is remembered that the word sometimes refers to the Adamic nature, and sometimes to evil resulting from that nature. Sin, as a nature, is the *source* of sin which is committed. Sin is the root which bears its own fruit in sin which is evil conduct. *Sin* is what the individual is by birth, while *sins* are the things he does in life.

There is abundant Biblical testimony to the fact that the “flesh,” the “old man,” or “sin,” is the source of evil. The child of God has a blessed “treasure” in the possession of the “new man” indwelling him, but he has this treasure in an earthen vessel. The earthen vessel is the “body of our humiliation” (2 Cor. 4:7; Phil. 3:21, R.V.).

Personality—the ego—remains the same individuality through all the operations of grace, though it experiences the greatest possible advancement, transformation, and regeneration from its lost estate in Adam, to the positions and possessions of a son of God in Christ. That which was, is said to be forgiven, justified, saved, and receives the new divine nature which is eternal life. That which was, is born again and becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus, though it remains the same personality which was born of certain parents after the flesh. Like physical death, the Adamic nature, which is the perpetuator of spiritual death, is not now dismissed, but, in the case of the redeemed, it is subject to gracious divine provisions whereby its injuries may be restrained. Salvation from the *power* of sin for the Christian, like salvation from the *penalty* of sin for the unsaved, depends upon two factors, namely, the divine provision and the human appropriation.

a. The Divine Provision. In each of these aspects of salvation the righteous basis for the divine provision is found in the death of Christ. That lost men might be saved from the penalty of sin and unto eternal glory, "Christ died for our sins" (1 Cor. 15:3); that regenerated men might be saved from the power of sin unto a holy walk, Christ "died unto sin" (Rom. 6:10). Christ's death *for* sin provides a finished work of God upon which He is able to remain just while He justifies the one who believes on Christ (Rom. 3:26). Christ's death *unto* sin provides a finished work of God upon which He is able, by the unceasing energy of His Spirit, to advance the sanctification of those from among the saved who "walk in the Spirit." Since Christ died for sin, there is, therefore, now no condemnation for those who believe, their *standing* and *safety* being perfected forever in Christ. Since Christ died unto sin, there is a walk upon a new principle made possible for those who are saved whereby their present *state* and *sanctity* may be according to the will of God for them.

The New Creation, organic union between the resurrected Christ and the believer, is based, according to the Scriptures, upon the substitutionary work of Christ in all its aspects and is accomplished by the regenerating work of the Spirit whereby Christ is begotten in the believer and by the baptizing work of the Spirit whereby the believer is placed in Christ. The words of Christ, "ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20), announce both

aspects of the Spirit's ministry in relation to the New Creation. These great transformations are wrought by the Spirit at the moment of, and as a part of, salvation. Concerning the placing of the believer in Christ, it is said: "For by one Spirit are we all [including each and every one] baptized into one body … and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13); and, again, "For as many of you [with reference to all who are saved] as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27).

When seeking to apprehend what is wrought by the Spirit's baptizing ministry, it is essential to determine the precise meaning of βαπτίζω. This is one of the great words of the New Testament and is used in relation to both *real* and *ritual* baptism—that is, both Spirit and water baptism. Being thus employed, whatever meaning is assigned to it in the one case should, reasonably, be assigned to it in the other case. Like βάπτω (used but twice in its primary meaning—*to dip*—Luke 16:24; John 13:26, and but once in its secondary meaning—*to stain,* or *dye,* by whatever means—Rev. 19:13; cf. Isa. 63:3 where the same event and situation is described), βαπτίζω is subject to both a primary and a secondary usage, and not a few exegetes contend that its New Testament usage is restricted to its secondary meaning. The primary meaning, according to practically all authorities, is *to submerge* in a physical envelopment, or an *intusposition*, while the secondary may imply no more than that a person, a thing, or a power exercises a dominating or transforming influence over the object it is said to baptize. Thus, quite apart from an actual intusposition, it is possible for one to be baptized into repentance, into the remission of sins, into a name, into Moses, or into Christ. Baptism by the Spirit into Christ is far removed from a physical envelopment. βάπτω, like its English equivalent—*to dip*—implies both a putting in and a taking out, while βαπτίζω, like its English equivalent—*to submerge,* or *immerse*—implies only a putting in; and, in the case of a baptism into Christ, no removal is either desirable or possible. The one thus joined to Christ partakes of all that Christ is, with respect to meritorious standing, and all that Christ has done, with respect to substitution—His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection. Christ being the righteousness of God, the believer, when thus joined to Him, is "made" the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. 5:21), and, therefore, is "made" accepted in the Beloved (Eph. 1:6), and by the blood of Christ is "made nigh" (Eph. 2:13). Likewise, when, in His judgment of the believer's sin

nature, Christ has been crucified, has died, has been buried, and has been raised from the dead, the child of God, for whom Christ has thus wrought, is said to have been crucified, to have died, to have been buried, and to have been raised from the dead in his Substitute, and as completely as though he had himself personally experienced each feature of that judgment. This context (Rom. 6:1–14) is the central passage on sanctification, which is by the Spirit on the ground of Christ's death unto the sin nature. In ascertaining the precise facts concerning the basis upon which God is free to control the old nature, too much emphasis cannot be put upon the truth that the old nature in each believer is already judged in the death of Christ. The unregenerate man is dead *in* sins (Eph. 2:1), but the regenerate man is dead *to* sin (Rom. 6:2).

The passage opens thus: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin [we who have died to sin; so, also, vss. 7–8, 11; Col. 2:20; 3:3], live any longer therein?" It would not become the Christian as a child of God to do so, and it is not necessary for him to do so since he is now "dead to sin." He cannot plead the power of a tendency over which there is no control. He still has the tendency, and it is more than he can control; but God has provided the possibility of a deliverance from its power both by judging the old nature and by giving him the presence and power of the Spirit. The believer is dependent upon God alone for deliverance by His Spirit, but He could not deliver until the sin nature is righteously judged. This judgment He has accomplished, and He has also given to Christians the Spirit who is ever present and wholly able. Thus the necessity to sin is broken and saved ones are free to move on another plane and in the power of His resurrection life. The argument in this passage is based on this vital union by which believers are organically united to Christ through their baptism into His body. The passage continues, "Know ye not [or, are ye ignorant], that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" As certainly as Christians are in Him they partake of the *value* of His death. So, also, the passage states: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death" (cf. Col. 2:12). Thus the saved are actually partakers of His crucifixion (vs. 6), death (vs. 8), burial (vs. 4), and resurrection (vss. 4–5, 8) and as essentially as they would partake had they been crucified, dead, buried, and raised. Being baptized into Jesus Christ is the *substance* of

which cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection are *attributes.* One is the cause, while the others are the effects. All this is unto the realization of one great divine purpose. “That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life,” or by a new life-principle. The Christian’s *walk*, then, is the divine objective. Christ died in the believer’s stead. The judgment belonged to him, but Christ became his Substitute. The child of God is thus counted as a copartner in all that his Substitute did. What He did forever satisfied the righteous demands of God against the “old man” and opened the way for a walk well-pleasing to God (cf. 2 Cor. 5:15).

As the passage proceeds, this truth of copartnership in Christ is presented again and with greater detail: “For if [as] we have been planted [conjoined, united, grown together; the word is used but once in the New Testament] together in the likeness [i.e., oneness; see Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7] of his death, we shall be [now, and forever] also in the likeness of his resurrection.” Those saved are already conjoined to Christ by the baptism of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:12–13), which places them positionally beyond the judgments of sin and they are therefore free to enter the experience of the eternal power and victory of His resurrection. “Knowing this [because we know this], that our old man is [was] crucified with him [for the same divine purpose as stated before], that the body of sin might be destroyed [our power of expression is through the body. This fact is used as a figure concerning the manifestation of sin. The body is not destroyed, but sin’s power and means of expression may be *annulled.* See vs. 12], that henceforth we should not serve [be bondslaves to] sin [the ‘old man’]. For he that is dead is freed [justified] from sin [they who have once died to sin, as we have in our Substitute, now stand free from its legal claims]. Now if we be dead with Christ [or, as we died with Christ], we believe that we shall also live with him [not only in heaven, but *now.* There is as much certainty for the *life* in Him as there is certainty for the *death* in Him]: knowing [or, because we know] that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him [we are thereby encouraged to believe as much concerning ourselves]. For in that he died, he died unto sin [the nature] once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God” (and so the believer may live unto God).

As certainly as this passage does not enjoin self-crucifixion, self-death, self-burial, or self-resurrection, so certainly it does not enjoin a re-

enactment of two out of four of these divine accomplishments—burial and resurrection—by an ordinance, regardless of the meaning with which the ordinance is supposed to be invested. The only thing the believer is enjoined to do, in view of Christ's death unto the sin nature, is to *reckon* himself to be dead unto it; not, indeed, to reckon the nature to be dead, but to reckon himself, being in Christ and a partaker of all that Christ wrought in judgment of that nature, to be dead unto it. Apart from such reckoning, it is clearly implied that sin, as a living force, will reign in the mortal body (Rom. 6:11–12).

The fact that the sin nature is judged is a revelation of supreme importance and speaks of God's faithfulness in behalf of His saved ones, but He also reveals to them the knowledge of His measureless provision for their sanctification and daily life. The record concerning Christ's death unto the sin nature is not given merely to enlarge the individual's knowledge of historical facts; it is given that he may be assured that there is deliverance from the reigning power of sin, as once unbelievers were assured through the revelation of the fact that Christ died for their sins that there is salvation from the penalty of sin. The death of Christ *unto* sin is the ground of a great confidence. Thus it may be concluded that the divine provision for the believer's deliverance from the domination of the sin nature is twofold, namely, (a) a legal and righteous judgment of the sin nature and (b) the gift of the indwelling, victorious Spirit of God.

b. The Believer's Responsibility. In gaining a deliverance from the power of sin, the believer's responsibility is stated in one word—*faith* (a faith which not only reckons one to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God—Rom. 6:11—and which yields one's self unto God—Rom. 6:13). Naught else remains for him to do since, as above stated, God has provided the righteous ground upon which the deliverance may be wrought by the Spirit and has caused that same victorious Spirit to indwell the believer for this very purpose. The requirement is not an *act* of faith, such as once secured regeneration; it is an *attitude* of faith, which is renewed and pursued in every succeeding day. To walk by means of, or in dependence on, the Spirit is to be delivered from the lust of the flesh (Gal. 5:16). Here, as a life principle of procedure, faith is, as always, opposite to human works. The Apostle testified that the result of his struggle, when he strove in his own strength to realize spiritual ideals,

was utter failure and he could only conclude that to will was present with him, but how to perform that which is good he found not (Rom. 7:18).

Before quoting this Scripture in Romans which reports the Apostle's contest, it should be noted that there is no erroneous supposition more universal and misleading than that a Christian can, in his own strength, command and control the old nature. The Apostle's experience and failure along this line are given in this Scripture as a warning to all Christians. No mention of the Spirit appears in this passage. The conflict is not between the indwelling Spirit and the flesh; it is rather a conflict between the new "I" and the old "I." The new "I" is the regenerated *man*, who, for the moment, is hypothetically isolated from the normal relationship to, and dependence on, the Spirit, and is seen in unaided human strength to be confronting the whole law, or will, of God (vs. 16), the vitiated flesh (vs. 18), and the humanly impossible demands for a holy life which are properly expected of every regenerate person (vss. 22–23, 25). The Apostle's experience answers the vital question, namely, Can the regenerate man, apart from dependence on the Spirit, do the will of God, even though he *delight* in that will (vs. 22)? In tracing the salient features of the Apostle's conflict and defeat, for clearer identification of the combatants, the Apostle's two names will be employed—Saul, the man of the flesh, and Paul, the regenerate man. The passage, with some comments, is as follows: "For that which I [Saul] do I [Paul] allow not: for what I [Paul] would, that do I [Saul] not; but what I [Paul] hate, that do I [Saul]. If then I [Saul] do that which I [Paul] would not, I consent unto the law [or will of God for me] that it is good. Now then it is no more I [Paul] that do it, but sin [Saul] that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me [Saul] (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I [Paul] would I [Saul] do not: but the evil which I [Paul] would not, that I [Saul] do. Now if I [Saul] do that I [Paul] would not, it is no more I [Paul] that do it, but sin [Saul] that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I [Paul] would do good, evil [Saul] is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members [Saul], warring against the law of my mind [Paul, who delights in the law of God], and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin [Saul] which is in my members. O wretched [Christian] man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:15–24).

The answer to this great question and cry of distress with which the above passage closes is given in a following verse (Rom. 8:2): “For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.” This is more than a deliverance from the Law of Moses: it is the immediate deliverance from sin (Saul) and death (its results, cf. Rom. 6:23). The effect of this deliverance is indicated by the blessedness recorded in the eighth chapter, as in contrast to the wretchedness recorded in the seventh chapter. The helpless and defeated “I” is in evidence in the one case, and the sufficient and victorious “I” by the Spirit, is in evidence in the other. The Christian is, then, to be delivered by the “law [or power] of the Spirit.” But attention must be called to the fact, stated in 7:25, that it is “through Jesus Christ our Lord.” The Christian is delivered *by* the Spirit, but the deliverance is made righteously possible *through* Jesus Christ our Lord, because of the believer’s union with Him in His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection.

Similarly, two natures were still in evidence in the Apostle’s experience since with the mind he desired to serve the law of God, but with the flesh he desired to serve the law of sin (Rom. 7:25). He did not remain a defeated Christian, for he found the faith principle of life, and this he states in Romans 8:4, which passage, with verse 3, is a consummation of all that has gone before from the beginning of chapter six: “That the righteousness of the law [the whole will of God for each believer to the last detail in every moment of life] might be fulfilled in us.” It could never be fulfilled *by* us. This victory, he goes on to state, is only for those who walk not in dependence on the flesh but in dependence on the Spirit. Deliverance from the power of the old nature, it is thus discovered, is in no way dependent on human effort other than the effort which is required to maintain an attitude of *faith*. There is a “fight … of faith,” and in this conflict the combatant seeks by divine enablement to preserve only an unbroken reliance upon the Spirit of God.

Nor is a freedom from the power of the sin nature secured on the part of the Christian by a supposed eradication of that nature through a falsely imagined, second work of grace. Though embraced by multitudes of earnest people, there is no Scriptural basis for either the rationalistic notion of eradication or for a supposed second work of grace, arguments for which are drawn almost wholly from mere human experience—of all things most

uncertain. The unscriptural character of these theories is obvious: (a) Eradication is not the divine method of dealing with the Christian's foes. There is no eradication of the world, or of the flesh, or of the devil, nor is physical death, so closely related to spiritual death, eradicated in this life. In every case, including the Adamic nature, the believer has but one assured way of deliverance—dependence upon the indwelling Spirit. (b) Were the claims of the eradicationists true, there would be no reason for the maintenance of a faith position and the great body of Scripture which directs the believer into the realization of the victory which comes alone by faith would be rendered meaningless. The two phrases—*not able to sin* and *able not to sin*— represent widely divergent ideas. The Word of God teaches that, by the power of the indwelling Spirit, the child of God, though ever and always beset in this life by an evil disposition, may be, for a given moment and under a specific situation, able not to sin. Such, indeed, is the power of the indwelling Spirit; but no word of the Scripture sanctions the notion that any Christian ever attains to a place where he is not able to sin. The consciousness of sinfulness, or of a tendency to sin, has been the experience of the most spiritual saints of all generations and especially as they have come into closer fellowship with God. Having drawn near to God, Job, the upright in heart, abhorred *self;* and Daniel, against whom no sin is recorded, under like circumstances, said, "My comeliness was turned in me into corruption." Galatians 5:16–17 describes the method by which spirituality has ever been attained by any member of this fallen race. This passage reads: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." The method is not one of ignoring the power of the sin nature, much less supposing it to be eradicated; it is rather in discovering the counter agency for victory which is provided in the indwelling Spirit. "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die [or are in the way of death]: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify [reckon to be dead] the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (or, are in the way of life— Rom. 8:12–13). The opposite of spiritual death is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. In spite of the presence of the sin nature, every Christian is "alive

unto God," having passed from death unto life; and, by the indwelling Spirit, every Christian is fully equipped unto every good work.

In *The Principles of Theology*, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, writing on Article IX of the Thirty-Nine Articles and of "the Permanence of Original Sin," declares:

> This question of the permanence of original sin in the regenerate is important on two grounds: (*a*) in its opposition to all forms of what is called "sinless perfection"; (*b*) on the other hand, against any yielding to defeat and accepting it as inevitable. Something must be said on each of these two points.
>
> (*a*) It is important to consider the relation of sin to our nature. The ultimate capacity in human nature is the capacity for feeling, for vivid impressions of pain and pleasure. These are called the primary sensibilities and have been disordered through sin, and are never entirely rectified in this life, though the Atonement covers their defect. Then come secondary sensibilities, leading to desires on the one hand and aversions on the other. It is at this point that Divine grace comes in. If the will does not consent there is no personal sin, but there is a disorder below the will which is sinful and needs to be dealt with. Personal responsibility is concerned only with that which the will determines. Atonement covers the rest, including incapacity and defect. It is also important to note the distinction between Adam and ourselves. He had the liability, but not the tendency to sin. We have both, and the tendency is what the Article calls the "corruption of the nature," "infection of nature," "concupiscence." The weakness of what is known as the Methodist doctrine of "Perfect Love" is that it teaches that grace meets all the needs of human nature in the sense of eradication. But it does not. Scripture continually distinguishes between sin and sins, between the root and fruit, but though the root remains, as stated by the Article, there is no need for it to bring forth fruit.
>
> (*b*) But the presence of inborn sinfulness in the regenerate, while real and powerful, is no excuse, still less justification for sinning. The Apostle clearly teaches that the redemptive work of Christ was intended to render inert or inoperative the evil principle within (Rom. 6:6, Greek). And thus we may say that while Scripture teaches something that is very near eradication, in order that we may not be satisfied with anything less than the highest type of Christian living, on the other hand, it as clearly teaches that the evil principle has not been removed. It loses its power over the believer, though the believer does not lose its presence. To the same effect is the Apostle's word: "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin" (Rom. 6:11). He thereby teaches that while we are to be dead to it, it is not dead to us. Sin is not dead, but we are to keep on reckoning ourselves to be dead to it. Such language would have been impossible if sin had been entirely removed. It is impossible to avoid noticing at this point the striking affinity between the Roman Catholic and Methodist doctrines of making sinfulness inhere in the will only. Our Article, in harmony with the Protestant Confessions of the sixteenth century goes much deeper, and shows that sin has affected the nature long before the will commences to act.
>
> The question is vital to many of the most practical and important aspects of living, for if we are wrong here we are liable to be wrong everywhere. Superficial views of sin inevitably tend towards superficial views of the redemptive work of Christ. We must, therefore, be on our guard against the two extremes: on the one hand we must insist that even in the regenerate the evil principle remains and will remain to the end of this life; on the other hand,

we must be clear that this evil principle need not and ought not to produce evil results in practice, since the grace of God has been provided to meet and overcome it.— Pp. 173–75

VII. The Christian's Relation to Imputed Sin

Physical death, as has been observed, is the penalty of imputed sin, and though for the Christian its judgment aspect is wholly repealed, the experience of death as the only way of departure from this world is the portion of all believers until the return of Christ. The penalty or judgment feature of death has been so perfectly abrogated that it can be said of all believers, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1, R.V.; cf. John 3:18; Rom. 8:38–39; 1 Cor. 11:32). The Apostle also declares, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 15:55–57). It is asserted that a mighty triumph has been gained over both death and the grave. "The sting of death is sin," but death's power to injure is canceled by the death of Christ. "The strength of sin is the law," but the entire merit system is terminated by Christ in His death. He met the demands for merit by releasing His own perfect merit to all who believe. The strength of sin is seen in the truth that it is *lawlessness;* yet the strength of the law as a means of righteousness is turned to feebleness because of the weakness of the flesh (Rom. 8:3). Thanks, indeed, be unto God for this victory over the judgment aspect of death, which victory is gained by the Lord Jesus Christ. The only effectual cure for death is life, and though the wages of sin—the first Adamic sin—is death, the gift of God is eternal life "through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23).

VIII. The Christian's Relation to Man's Estate Under Sin

This relationship is only a memory. The Apostle, writing to the Ephesian believers of this very thing, says, "Wherefore remember" (Eph. 2:11). The change from the lost estate *under sin* to the saved estate *under grace* could not be adequately estimated by any mind or fully described by any tongue. What was once a complete demerit is exchanged for the infinitely perfect merit of Christ; a place in the *cosmos* has been exchanged for a place in the kingdom of the Son of His love; and the doom of sin's judgment has been

exchanged for an immutable position in the sovereign grace of God—grace that not only super- abounds but never ceases. Those under sin are said to be without Christ, having no hope, without God, in the *cosmos* (Eph. 2:12); those that are under grace are described with respect to their unchanging estate by the words, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (Eph. 1:3).

Chapter XXIII

PUNISHMENT

THE GENERAL theme of punishment, in its broad application, is divided into *chastisement, scourging,* and *retribution.* Of these, the first two relate to God's way of dealing with impenitent Christians, and the last to God's final dealing with the unsaved. These separate doctrines are to be treated more fully later in this work on theology. Only a brief outline will be introduced here.

I. Chastisement

The doctrine of chastisement is closely related to that of the Christian's suffering, though all suffering is not chastisement. When God uses suffering to correct His own, it becomes chastisement. Representing this line of truth as it obtained in the Old Testament, David said: "I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will guide thee with mine eye. Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding: whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee" (Ps. 32:8–9). The harsh bit is applied to the willful, otherwise that one might be guided by His eye. In the same Psalm, David relates his own experience as a result of withholding his confession to God. He declares, "When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer" (vss. 3–4). Following this he made his confession and was restored. Of this he says, "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin" (vs. 5). There is a form of correction which may be avoided by confession. Of this it is written, "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:31–32). Confession is self-judgment and it serves to obviate painful discipline which must be inflicted upon the rebellious that they be not condemned with the *cosmos* world. None will be so afflicted who is not at the same time conscious that

he is resisting God and of the reason why he is under correction. Discipline in one form or another is the universal experience of all who are saved; even the fruit-bearing branch is pruned that it may bear more fruit (John 15:2). The testimony of the central passage of the Bible on chastisement (Heb. 12:4–15) is to the effect that every son is disciplined.

II. Scourging

The experience of scourging is closely related to that of chastisement, but seems, from the one passage in which it occurs (Heb. 12:6), to differ from chastisement. It is reasonably concluded that scourging refers to the conquering of the will and results in a surrendered life. It may be wrought but once in a believer's lifetime. On the other hand, chastisement may be repeated many times before the work of scourging is consummated. God is not satisfied with anarchy in His household.

III. Retribution

As every form of discipline has for its object the improvement or development of its subject with a view to the realization of the high and holy purposes which God has determined for those that are saved, there is no training or instruction intended in the retribution of the lost. The two classes are identified in two of the passages already cited. In 1 Corinthians 11:31–32, one class is preserved and the other is condemned. Similarly, in Hebrews 12:6–8, one class is addressed as "sons," while the other class is designated "not sons." In each case God is seen to be working for the betterment of one group, but only condemning the other group. No improvement is anticipated in God's dealings with those condemned, who are also called "not sons." Judgment falls on them as a vindication of the dignity of the One to whom every creature owes his existence and whose will has been revealed, which will has been outraged by sin. It is well to remember that every member of the human family was once in the same condemnation and ever would be but for divine redemption. It is equally to be pondered that the offer of saving grace is now extended to the whole lost world. Punishment of the unregenerate is inflicted as a requital of offense against God, and thus becomes more than an imposition of sin's

consequences. The moral order of the universe must be, and will be, upheld; but far beyond that is the vindication of the dishonor done to the Person of God. If the truth be recognized that the most enlightened of men are incapable of understanding the true nature of sin or its effect upon the One who is infinitely holy, it should be admitted by all that vindicating punishment is beyond human understanding. It is clearly disclosed in the Bible and more on the lips of Christ than any other. The revelation stands not only on the authority with which the Bible speaks, but it stands, also, on the basis of the truth that no man is in a position to dispute it.

"Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord" (Rom. 12:19, R.V.). In this text, God asserts, first, His own reaction toward sin by the words *Vengeance belongeth unto me*; but He also implies the necessity for penalty when He says, *I will recompense.* The recompense or penalty is more than a mere abandonment of the sinner. It is true that the "second death," which is eternal, is a separation from God and that that eternal estate is an immeasurable penalty in the light of the fact that the lost soul must know what grace might have wrought. The penalty is a definite imposition over and above the natural course of events—a retribution which corresponds to the punishment required. It is as certain as the character of God that whatever is imposed will be just and right, and it will be so recognized by all. God will not in this, any more than in any other undertaking, be the author of that which is evil.

Chastisement is a demonstration of divine love, but retribution is a manifestation of divine wrath. God has never proposed the amendment of sinners now, nor will He in eternity. He has provided at infinite cost a perfect regeneration and new creation through faith in Christ. This may be received or rejected by men. There is no word in the Bible which corresponds to extinction. The estate of the lost is both conscious and endless. Even physical death, on which they might depend for some relief, will have been destroyed and banished forever.

The dark picture of human failure and sorrow is drawn only that the good news of the gospel may be more readily received. All of God's unveilings of the destiny of the lost is with the appeal that men turn to Him and live in His grace forever.

A very perplexing problem arises when retribution and redemption are not fully distinguished. It is whether punishment is remedial; if it is, why

should there be redemption? At this point sincere men have lost their way and drifted into the rationalistic theories of Universalism and Restitutionism. Two extended quotations will throw light on this problem:

> The distinctive purpose of divine punishment cannot be the improvement of the person punished, because this is the object of *redemption.* If punishment were the means appropriate to this end, there would be no need for redemption; or rather, if this object is attained by redemption, of what use is the severity of punishment? Are we to suppose that when redemption proves ineffectual for the improvement of man, punishment must be resorted to, to attain the object? It would then follow that punishment is more effectual for man's regeneration than redemption. The conflict between the sphere of punishment and that of redemption becomes all the more perplexing, when we recollect that the main feature of redemption is the doing away with punishment by the forgiveness of sins. If punishment is remedial, is it a kindness to free man from it before it has accomplished its work? And how is it possible that redemption, which is the removal of punishment, should renovate, if punishment itself does so also? And yet the influence of punishment in preserving, and re-establishing the power of moral goodness in the sufferer, must not be wholly denied. Punishment, on the one hand, acts as a barrier against the desolating inroads of sin by reasserting the fixed ordainments of the law; and, on the other hand, it bears witness to the sinner of the crushing power wherewith evil recoils upon himself, and makes him tremble when he surrenders himself to it. In these two ways, it *prepares* man for the work of redemption. But in its own distinctive nature, it is not adapted or calculated to produce a true improvement, an inward renovation of the sinner. On the contrary, the two spheres, that of redemption, which alone can accomplish a true renewal, and that of punishment, mutually exclude one another. Whenever a living participation in the blessings of redemption begins, punishment, properly so called—δίκη, ἐκδίκησις, τιμωρία—ceases; but, so long as man continues to be the subject of God's righteous punishment, he is excluded from those blessings, John 3:36.—Dr. Julius Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, I, 246
>
> Punishment is not a proper means of reformation; for true reformation can issue only from free self-determination. It is voluntary in its nature. But a self-determination that is brought about by the fear of pain would not be moral, and of the nature of virtue. Any reformation effected from a selfish motive is not genuine reformation. Furthermore if true reformation could be produced by punishment, why should not the legal and punitive method of the Old Testament have been the only one? The old economy was full of threatenings and penalties, and of fearful examples of their actual execution. Why did God send his Son, and make a new covenant and economy of mercy? Of what use is redemption, or the *remission* of punishment, if punishment is in itself healing and remedial? The Scriptures never represent punishment as reformatory. The proper punishment of sin is death. Rom. 6:23. As temporal death, which is the extreme penalty in human legislation, is not intended to reform the criminal, and reinstate him in human society, but forever cuts him off from it, so eternal death, in the Biblical representation, is not intended to be a means of educating the sinner and fitting him for the kingdom of heaven, but forever banishes and excludes him from it.—Augustus D. Twesten, *Dogmatik*, Th. II, Par. 39, both cited by W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 738–39

Akin to these problems is the one of the divine attitude toward the countless multitudes who have died having never heard the gospel of redemption. Again a temptation—too strong for many—is developed, and men contend that the heathen will be saved on the ground of their ignorance or that they will be saved if they have lived up to the light they have. These conclusions are grounded in the fallacy that man needs no regeneration which is based on efficacious blood. The nature of the plan of salvation is such that it does not incorporate partial compliance, nor can it be executed on the ground of good intentions. The problem assumes a deeper aspect when it is claimed that God, being sovereign, is able to do whatsoever He pleases to do. This idea relates redemption to sovereignty, whereas it is correctly related to righteousness. Even God cannot redeem apart from the blood of His Son. Should He do so, He would be unrighteous; for no other satisfaction exists which answers the wickedness of creatures. If it be claimed that God is free to save through Christ whom He will, the answer is discovered at once in the Word of God. There His saving grace is always (apart from infants who die) a matter of a personal reception of it. The element of faith is never wanting: “He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God” (John 3:18). If it were true that the heathen are saved by ignorance or their faithfulness to such light as they have, there would be no call for a missionary program. In fact, the very act of taking the gospel to those who are saved by something within themselves is an imposition of colossal proportions; for by such an undertaking the heathen who are supposedly safe in their own virtues, are transferred to a system wherein they may, and probably will, be lost forever through the rejection of the gospel.

The heathen are pictured as utterly lost until the gospel is received by them. Without that truth every commission recorded in the New Testament is a useless enterprise, calculated to injure rather than help those to whom the message goes. The gospel does engender a responsibility and becomes for those who reject it a “savour of death unto death,” as its reception is a “savour of life unto life.”

At the root of these difficulties lies the rationalistic notion that all men are divinely appointed to be saved, and, if they are not, God has failed to that degree in His purpose. The clarifying truth is that He has an elect

company from all nations and that not one of these will fail to hear and respond to the gospel. The larger problem of His purpose in other ages must be reserved for a later consideration.

Chapter XXIV

The Final Triumph Over All Sin

Revelation and reason unite in one testimony that evil is a temporary thing in the universe of God. Reason declares that, since God is infinitely holy and the Designer and Creator of the Universe, evil must have begun its manifestation subsequent to creation by His permission and is to serve a purpose compatible with His righteousness. Reason also anticipates that, when that purpose is accomplished, evil will be dismissed from the universe of God, and that God, having undertaken to deal with evil, will complete His task to that degree of perfection which characterizes all His works. On the other hand, revelation predicts a coming victory over evil which no unaided finite mind can grasp. The student would do well again to pause and reflect on the marvelous character of a Book which with absolute accuracy and without hesitation unveils the eternity to come as it unveils the eternity past. This incomparable Book is given by divine inspiration to the end that the man of God (and how little it serves any other!) may be perfect, both in knowledge and in character, by its sanctifying power, and "throughly" furnished unto every good work (2 Tim. 3:16–17). Certain major passages are indicated when the final triumph of God is in view:

1 Corinthians 15:25–28. This portion of the Scriptures, which has the character of a parenthesis in the midst of the one exhaustive revelation concerning resurrection, presents the divine program for the purification of the universe in preparation for the eternal glory. Having declared that resurrection is common to all men and that there is an order or succession in resurrection—(1) Christ the First-Fruits, (2) they that are Christ's at His coming, and (3) the end or consummating resurrection—the Apostle indicates that the second resurrection in this order, which resurrection is to occur at Christ's coming, will be of a group designated as "they that are Christ's." This disclosure corresponds with the statement in 1 Thessalonians 4:16, which is that the dead in Christ are to be raised first, and the declaration in Revelation 20:4–6, where it is indicated that those upon whom the divine seal of blessing rests are raised *before* the thousand years begin, while "the rest of the dead" are to be raised *after* the thousand years

are ended. In John 5:25–29 Christ's own words are recorded in which He states that there are two groups in resurrection, but no mention is made by Him of the time that intervenes. According to Christ, these two groups are raised within that prophetic "hour" which has already continued almost two thousand years and, according to prophecy, will continue a thousand years after Christ returns. The notion that there is one general, all-inclusive, simultaneous resurrection within one hour is more a product of Romish theology than a doctrine of the Scriptures.

In the period between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of the company designated "they that are Christ's," there must be the securing of the complete number of those, the elect company, who comprise this group. At His coming for His own, Christ not only takes this company to Himself both by resurrection and translation, but He then terminates this specific divine undertaking. Similarly, the period between the resurrection of Christ's own and the "end" resurrection is characterized by the exercise of power and authority on the part of Christ. This period, according to Revelation 20:4–6, is a millennium of years. At the end of this period and by virtue of His reign, Christ, it is asserted, will "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father." The kingdom referred to here represents the larger sphere of divine authority, for by His authority and power "all enemies"—angelic and human—will be put under His feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. By divine permission, this larger domain of government has come to be in a state of rebellion. A vast company of angels kept not their first estate and almost the whole human family have been or now are at enmity with God. Death, which was foreign to the first estate of man, has wrought its blight over the earth throughout all generations. In that millennial period, Christ, we are told, will put down all rebellion and restore to God the Father an undivided kingdom. The word παραδίδωμι is well translated by *deliver up* provided no intimation is superimposed on it which would imply that the Son ceases His own authoritative reign. This He could not do in the light of His eternal occupancy of the Davidic throne (Luke 1:32–33; cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Dan. 7:14). It should hardly be expected of those who see nothing in prophecy of Israel's future and who fail to recognize the unending earthly reign of Christ, that they would observe the import of this passage. That his precise meaning may be understood, the Apostle goes on to state that all authority has been committed to the Son by the Father, with

the all-important and reasonable exception that the Father who gave the authority to the Son is not Himself under the otherwise universal rule of the Son. Thus the Son, having put down all enemies, having destroyed death, and having presented a conquered universe to the Father, will continue, then as now, His everlasting reign. There will never again be an opposing voice in the universal kingdom of God; but God—Father, Son, and Spirit— as at the beginning shall be "all in all."

In its eschatological bearing, few passages are of greater import than this. Three determining facts appear in this context (1 Cor. 15:24–28): (a) During the period between the resurrection of those who are Christ's and the end resurrection the vast authority of the Son will be exercised to the end that all opposing rule and authority will be put down. All enemies are to be put under Christ's feet. Even "the last enemy"—death —shall be destroyed (καταργέω, which same word is in verse 24 translated *put down;* cf. 2 Tim. 1:10, where by the use of the same word it is asserted that Christ hath already *abolished* death for the believer; and Heb. 2:14, where it is disclosed that by His death Christ will yet destroy him that had the power of death; and 2 Cor. 3:13, where, with Rom. 7:4, the old order is said by Christ's death to have been *abolished;* and Eph. 2:15, where the enmity between Jew and Gentile is declared to be *abolished* by the same death; and, finally, Rom. 6:6, where it is said that on the ground of Christ's death the "body of sin" may be *disannulled*). (b) All authority being given to the Son by the Father (first, as Creator—Col. 1:16—second, as Preserver—Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:17—and third, as Ruler, by specific divine decree—Matt. 28:18 —though the Father reserves certain powers to Himself—Acts 1:7), the Father is Himself excepted as not being at any time subject to the authority He has given to the Son (cf. Heb. 2:8). And (c) the Son, having exercised His power to the extent that all enemies to the authority of God have been put under His feet, continues His reign, then as now, by the unrevoked authority of the Father. The construction, according to worthy exegetes, does not necessitate the conclusion that in presenting a restored order to the Father (vs. 24) or that by continuing to reign in future ages by the authority of the Father, as He does now (vs. 28), the Son will resign His rule. This He could not do in the light of the many predictions that His reign will be everlasting. He whose relation to Israel and to this earth is that of a king and whose kingdom is everlasting, will, indeed, reign until the kingdoms of this

world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; but this is not the end, for of Him it is also said that "he shall reign for ever and ever" (Isa. 9:7; Luke 1:33; Rev. 11:15). Thus, by this important passage, the final triumph of God over all evil is disclosed.

Revelation 20:11–22:7. Of the several passages of Scripture bearing on the final triumph of God there is none more vital or exhaustive than the one now to be considered. A word-by-word exegesis of this entire context is a *desideratum*, but only a slight reference can be made to this passage.

When Christ said, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14:2), He made reference, it would seem, to the entire universe in which there are various abodes. The passage under consideration indicates four such dwelling places: (1) the new heaven, the abode of God; (2) the celestial city, which is distinctly identified as separate from the new heaven in that it comes down out of heaven (Rev. 21:2, 10); (3) the new earth, which is inhabited by glorified Israel, which nation is always related to the earthly sphere and whose existence is, by Jehovah's covenant, everlasting, and with Israel on the earth are "the nations of them which are saved" who bring their glory and honor into the city; and (4) the abode of those who are "without," whose characters and estates are rendered unchangeable and separate from God forever. Of these abodes, (1) the new heaven, the home of the Triune God, is shared by the Church (John 14:3) and the holy angels. Comparatively little is revealed regarding the specific character of the new heaven that is to be, and probably for the reason that no finite mind would be able to comprehend it. Much, however, is written concerning (2) the celestial city which is said to come down from God out of heaven —its character, its dimensions, its inhabitants or those who frequent its portals, the material which enters into its structure, and its glory. The patriarchs anticipated this city. Abraham, the tent-dweller, looked for "a city which hath foundations" (Heb. 11:10, 16). The city is cosmopolitan—a place frequented and enjoyed by those of other abodes. In fact, the Bride, whose home is so evidently to be in the new heaven where Christ will be, is so completely a part of this city that it bears the name, "The bride, the Lamb's wife." The presence and privilege of the Church in that city is also indicated by the fact that its twelve foundations bear the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Into this city enter, also, the angels, Israel, and the nations; for at the gates are twelve angels and its very portals are named after the twelve

tribes of Israel. Likewise, the nations of them which are saved will bring their glory and honor into it. This city, even to its streets, is built of pure gold like unto crystal. Its length is twelve thousand furlongs, which according to present computation is fifteen hundred miles. Its length and its breadth and its height are said to be equal. The city will be aflame with the Shekinah light and glory of God. (3) The new earth will be the abode of the earthly peoples who are under the everlasting covenant of God. And (4) the final place where the unredeemed must abide.

Hebrews 12:22–24. Again the celestial city is described, but only in relation to its inhabitants, or those who pass its portals. It will be observed that, as there are various abodes in the Father's house, there are at least six classifications of the creatures of God—the holy angels, the Church, Israel, the nations of them which are saved, the fallen angels who with Satan are consigned to everlasting fire (Matt. 25:41; cf. Rev. 20:10), and unregenerate men who, because their names were not written in the Lamb's book of life, are likewise cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:15; 21:8; cf. 21:27). The unregenerate, in relation to the abode of those who are under the eternal blessing of God, are also said to be "without" (Rev. 22:15).

According to Revelation 20:11–22:7, those within the celestial city are: God the Father, God the Son (mentioned under the suggestive title of the Lamb), the angels, the Church, and the earth-dwellers—both Israel and the nations. In Hebrews 12:22–24, the passage now under consideration, the same enumeration of inhabitants appears—"God the Judge of all"; "Jesus the mediator of the new covenant"; "an innumerable company of angels"; "the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven"; and "the spirits of just men made perfect," which last designation is evidently of Israel and the nations who will then have been purified by divine grace and on the ground of Christ's redemption and who are dwellers in the new earth. The redeeming blood of Christ is ever in view. In the enumeration of inhabitants given in the Revelation, Christ appears as *the Lamb;* and, in the enumeration given in Hebrews, He appears as the Mediator of a new covenant with its blood speaking "better things than that of Abel." From this evident emphasis upon the blood of Christ, it may be concluded that all God shall have wrought will have been based upon the value of that blood.

2 Peter 3:7–13. Two essential facts are presented in this passage, namely, (1) There is to be a new heaven and a new earth. The present heaven, being on fire, shall be dissolved and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. This same scene is described in Hebrews 1:10–12, where it is written that the heavens and the earth shall perish. They shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture they will be folded up and changed. Concerning the passing of the old, it is stated in Revelation 20:11 that the earth and the heaven are to flee away from the face of Him that sits upon the great white throne, and no place will be found for them any more. Peter also testifies, "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." This expectation may be based as well upon the Old Testament. In Isaiah 65:17 we read: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." So surpassing will this new creation be, that the present order will never again be remembered. Likewise, in Isaiah 66:22, R.V., it is predicted: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith Jehovah, so shall your seed and your name remain." According to this prophecy, there is to be not only a new heaven and a new earth, but Israel will abide to share in that glory as long as the new creation endures.

Returning to the passage under consideration, we observe that Peter dates the time of this great transformation as occurring in connection with "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (2 Pet. 3:7), and this coincides precisely with the record given in Revelation 20:11–15, where it is said that, when the wicked dead are gathered before God for final judgment, the old order then passes away from the face of Him who sits upon the throne. Those dwellers in heaven and those dwellers on earth who are appointed of God to inhabit the new creation must stand aside in space and observe one of the most stupendous creative acts of God— "He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5).

Though little is recorded in the Bible about the character of the new heavens, much, as has been pointed out, is disclosed concerning the character of the city which comes out of the new heaven. Similarly, there are important revelations, though limited, concerning the new earth. The one extended passage bearing on the conditions which are to obtain on the new earth is as follows: "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying,

Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men [an earthly designation], and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Rev. 21:3–4). Evidence that this is a description only of conditions in the new earth is twofold: (a) Tears, death, sorrow, crying, and pain, described as "the former things," belong only to the old earth and these will have "passed away." (b) God is seen to be dwelling among *men.* There He makes His tabernacle and they are said to be His people, and He shall be with them and be their God. He will dwell then as now with the holy angels (Matt. 22:30), and He will dwell with the saints in light (Col. 1:12); but marvelous indeed is the revelation that God will be in unhindered and unbroken communion with the dwellers of the earth. The new earth will be as holy as the new heaven. Peter states that there will be "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13). Thus it is declared that the three spheres of eternal glory—the new heaven, the celestial city, and the new earth—are each and all to be as pure as God is pure, and He abides in each forever. In like manner, the three orders of created beings—the unfallen angels, the Church of the firstborn, and the earth dwellers composed of Israel and the nations that are saved, will be accorded complete and unending fellowship with God. Since no word of God can fail, every word of prophecy will be fulfilled and the final triumph of God over evil will be as perfect as are all His works.

The Scriptures thus predict a glorious, universal, divine triumph which is yet to be—a triumph on the plane of infinity and including the disposition of sin as a *principle.* Even a feeble analysis, such as a finite mind might undertake, must disclose the fact that, concealed in this aspect of the sin question, is the most important reason the human mind has ever discovered why sin was permitted to enter this universe with its injury to creation and its measureless imposition of sacrifice upon the Son of God. It is true that the grace of God cannot be manifested except as there are fallen creatures in existence who, because of the corruption of sin, are objects of grace, and that the demonstration of divine grace, the inestimable glory of which is observable not in time but in eternity (Eph. 2:7), constitutes an obvious reason for the permission of sin; but more far-reaching and all-inclusive is

the fact that the principle of evil, as opposed to good, is brought out of that abstract form in which it existed before creation, and, upon the ground of its concrete fruitage in and through creation, is subject to divine judgment and to be dismissed forever. Incomprehensible, indeed, is the triumph of God when, through the cross of Christ, one lost soul is redeemed and by His saving power is so transformed as to appear in heaven conformed to the image of His Son; and every victory over sin in any of its forms must redound to His everlasting praise. Yet how exceeding in its infinite glory is the judgment and banishment of sin itself! How transcendently blessed will be that holy peace which will yet reign throughout the universe of God! More wonderful, it would seem, will it be than the peace which reigned in the eternal past, since to hold the experience and judgment of sin in retrospect is more conducive to peace than to hold them in prospect. Being engulfed in the din and darkness of the immediate phase of the conflict, the mind of man cannot extricate itself from its injuries and surroundings and thus fails to apprehend the assured divine triumph which God has determined and which He will execute with that perfection which characterizes all His works. Of all the marvels of divine achievement, none could surpass in glory the oncoming, sin-free universe in which righteousness is seen, not *contending* and *suffering* as now, nor even *reigning* as in the yet future earthly kingdom, but *dwelling* throughout the whole vast field of God's creation, except in the abode of fallen angels and lost men.

God, being infinitely holy, can sustain no relation to sin other than to judge it by that white flame of righteousness which He is. The death of Christ as the Father's provided Lamb not only reveals the measureless love of God for sinners, but opens the way whereby God, because of the judgment of sin which Christ wrought, is free to act without restraint in behalf of the wider field of the universe itself.

A key to the understanding of God's ways in the ages of time is the fact that He is pleased to put every challenge to an experimental test. This method, without doubt, will secure the *desideratum* when every mouth will be stopped. It is reasonable to believe that evil in its abstract form and as an opposing principle, at whatever time it began to exist, was itself a challenge to God and that, on the largest conceivable scale, its claims are being subjected to a demonstration which will not only set forth the character of

evil in all its magnitude but will also set forth the holy character of God—a revelation of surpassing import—and the exceeding grace of God. To this end it was necessary to permit sin to assume concrete form and run its course to its end. Under the permissive will of God, sin has wrought measureless injury within angelic spheres. It has wrought the complete ruin of the human race, apart from redeeming grace. But sin's incomputable cost is the blood of the Son of God which alone could provide a righteous ground for the judgments of God against evil in all its aspects, establish forever His holy character, and secure an accomplished redemption for those whom He had chosen from before the foundation of the world, through whom, also, He might show forth the unsearchable riches of His grace. Little, indeed, did the eyewitnesses of the death of Christ realize the stupendous thing that was transpiring before their vision. The cross was the complete verdict against sin for the individual believer; it reaches to Israel, to the Gentiles, to creation, to things in heaven, to angelic spheres, and to the very root of evil itself in its unlikeness to God. The triumph of God will be perfect and eternal.

"O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

Volume Three

Soteriology

Table of Contents

Soteriology

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION TO SOTERIOLOGY The Savior

CHAPTER II. THE PERSON OF THE SAVIOR I. christ's seven positions

1. The Preincarnate Christ 2. The Incarnate Christ
3. Christ in His Death
4. The Resurrected Christ
5. Christ Ascended and Seated in Heaven
6. Christ Returning
7. Christ Reigning Forever

II. CHRIST'S OFFICES 1. Prophet a. The Preincarnate Ministry

b. The Incarnate Ministry
(1) Six Features of Christ's Incarnate Ministry (a) "God Was Manifest in the Flesh"
(b) "Justified in the Spirit"
(c) "Seen of Angels"
(d) "Preached unto the Gentiles"
(e) "Believed on in the World"
(f) "Received up into Glory"
(2) Christ Forthtelling and Foretelling
(a) Christ Forthtelling
(b) Christ Foretelling
c. The Ministry from Heaven

2. Priest
a. In His Person
b. By Appointment
c. Eternal Duration

3. King

III. THE SONSHIPS OF CHRIST 1. The Son of God 2. The Son of Man

3. The Son of David
4. The Son of Abraham

IV. THE HYPOSTATIC UNION Conclusion

CHAPTER III. INTRODUCTION TO THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST I. SUFFERINGS IN LIFE

1. Sufferings Due to His Holy Character 2. Sufferings Due to Christ's Compassion
3. Sufferings Due to Anticipation

II. SUFFERINGS IN DEATH 1. Contrast between the Crucifixion and the Cross 2. Who Put Christ to Death?

3. What Christ Suffered at the Hands of Men and What He Suffered at the Hands of His Father 4. The Value of Christ's Sufferings to the Father 5. The Wisdom, Power, and Sacrifice of God
6. The Unified Action of the Three Persons
7. Two Major Features of Soteriology

CHAPTER IV. THINGS ACCOMPLISHED BY CHRIST IN HIS SUFFERINGS AND DEATH I. A substitution for sinners

1. The Words Which Imply Substitution 2. Vicarious Suffering in General
3. Mediation
4. Substitution with Respect to the Judgment of Sin 5. Substitution in the Realms of Divine Perfection II. CHRIST THE ENDING OF THE LAW PRINCIPLE IN BEHALF OF THOSE WHO ARE SAVED III. a redemption toward sin

IV. A RECONCILIATION TOWARD MAN

V. A PROPITIATION TOWARD GOD

VI. THE JUDGMENT OF THE SIN NATURE

VII. THE GROUND OF THE BELIEVER'S FORGIVENESS AND CLEANSING VIII. THE GROUND FOR THE DEFERRING OF RIGHTEOUS DIVINE JUDGMENTS IX. THE TAKING AWAY OF PRECROSS SIN ONCE COVERED BY SACRIFICE X. THE NATIONAL SALVATION OF ISRAEL

XI. MILLENNIAL AND ETERNAL BLESSINGS UPON GENTILES XII. THE SPOILING OF PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS XIII. THE GROUND OF PEACE

XIV. The Purification of Things in Heaven

Chapter V. The sufferings and Death of Christ in Types I. The General Sacrifices Of The Old Testament 1. Abel's Offering 2. Noah's Altar and Sacrifice

II. The Prescribed Sacrifices Of The Old Testament 1. The Paschal Lamb 2. The Five Offerings (Lev. 1:1–7:38)

3. The Two Birds (Lev. 14:1–7)
4. The Day of Atonement
5. The Red Heifer (Num. 19:1–22)

III. Miscellaneous Types Of Christ's Death 1. The Coats of Skin (Gen. 3:21) 2. Noah's Ark (Gen. 6:14–8:19)

3. Bread and Wine at the Hand of Melchizedek (Gen. 14:17–24) 4. The Offering of Isaac (Gen. 22:1–14)
5. Joseph (Gen. 37:2–50:26)
6. Manna in the Wilderness (Ex. 16:14–22)
7. The Smitten Rock (Ex. 17:5–7; Num. 20:7–13) 8. The Tabernacle (Ex. 25:1–40:38)

IV. The Death Of Christ According To Various Scriptures 1. The Death of Christ according to Genesis 2. The Death of Christ according to Old Testament Prophecy 3. The Death of Christ according to the Gospels 4. The Death of Christ according to Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians 5. The Death of Christ according to Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians 6. The Death of Christ according to the Epistle to the Hebrews 7. The Death of Christ according to Other Books of the New Testament Chapter VI. Biblical Terminology Related to Christ's Sufferings and Death I. Atonement

II. Expiation

III. Forgiveness and remission

IV. Guilt

V. Justice

VI. Justification

VII. Penalty

VIII. Propitiation

IX. Reconciliation

X. Redemption and ransom

XI. Sacrifice

XII. Satisfaction

XIII. Vicarious and Substitutionary

Chapter VII. Theories False and True of the Value of Christ's Death I. Preliminary Considerations

1. General Facts Revealed 2. The Death of Christ Is Unique

3. Its Extent

4. Its Three Directions

5. Divine Satisfaction through Christ's Death Is Not Personal Salvation 6. Type and Antitype

7. Theories May Be Questioned

II. Historical record 1. From the Beginning to Anselm 2. From Anselm to Grotius

3. From Grotius to the Present Time

III. Theories in general 1. The Marturial Theory 2. The Moral Influence Theory

3. The Identification Theory

4. The Rectoral or Governmental Theory

5. The Doctrine of Satisfaction

Conclusion

Divine Election

Chapter VIII. The Fact of Divine Election I. the terms used

1. Biblical Usage 2. Chosen

3. Drawing

4. Calling

5. Divine Purpose

6. Foreknowledge

7. Foreordination and Predestination

II. a clear revelation III. essential truths embraced

1. God Has by Election Chosen Some to Salvation, But Not All 2. Divine Election Was Accomplished in Eternity Past 3. Election Does Not Rest Merely on Foreknowledge 4. Divine Election Is Immutable

5. Election in Relation to Christ's Mediation IV. OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION Chapter IX. the order of elective decrees

I. THE ORDER SET FORTH BY THE SUPRALAPSARIANS II. THE ORDER SET FORTH BY THE INFRALAPSARIANS III. THE ORDER SET FORTH BY THE SUBLAPSARIANS IV. THE ORDER SET FORTH BY THE ARMINIANS

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER X. FOR WHOM DID CHRIST DIE?

I. CLASSIFICATION OF VIEWS

1. The Extreme Limited Redemptionists 2. The Moderate Calvinists Who Are Limited Redemptionists 3. The Moderate Calvinists Who Are Unlimited Redemptionists 4. The Arminians

II. POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO SCHOOLS OF MODERATE CALVINISTS III. Dispensational Aspects of the Problem

IV. THREE DOCTRINAL WORDS

V. THE CROSS IS NOT THE ONLY SAVING INSTRUMENTALITY VI. UNIVERSAL GOSPEL PREACHING

VII. IS GOD DEFEATED IF MEN ARE LOST FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED?

VIII. THE NATURE OF SUBSTITUTION

IX. THE TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES

1. Passages Which Declare Christ's Death to Be for the Whole World (John 3:16; 2 Cor. 5:19; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2) 2. Passages Which Are All-Inclusive in Their Scope (2 Cor. 5:14; 1 Tim. 2:6; 4:10; Titus 2:11; Rom. 5:6) 3. Passages Which Offer a Universal Gospel to Men (John 3:16; Acts 10:43; Rev. 22:17, etc.) 4. A Special Passage: 2 Peter 2:1

CONCLUSION

THE SAVING WORK OF THE TRIUNE GOD

CHAPTER XI. THE FINISHED WORK OF CHRIST Chapter XII. The Convicting Work of the Spirit I. The need of the spirit's work

II. THE FACT OF THE SPIRIT'S WORK

1. "Of Sin"
2. "Of Righteousness"
3. "Of Judgment"

III. THE RESULTS OF THE SPIRIT'S WORK Chapter XIII. The Riches of Divine Grace

I. The Estate of the Lost

II. The Essential Character of God's Undertakings 1. They Are Not Experienced 2. They Are Not Progressive

3. They Are Not Related to Human Merit
4. They Are Eternal in Their Character
5. They Are Known Only by Revelation
6. They Are Wrought by God Alone
7. They Are Not Wrought by Man

III. The Riches of Divine Grace 1. In the Eternal Plan of God 2. Redeemed

3. Reconciled
4. Related to God through Propitiation
5. Forgiven All Trespasses
6. Vitally Conjoined to Christ for the Judgment of the Old Man "unto a New Walk"
7. Free from the Law
8. Children of God
9. Adopted
10. Acceptable to God by Jesus Christ
    a. Made Righteous
    b. Sanctified Positionally
    c. Perfected Forever
    d. Made Accepted in the Beloved
    e. Made Meet
11. Justified
12. Made Nigh
13. Delivered from the Power of Darkness
14. Translated into the Kingdom of the Son of His Love 15. On the Rock, Christ Jesus
16. A Gift from God the Father to Christ
17. Circumcised in Christ
18. Partakers of the Holy and Royal Priesthood 19. A Chosen Generation, a Holy Nation, a Peculiar People 20. Heavenly Citizens
21. Of the Family and Household of God

22. In the Fellowship of the Saints
23. A Heavenly Association
    a. Partners with Christ in Life
    b. Partnership in Position
    c. Partners with Christ in Service
    d. Partners with Christ in Suffering
    e. Partners with Christ in Prayer
    f. Partners with Christ in Betrothal
    g. Partners in Expectation
24. Having Access to God
    a. Access into His Grace
    b. Access unto the Father
    c. Access Is Reassuring
25. Within the Much More Care of God
    a. Objects of His Love
    b. Objects of His Grace
        (1) Salvation
        (2) Safekeeping
        (3) Service
        (4) Instruction
    c. Objects of His Power
    d. Objects of His Faithfulness
    e. Objects of His Peace
    f. Objects of His Consolation
    g. Objects of His Intercession
26. His Inheritance
27. The Inheritance of the Saints
28. Light in the Lord
29. Vitally United to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit 30. Blessed with the Earnest or First-Fruits of the Spirit 31. Glorified
32. Complete in Him
33. Possessing Every Spiritual Blessing

CONCLUSION

The Eternal Security of the Believer

Chapter XIV. Introduction to the Doctrine of Security Chapter XV. The Arminian View of Security

I. The Arminian view of Major soteriological Doctrines 1. The Arminian View of Original Sin 2. The Arminian View of Universal and Efficacious Calling 3. The Arminian View of Divine Decrees

4. The Arminian View of the Fall
5. The Arminian View of Omniscience
6. The Arminian View of Divine Sovereignty
7. The Arminian View of Sovereign Grace

II. The Arminian Emphasis upon human experience and reason III. The Arminian appeal to the Scriptures

1. Scriptures Dispensationally Misapplied 2. Passages Related to the False Teachers of the Last Days 3. A Mere Reformation or Outward Profession
4. A True Salvation Is Proved by Its Fruits
5. Warnings to the Jews
6. Warnings to All Men
7. Gentiles May Be Broken Off Corporately
8. Believers May Lose Their Rewards and Be Disapproved 9. Believers May Experience Loss of Fellowship 10. Christians May Fall from Grace
11. Miscellaneous Passages

Conclusion

Chapter XVI. The Calvinistic Doctrine of Security I. The Reasons which depend on God the father 1. The Sovereign Purpose of God 2. The Father's Infinite Power Set Free

3. The Infinite Love of God
4. The Influence on the Father of the Prayer of His Son II. The Reasons Which Depend on God the Son 1. Christ Has Died 2. Christ Is Risen
3. Christ Advocates
4. Christ Intercedes

III. Responsibilities Belonging to God The Holy Spirit 1. The Holy Spirit Regenerates 2. The Holy Spirit Indwells

3. The Holy Spirit Baptizes
4. The Holy Spirit Seals

Chapter XVII. The Consummating Scripture I. Delivered from the Law

II. The Fact of the Presence of the Divine Nature III. The Christian a Son and Heir of God

IV. The Divine Purpose

V. The Execution of the Divine Purpose

VI. Christ's Own Achievement

VII. The Incompetency of Celestial and Mundane Things Conclusion

Chapter XVIII. Deliverance from the Reigning Power of Sin and Human Limitations I. Deliverance from the Power of Sin

1. The World 2. The Flesh
3. The Devil
Conclusion

II. Salvation from Human Limitations 1. The Spirit Produces Christian Character 2. The Spirit Empowers unto Christian Service Conclusion

Chapter XIX. The Believer Presented Faultless I. Heavenly Citizenship

II. A New Fraternity

III. A Standing Perfected Forever

IV. A Renewed Body

V. Freedom from the Sin Nature

VI. To be Like Christ

VII. To Share in Christ's Glory

Conclusion

The Terms of Salvation

Chapter XX. The Terms of Salvation I. Repent and Believe

1. The Meaning of the Word 2. The Relation of Repentance to Believing
3. The Relation of Repentance to Covenant People 4. The Absence of the Demand for Repentance from Salvation Scriptures 5. The Significance of Repentance in Specific Passages Conclusion

II. Believe and Confess Christ

1. Scripture Bearing on Confession of Christ 2. Two Conclusive Reasons

Conclusion

III. Believe and be Baptized

Conclusion

IV. Believe and Surrender to God

1. The Incapacity of the Unsaved 2. What Is Involved
3. The Preacher's Responsibility

Conclusion

V. Believe and Confess Sin or Make Restitution VI. Believe and Implore God to Save

1. "Seek Ye the Lord"
2. Believe and Pray

Epilogue

SOTERIOLOGY

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO SOTERIOLOGY

SOTERIOLOGY is that portion of Systematic Theology which treats of salvation. The word *salvation* is a translation of the Greek word σωτηρία (cf. σώζω and σωτήριος), and is derived immediately from the word σωτήρ which means *Savior.* Σωτηρία appears forty-five times in the New Testament. Forty times it is translated *salvation*, once it is translated *deliver* (Acts 7:25), once *health* (Acts 27:34), once *saving* (Heb. 11:7), and twice *saved* (Luke 1:71; Rom. 10:1).

In comparison with that which obtains in the New Testament, the Old Testament doctrine of salvation is more involved, largely because of that which enters into all Old Testament revelation, namely, the progress of doctrine. This progression may well be stated in the words of Christ: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark 4:28). It appears that, in the Old Testament, the English word *salvation* presents a latitude of meaning ranging from deliverance from enemies to right relations with God. Deuteronomy 28:1–14 describes the desired estate of an Israelite in the land, and to him salvation consisted largely in deliverance from all that might hinder those blessings. Such, indeed, were the benefits which Jehovah Himself held before His people. A still greater hope was ever before Israel of a spiritual triumph in their yet future covenanted kingdom. In reference to their estate in that kingdom it is written:

> "And the LORD thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live" (Deut. 30:5–6); "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:33–34); "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart

> of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God" (Ezek. 36:24–28); "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins" (Rom. 11:26–27).

These Scriptures, which represent a very large array of similar promises, speak of the nation as a whole, and predict restoration and salvation of that people according to Jehovah's eternal purpose. Over against this national expectation were the issues involved in the relation which the individual sustained to God, which reality was a matter wholly independent of those great promises which secure the salvation of the nation.

Abraham begat seed by Hagar, by Sarah, and by Keturah; but only "in Isaac [Sarah's son] shall thy seed be called" (Rom. 9:7). And, again, the election of God for the nation of promise determines that, of the sons of Israel, "the elder shall serve the younger" (Rom. 9:12; cf. Isa. 60:12), and only through Jacob shall the national covenants be realized. Of the seed of Jacob, though as a nation they are preserved in their solidarity and entity and "though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved" (Rom. 9:27); a remnant who as individuals were in right relation to God appeared in every generation. To this group the Apostle refers when he says, "For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Rom. 9:6), and it is of this spiritual Israel that he also speaks when he declares, "And so all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11:26). Thus the final outworking of the divine purpose in behalf of the people to whom the earthly covenants belong, and whose destiny is that of the earth (cf. Matt. 5:5), is consummated both with respect to the elect nation and the fulfilling of the hope for each individual Israelite whose life was lived in the particular time when distinctive Jewish promises obtained. The present age must ever be seen in its exceptional character, namely, that there is now no difference between Jew and Gentile either with regard to their lost estate or their need of salvation by grace (Rom. 3:9), and no difference with regard to the terms upon which they may be saved (Rom. 10:12; cf. Acts 15:9). The distinctive doctrines of Judaism must be discerned as such, both with reference to their character and with reference to the dispensation in which they are in force. For want of specific revelation, the salvation of the

individual under Judaism—with regard to terms, time, and general character—is obscure to men.

With respect to the meaning of the word *salvation*, the Old and New Testaments are much alike. The word communicates the thought of deliverance, safety, preservation, soundness, restoration, and healing; but though so wide a range of human experience is expressed by the word *salvation*, its specific, major use is to denote a work of God in behalf of man. When thus employed, it represents what is evidently the most comprehensive one doctrine of the Bible. It gathers into one conception at least twelve extensive and vital doctrines, namely, redemption, reconciliation, propitiation, conviction, repentance, faith, regeneration, forgiveness, justification, sanctification, preservation, and glorification.

It may be observed, also, that two fundamental ideas inhere in the meaning of the word *salvation:* on the one hand, to be saved is to be rescued from a lost estate, while, on the other hand, to be saved is to be brought into a saved estate, vitally renewed, and made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light. Gospel preaching may follow either of these conceptions. It may warn the wicked to flee from the wrath to come, or it may woo them by the contemplation of those benefits which God's infinite grace provides. The undesirable estate from which God's salvation would rescue men has been partially defined in previous portions of this work. Under satanology it was pointed out that unregenerate men are under the power of Satan, being energized by him, and that only the deliverance of God which translates out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. 1:13) can avail. Likewise, in both Anthropology and hamartiology it has been demonstrated that man is born of a fallen race, condemned because of his participation in Adam's sin, doomed because of the fact that he has only a fallen nature, judged as one who is under sin, and guilty before God because of his personal sins. It is also asserted that divine salvation is from the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13), from wrath (1 Thess. 5:9; John 3:36), from death (2 Cor. 7:10), and from destruction (2 Thess. 1:9). On the other hand, divine salvation provides a dismissal and removal of every charge against the sinner and equips him with eternal life in place of death, with the perfect merit of Christ in place of condemnation, and with forgiveness and justification in place of wrath.

In its broadest significance, the doctrine of salvation includes every divine undertaking for the believer from his deliverance out of the lost estate to his final presentation in glory conformed to the image of Christ. Since the divine objective is thus all-inclusive, the theme is divided naturally into three tenses: (a) The Christian *was* saved when he believed (Luke 7:50; Acts 16:30–31; 1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Cor. 2:15; Eph. 2:8, R.V.; 2 Tim. 1:9). This past-tense aspect of it is the essential and unchanging fact of salvation. At the moment of believing, the saved one is completely delivered from his lost estate, cleansed, forgiven, justified, born of God, clothed in the merit of Christ, freed from all condemnation, and safe for evermore. (b) The believer is *being* saved from the dominion of sin (Rom. 6:1–14; 8:2; 2 Cor. 3:18; Gal. 2:20; 4:19; Phil. 1:19; 2:12; 2 Thess. 2:13). In this second tense of salvation the believer is being divinely preserved and sanctified. (c) The believer is *yet* to be saved from the presence of sin when presented faultless in glory (Rom. 13:11; 1 Thess. 5:8; Heb. 1:14; 9:28; 1 Pet. 1:3–5; 1 John 3:1–3). To this may be added other passages which, each in turn, present all three tenses or aspects of salvation—1 Corinthians 1:30; Philippians 1:6; Ephesians 5:25–27; 1 Thessalonians 1:9–10; Titus 2:11–13.

Similarly, no greater fact regarding divine salvation can be declared than is asserted in Jonah 2:9 (R.V.), “Salvation is of Jehovah,” and in Psalm 3:8 (R.V.), “Salvation belongeth unto Jehovah.” The truth that salvation is of Jehovah is sustained both by revelation and by reason. As for revelation, it is the testimony of the Scriptures, without exception, that every feature of man’s salvation from its inception to the final perfection in heaven is a work of God for man and not a work of man for God. As for reason, there need be but a moment’s consideration of the supernatural character of every step in this great achievement to discover that man could contribute nothing whatsoever to its realization. That every step is by faith is a necessity since man, having no power to effect a supernatural result, must be cast back in faith upon Another who is able. These obvious truths may be viewed from two different angles: (a) What may be termed the *legal* aspect of the problem of the salvation of a sinful being is one of satisfying those unyielding and infinitely holy demands of divine righteousness and divine government which are outraged by sin in its every form. No man can make an atonement for his soul and thus save himself. The penalty for his sinful condition requires so great a judgment that, in the end, were he to pay it,

there would be nothing left to save. Over against this, is the truth that God has wrought in the substitutionary death of His Son to the end that the penalty is paid. This becomes the only hope for man, but the attitude of dependence upon Another, as a principle, is far removed from man's own effort to save himself. (b) What may be termed the *practical* aspect of the problem of the salvation of a sinful being is seen in the character of all that enters into the estate of the saved. No one under any circumstances could forgive his own sin, impart eternal life to himself, clothe himself in the righteousness of God, or write his name in heaven. Thus it is concluded that no more obvious truth will be found on the sacred pages than this, that "salvation is of Jehovah." Not only is all that enters into salvation in its first tense wrought by God instantly, in response to that simple faith which trusts Him for it, on the ground of the confidence that He is able to save righteously only through the death of His Son, but God is revealed to the sinner as One who desires to save with an infinite longing. He that spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all, could hardly demonstrate more fully His passion to save the lost.

The greatest of all motives which actuates God in the exercise of His saving grace is the satisfying of His own infinite love for those ruined by sin. In this may be seen the truth that the salvation of a soul means infinitely more to God than it could ever mean to the one who is saved, regardless of the glorious realities which constitute that salvation. But, in addition to the satisfying of infinite love, three other divine motives in the salvation of the lost are disclosed: (a) It is written, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2:8–10). Most emphatic is the truth thus declared, that salvation is a divine undertaking on the basis of pure grace in which no human works or merit may enter. This salvation is *unto* good works, it is never *by* good works; and it is *unto* such good works as are foreordained of God. (b) In like manner, it is declared that God is motivated in His salvation of men by the advantage which their salvation will be to them. John 3:16 states: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It is clearly asserted in this familiar text that a twofold benefit accrues to all who

believe on Christ—they do not perish and they do receive everlasting life. These advantages are immeasurably great both in their intrinsic value and in their endless duration. The question may be asked whether there could be any higher actuating motive on the part of God in man's salvation than the benefit man receives from it. There is an objective in God's exercise of His saving grace which is far more a reality to God than either good works or man's own benefit. It is (c) the fact that man's salvation is by divine grace to the end that the grace of God may have an adequate manifestation. Of this truth it is recorded, "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:7). There was that in God which no angel had ever seen. They had observed His wisdom and power displayed in the creation and upholding of all things. They had beheld His glory, but they had not seen His grace. There could be no manifestation of divine grace until there were sinful creatures who were objects of grace. The importance, in heavenly realms, of the unveiling of infinite grace could not be estimated in this world. There was no complete exhibition of divine love until God gave His Son to die for lost men. The momentousness of that demonstration is also beyond human understanding. In like manner, there could be no complete exhibition of divine grace until sinners were saved through the death of God's Son, and the measure of that grace is also beyond finite understanding. The thought transcends all comprehension, that even one from this fallen sinful race will be so changed by divine power that he will be satisfying to God as an exhibition of His infinite grace, and, though the vast spaces of heaven be thronged with such, the demonstration is not enhanced by multiplied representations, for each individual will be the expression of God's superlative grace.

By the perfect accomplishment of Christ in His death—dying the Just for the unjust—the saving arm of God is no longer shackled on account of those just claims of judgment which His outraged character and government must otherwise impose, and, being thus freed to act, He does all that infinite love dictates. Naught in heaven or on earth—naught within the Godhead or among created beings—could surpass the end which divine salvation achieves for a lost soul as the manifestation of God's grace and the satisfaction of His love. This incomprehensible, illimitable result is assured in the promise that every saved one will be "conformed to the image of his

Son" (Rom. 8:29); and the Apostle John also testifies, "When he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). This is evidently what is in the mind of the Apostle when he writes, "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. 15:49). Even now Christ is in the believer as "the hope" of that "glory" (Col. 1:27), and this body itself will be fashioned "like unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3:21). It is no small distinction for a hell-deserving sinner that God should so love him that, having borne his judgments, He should employ him as the agent by whom He will declare eternally to the universe the precise scope and character of His unqualified grace.

The gospel preacher would do well to study, to the end that he may rightly emphasize the two divine perfections in man's salvation, before mentioned, both of which are gained on righteous grounds through the death and resurrection of Christ. One of these is a disposal of that which is evil, while the other is the securing of that which is good. These two divine perfections are (1) that by the death of Christ, all judgment and condemnation are so perfectly borne that they can never again be reckoned against the believer (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). Even in the salvation of a soul, no blow is struck, no criticism or censure is uttered. (2) Likewise, and on the ground of that same death and on the ground of Christ's resurrection, every requirement for eternal association with God in heaven is bestowed—all, indeed, on the principle of uncomplicated grace.

In concluding this introduction to the study of Soteriology, the student is enjoined to give exceptional attention to this great theme, and for two important reasons, which are, (1) God's message includes the whole human family in its outreach, and since the great proportion are unregenerate, and since the gospel of salvation is the only word addressed to the unsaved, it is reasonable to conclude that, in a well-balanced ministry, gospel preaching should account for no less than seventy-five percent of the pulpit testimony. The remainder may be for the edification of those who are saved. It stands to reason that, if so much of the preacher's message should be within the general field of Soteriology, the study of this division of Systematic Theology should be attended with great diligence, sincerity, and prayerful expectation. (2) The preacher is an important link in the chain which connects the heart of God with the souls of lost men. Concerning the other links in this chain, it may be remarked that there is no deficiency in the

provisions of redemption through the sacrifice of Christ. There is no flaw in the record of that redemption as revealed in the Oracles of God. There is no weakness or failure on the part of the enabling Spirit. There should be no omissions, defects, or derelictions in the preacher's presentation of redemption to those for whom it is provided. When seriously contemplated, the responsibility of gospel preaching cannot but solemnize the heart and be the cause of an ever increasing dependence upon God. It is not to be wondered at that the Apostle, speaking for the Holy Spirit, declares with that unique emphasis which a twofold repetition imposes, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:8–9). This *anathema* has never been revoked, nor could it be so long as the saving grace of God is to be proclaimed to a lost world. From the human point of view, a misrepresentation of the gospel might so misguide a soul that the way of life is missed forever. It behooves the doctor of souls to know the precise remedy he is appointed to administer. A medical doctor may, by an error, terminate what at best is only a brief life on earth. The doctor of souls is dealing with eternal destiny. Having given His Son to die for lost men, God cannot but be exacting about how that great benefit is presented, nor should He be deemed unjust if He pronounces an anathema on those who pervert the one and only way of salvation which was purchased at so great a cost. A sensitive man, when realizing these eternal issues, might shrink from so great a responsibility, but God has not called His messengers to such a failure. He enjoins them to "preach the word" and assures them of His unfailing presence and enabling power. Probably at no point in the whole field of theological truth is the injunction more applicable which says, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

The study of Soteriology is to be pursued under the following main divisions: (1) the Savior, (2) divine election, (3) for whom did Christ die? (4) the saving work of the triune God, (5) the eternal security of the believer, (6) deliverance from the reigning power of sin and human limitations, (7) the terms of salvation.

The Savior

Chapter II

THE PERSON OF THE SAVIOR

THERE IS but one Savior and only One who in every respect is qualified to save. The truth thus asserted is the foundation of Soteriology, and, of these two declarations, the first calls for an investigation into the *Person* of Christ—which line of truth has been considered in many pages under trinitarianism, and there properly restricted to contemplation of His Person. The second declaration—that He alone is qualified to save—calls for an investigation into the *work* of Christ on the cross and is the ground of all that enters into Soteriology. Thus, in turn, Soteriology is the cornerstone of Systematic Theology, being, as it is to the fullest degree, that which man may comprehend of God's self-revelation to a fallen race. Volume V in this work on Systematic Theology is assigned to the pursuance of Christology. On those pages a more orderly and comprehensive treatment of that great theme will be undertaken. As stated above, under trinitarianism specific consideration has been given to Christ's Person. Under Soteriology (apart from an introductory word), specific consideration is to be given to Christ's work, while under Christology these two fundamental truths are to be considered together. As before intimated, it is essential, when approaching the study of the work of Christ, to restate or review certain facts relative to His Person to the end that some larger recognition may be secured about who it is that undertakes to provide so great a salvation. Attention is therefore first directed to the Person of the Savior. That man is incapable of a comprehension of Deity is a truism, and it is equally certain that man is incapable of depicting what he cannot comprehend. In the Bible, God has spoken regarding Himself, and this has accomplished much for impotent man in his attempt to know the truth about God; yet this revelation—even when the mind is illuminated by the Spirit—is dimly apprehended. It is under such unavoidable restrictions that a human author may write or a human voice may speak. Unspeakably exalted is the theme of the Person of Christ; but, for the present emergency, this division of the general thesis may be subdivided into four aspects—(a) Christ's seven positions, (b) His offices, (c) His sonships, and (d) the hypostatic union.

I. Christ's Seven Positions

The entire field of Christology is well comprehended in the seven positions in which Christ is set forth in the Scriptures. Though these are observed more thoroughly under Christology, there seems to be no more illuminating approach to this vast theme respecting the Person and work of Christ. The purpose in this preparatory treatment is an attempt to comprehend—as far as may be possible—the infinite greatness of the One who has undertaken to save the lost. The spiritual progress of the Christian may be measured by the growth he makes in "the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 3:18). It is stated by Christ Himself that the work of the Spirit in the heart of the believer will be to "glorify me" (John 16:14). By these Scriptures it is indicated that the believer's conception of Christ who saves him should not only be extended to supernatural proportions, but should be increasing with every passing day. That He may have pre-eminence, these seven positions are introduced here.

1. The Preincarnate Christ. It is doubtless true that, in view of the truth that He took upon Himself the human form and nature, the mind of man is disposed to think of Christ in terms of finite inability and incompetency. A certain cure for this misleading practice is meditation and reflection on His preincarnate existence. Such consideration always tends to an apprehension of the incarnate Christ which is free from human misconceptions. Having received and welcomed something of His eternal Godhood, it will be natural to give His Deity its proper place when pursuing the truth respecting His incarnate mode of existence.

It is hoped that the student is mindful of the somewhat extended investigation, under Theology Proper, of the major passages (Isa. 7:14; 9:6–7; Micah 5:2; Luke 1:30–35; John 1:1–2, 14; Phil. 2:6–8; Col. 1:13–17; 1 Tim. 3:16) bearing on Christ's preincarnate existence as one in the triune Godhead. But one passage will be reconsidered in this connection, namely,

John 1:1–2, 14. Though, so far as the record goes, the Son of God did not apply the specific term *Logos* to Himself, it is applied to Him by the Holy Spirit in the passage under consideration. This appellation might with the best of reason be used more than it is to identify the preincarnate Son of God. A distinctive name which relates Him to eternity is not only needed, but is thus supplied by the Holy Spirit, whose use of this title in this connection is complete authority for its employment, for the same purpose,

under all circumstances. By its very meaning, the designation *Logos* bears a far-reaching revelation, not only of His Deity, but of His essential and eternal relation to the First Person. Of this name *Logos*, A. B. D. Alexander writes:

> The doctrine of the Logos has exerted a decisive and far-reaching influence upon speculative and Christian thought. The word has a long history, and the evolution of the idea it embodies is really the unfolding of man's conception of God. To comprehend the relation of the Deity to the world has been the aim of all religious philosophy. While widely divergent views as to the Divine manifestation have been conceived, from the dawn of Western speculation, the Greek word *logos* has been employed with a certain degree of uniformity by a series of thinkers to express and define the nature and mode of God's revelation. *Logos* signifies in classical Greek both "reason" and "word." Though in Biblical Greek the term is mostly employed in the sense of "word," we cannot properly dissociate the two significations. Every word implies a thought. It is impossible to imagine a time when God was without thought. Hence thought must be eternal as the Deity. The translation "thought" is probably the best equivalent for the Greek term, since it denotes, on the one hand, the faculty of reason, or the thought inwardly conceived in the mind; and, on the other hand, the thought outwardly expressed through the vehicle of language. The two ideas, thought and speech, are indubitably blended in the term *logos;* and in every employment of the word, in philosophy and Scripture, both notions of thought and its outward expression are intimately connected.—*The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, III, 1911–12

The Second Person, fulfilling the significant meaning of the title *Logos*, is, and always has been, as He ever will be, the manifestation of God. This is implied in the term *Logos;* for He who bears that name within the Godhead, is to the Godhead what speech is to thought—the expression of it. Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander writes clearly of this:

> This word carries its own meaning with it; in other words, that the simple idea presented to the mind by this word is so truly descriptive of Jesus Christ that it may be used without any qualification as a designation of Him, just as the words life, light, manna, passover, peace, etc., elsewhere are used. But this throws us upon the inquiry, In what sense is Jesus Christ the Word? for it must be allowed that the term does not so immediately yield up its meaning as do some of those other terms with which we have compared it. Now, in reply to this I think the oldest answer is still the best. "The Son," says Origen, "may be the Word because He announces the hidden things of His Father;" or, as another of the Fathers gives it, because He is the interpreter of the will of God. The idea here is, that as a word is the interpreter of the hidden invisible spirit of man, so Jesus, coming forth from the bosom of the Father, of Him whom no man hath seen at any time, has revealed Him to us. Words bridge over the chasm between spirit and spirit, and form a medium of communication between mind and mind. They are winged messengers that come from that which sense cannot descry, and through the medium of sense convey to others knowledge of that hidden power that sent them forth. They are thus emphatically revealers of the invisible, palpable exponents to us of what, but for them, must ever have remained hidden from us, being supersensible. In like

manner has Jesus Christ made known and expounded God to us. In Himself God is utterly beyond our knowledge; we cannot by searching find Him out; and it is only as He reveals Himself to us that we can have any just thought of Him at all. But of all the revelations of Himself which He has given to men, none is so full, so clear, so impressive, as that which He has given in the Person of His Son. Here all the other rays of light which God has sent forth to illuminate our darkness are concentrated in one blaze of glory. Here all the other words which God hath spoken to men are gathered up and condensed into one grand and all-embracing utterance, which therefore becomes emphatically *The Word*—the living personal manifestation of God to men. …

The attentive reader of the O. T. cannot have failed to observe how there runs through the writings which it contains a distinction between God as He is in Himself,—hidden, invisible, unsearchable, incomprehensible; and God as He is in relation to His creatures,—revealed, manifested, declared. Sometimes this is conveyed very distinctly and unmistakably, as by the appearances of the Angel of Jehovah, who is both Himself Jehovah and yet distinct from Jehovah —a representation which can be rendered intelligible only on the supposition of a distinction between God as revealed and God as concealed. In other cases the same idea is presented by certain forms of expression which presuppose it, and are explicable only on the assumption of it. Such, for instance, is the frequently-recurring expression, the "Name of God"—an expression which indicates something distinct from God as God, but to which, nevertheless, personal and divine qualities are ascribed; for men are commanded to put their trust in God's name, God serves men by His name, God puts His name in a person or place, the result of which is that God is in that person or place; and many other similar usages, which can be explained satisfactorily only on the supposition that the name of God is God, not as He is in Himself, but as He is revealed to men. Such also is the distinction made between the "face of God," which no man can behold, and His "back," which Moses was permitted, in compliance with his earnest request, to see. As the countenance is the index of the soul, the spiritual part, so to speak, of the body, the face of God is His inner essential glory, His essence as a Spirit; and as the back part of a man is purely material, and subject to the scrutiny of the senses, so this is used by God to denote what of Him may be revealed, and by being revealed may be known by His creatures. What that is He Himself expressly declares when, in the same connection, in answer to the prayer of Moses, "Show me Thy glory," God says, "I will make all my goodness [properly, *beauty, majesty*] to pass before thee, and will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee." This was what Moses could see, and this—the divine name or revelation of God, the beauty, the manifested perfection of God —He would make to pass before him; and it is of this that God speaks as His back, because it could be made known to men in contradistinction to His face, His essential being, which no man could see and live. These instances may suffice to show that the idea of a distinction between God as He is in Himself and God as revealed to His creatures could not but be familiar to an attentive reader of the ancient Jewish Scriptures; so that St. John, in representing the great Revealer of God as with God and as God, would not overstep the limits of enlightened Jewish thought and intelligence.—*System of Biblical Theology*, I, 360–63

There are three determining truths set forth by John in his Gospel concerning the Logos: (a) He, as one with God and as God, is from all eternity (1:1–2), (b) He becomes flesh (1:14), and (c) He ever manifests the

First Person (1:18). With this comprehensive revelation all the Bible is in accord, and such is the adorable, almighty, all-wise, eternal Person who came into the world to be the Savior of men.

2. The Incarnate Christ. In a reasonable effort to attain to a worthy appraisement of the Redeemer, this fundamental truth must be fixed in mind as the ground for all other realities which enter into His marvelous, exalted Being, namely, that, since He combines in Himself undiminished Deity and perfect humanity, there is none other comparable to Him, either within the Godhead, among angels, or among men. This theanthropic Person is as much God as is the Father or the Holy Spirit; but neither the Father nor the Spirit has come into union with that which is human. Similarly, this theanthropic Person is in every respect the embodiment of every feature of a true human being; but no other human being has ever been so united to the Godhead. There is no implication here that this theanthropic Person is superior to the Father or the Spirit; it is only pointed out that He differs from all others in heaven or on earth in that the breadth of the sphere of His Being has been expanded to a point to which none other has ever attained or will ever attain. He functions perfectly and finally in the service for which a theanthropic Person was indicated. No need of another could ever arise. In view of the later consideration of the whole field of mediation, pursuance of this theme is discontinued for the present. However, most urgently the truth is stressed that, apart from an interminable investigation into, and meditation on, the peculiar features of this unique theanthropic Person, there can be no commendable growth "in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

3. Christ in His Death. Again, extended discussion awaits a later contemplation of the sufferings of Christ; yet the right evaluation of the Savior is bound up, to a large degree, with His work upon the cross. Such an evaluation had come to the Apostle when, in personal adoration, he said of Christ, "who loved me, and gave himself for me." Vast indeed are the triumphs of Christ through the cross—reaching on to the transformation of things on earth and in heaven. A right understanding of these will result in a richer and fuller knowledge of the One who is mighty to save.

4. The Resurrected Christ. The incarnation accomplished the union of two natures in one theanthropic Person, in which union His Deity was veiled and His humanity, though sinless, was such as might mingle in the common experiences with other men; but the resurrection accomplished the unveiling of His Deity and the glorification of His humanity. Through the resurrection, He became what He ever will be and that which none other had ever been before—a glorified man in heaven. Of Him it is said, "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting" (1 Tim. 6:16). Because of His sufferings and death, God hath, in resurrection, highly exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name. In any recognition of all the Savior is, there must be a contemplation of His present estate—that which He ever will be in heaven.

5. Christ Ascended and Seated in Heaven. The omnipresent Savior, though indwelling every believer, though present where two or three are met unto His name, and though accompanying every messenger to the end of the age, is, nevertheless, locally present in heaven, seated on His Father's throne and there administering as Savior of lost men, as Head over all things to the Church; and is preparing a place for the sons whom He is bringing into glory. When on earth, none knew Him more intimately than John, the beloved disciple. He saw Him as a child, in His public service, in transfiguration, in death, and in resurrection; yet, when he saw Him in glory —as described in Revelation 1:13–18—it was then that John fell at the glorified Savior's feet as one dead, and was able to arise only as he was lifted up and strengthened by his glorified Lord. It is with that same glorified Savior that Christians will be confronted as they enter heaven, and it is of this Savior the believer must now be aware if he would know who it is that saves his soul.

6. Christ Returning. The utmost capacity of language to express limitless glory is strained in those passages wherein the second advent of Christ is described (cf. Isa. 63:1–6; Dan. 7:13–14; Matt. 24:27–31; Acts 15:16–18; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; Rev. 19:11–16), and that conception of this glorious Person must be added to the sum total of all that the Savior is, by

whom the lost are saved and by whom they are presented faultless before the presence of His glory.

7. Christ Reigning Forever. By the authority of the Father, the Son, to whom all authority is given, must reign upon the throne of David until all enemies are put under His feet. Then, by the same authority He will reign forever and ever, that God may be all in all (1 Cor. 15:24–28). It is predicted that His reign shall be everlasting—on the throne of His father David (cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Ezek. 37:21–25; Dan. 7:13–14; Luke 1:31–33; Rev. 11:15). Such is He in whom the sinner trusts and such is He whom all Christians are admonished to know. The call to know "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" is a call to enter an immeasurable realm of reality—even all that the Savior is.

II. Christ's Offices

It has been the belief, based on the Scriptures, of the Bible interpreters living in the Old Testament dispensation as well as of those living in the New Testament dispensation, that the title *Messiah* of the Old Covenant and the title *Christ* of the New Covenant imply a threefold official responsibility —that of Prophet, Priest, and King. There is every reason to retain this general division of truth, and these offices are to be considered separately.

1. Prophet. The underlying conception of a prophet is that he is a channel or means of communication through whom God's message may be delivered to man. In this respect the prophet's service is the opposite of that of the priest, whose responsibility is to represent man to God. Both ministries belong equally to Christ and together constitute two major aspects of His mediatorial work. He, as Mediator, stands between God and man and represents each in turn to the other.

Distinction must be made between the prophet of the Old Testament and the prophet of the New Testament. In either instance the field of service is twofold—*foretelling* and *forthtelling*. The ministry of the Old Testament prophet was largely that of a reformer or patriot. He sought the restoration to covenant blessings of the people who were under the covenants. No better illustration of this will be found than John the Baptist—the last prophet of the old order and the herald of the Messiah. Of him Christ said,

“A prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet” (Matt. 11:9); and no greater prediction was uttered by John than that couched in the words, “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the word!” (John 1:29, R.V.). Having the attitude of a reformer and revivalist, the Old Testament prophet was appointed of God to give warnings about the chastisement of God that was impending upon His erring people, and, with the predictions, to give the witness from Jehovah that the purpose and faithfulness of Jehovah with respect to Israel’s ultimate blessings could never fail. Because of their sins, the people would suffer trials, but, in the end, God’s covenant blessings would be experienced since God could not change. With respect to Israel, “The gifts and calling of God are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29). Concerning the Old Testament prophet, an order of development is to be observed. He was first styled *the man of God*, later he was known as *the seer*, and finally he was identified as *the prophet.* The order of development is easily traced. The man of God could, on the basis of the unvarying principle that the pure in heart see God, see, and therefore became known as the seer. For those who have spiritual sight, it is but a short step to the ability to declare both by foretelling and by forthtelling.

In Volume I of this work, under Bibliology and in Chapter V devoted to canonicity, it has been pointed out that certain responsibilities on the part of Jewish authorities with respect to the Scriptures were assigned. The responsibility of the people is declared in Deuteronomy 4:2, “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.” The instruction to the king upon the throne—though no king would rule in Israel for five hundred years to come—was disclosed in Deuteronomy 17:18–19, “And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the LORD his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them.” The judges interpreted the law contained in the Scriptures; but should a matter arise which the judges could not determine, it was referred to the priests who served as a supreme court, and the offender who would not abide by the ruling of the priests was put to death. This important provision is recorded in Deuteronomy 17:8–10, “If there arise a matter too hard for thee

in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the LORD thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and enquire; and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgment: and thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the LORD shall choose shall shew thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee." To the Levites was given the custody of the Scriptures. It is written, "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (Deut. 31:26). But to the prophet was given the high responsibility of receiving and delivering the Word of God. The commission of the prophet to speak for God and the requirement of the people to hear is set forth in the midst of Israel's constituted law. No doubt, the passage, as many another, has its final fulfillment in the prophetic ministry of Christ. Christ is the final Prophet of all prophets, the final Priest of all priests, and the final King of all kings. This instruction is an immediate authorization of the prophets who under God were to succeed Moses. The passage reads: "The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. … I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him" (Deut. 18:15, 18–19). The true prophet's message had to be received and heeded by the whole house of Israel from the king on the throne to the least in the kingdom. Of these messages, however, only such portions as the Spirit of God determined became canonical. The true prophet attested his own message and demonstrated its authority by supernatural evidence. This did not preclude one prophet attesting the message another prophet had received and delivered with authority. Such corroboration is observable, especially in regard to writings which have their place in the New Testament Canon.

On the other hand, the New Testament prophets—aside from the specific writing of the New Testament—are appointed more to a ministry of forthtelling than to the ministry of foretelling. The prophetic word is

completed in the Bible with the record of all that will be to the end of God's program. There is therefore no further need of the prophet who foretells. The general classification of the New Testament ministries is found in Ephesians 4:11, where it is written concerning the ascended Lord: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." The apostle, whose right to the title depended upon his immediate relation to Christ while Christ was here in the world, is not, naturally, continued beyond the first generation of the Church on earth. The evangelist is the pioneer missionary, rather than the modern revivalist who bears the name, and who has little recognition in the New Testament. The pastor and teacher—apparently two activities on the part of one person—ministers to the edification of the saints in their work of the ministry. The New Testament prophet's service is well defined in one passage: "But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort" (1 Cor. 14:3). Other Scriptures are of equal significance. Writing of the revelation of the mystery, the Apostle declares: "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph. 3:5). Similarly, the benefaction of gifted men to the Church is again cited by the same Apostle in 1 Corinthians 12:10, where prophecy is treated as one of the gifts to be exercised: "To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues." In like manner verses 28–29 are revealing: "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all workers of miracles?" The Church is being built upon the apostles and New Testament prophets—not the Old Testament prophets (Eph. 2:19–20).

All that enters into the peculiar ministry of the prophet—both Old Testament and New Testament—serves only to clarify the important truth that Christ is a Prophet, and as such is supreme and final in that office. He fulfills all that ever entered into the divine conception peculiar to the prophet. The earliest and most important anticipation of Christ's prophetic ministry, as noted above, is recorded in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18–19. This preview is distinguished by the fact that it is several times quoted in the New Testament (cf. Acts 3:22–23; 7:37). It is asserted in this Scripture that

the anticipated prophet would speak only the words divinely given Him. Every statement by Christ which asserts that His message was given Him by His Father (cf. John 7:16; 8:28; 12:49–50; 14:10, 24; 17:8) is a confirmation of the truth that He is that prophet. This great prediction in Deuteronomy 18:15–19, carries a secondary meaning applicable to all Old Testament prophets who spoke for God. The exceedingly pragmatic test to distinguish between the true and false prophet is set forth in verses 21–22: "And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shall not be afraid of him." The deeper significance of this test is that, since Christ is a true Prophet, every word He has spoken will assuredly come to pass.

It is also indicated that Christ applied the title of *prophet* to Himself. Speaking thus He said, "A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house" (Matt. 13:57). Likewise, "Nevertheless I must walk to day, and to morrow, and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (Luke 13:33). It should be observed, also, that Christ was recognized by others as being a prophet. "Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world" (John 6:14). From this it may be seen that an Old Testament prophet is identified by mighty works. In this feature Christ surpassed all others, as He surpassed in the added qualifications of teacher and predictor.

The whole prophetic ministry of Christ may be divided into three time periods, which are:

a. The Preincarnate Ministry. As *Logos*, the Second Person has always been the self-revelation of God. This specific method of manifestation is perhaps best set forth in John 1:18: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Whenever truth about the Person of God or His message is to be disclosed —whether it be by the Angel of Jehovah or the Incarnate Son—the Second Person as *Logos* is the One who reveals.

b. The Incarnate Ministry. Quite apart from His teachings, the *Logos* was God manifest in the flesh.

(1) *Six Features of Christ's Incarnate Ministry.* Of Christ the Scriptures declare: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory" (1 Tim. 3:16). These six great assertions are divinely distinguished subdivisions of the entire scope of the incarnate manifestation.

(a) *"God Was Manifest in the Flesh."* In the Person of Christ the *Logos*, the incomprehensible actuality of God has been translated into terms which the human creature may comprehend. His presence among men was the presence of God. Whatever He did was an act of God and should be recognized as such. It was God who took little children in His arms and blessed them, that healed the sick, that raised the dead, and through death reconciled the world unto Himself. Of this truth Christ thus spoke: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise" (John 5:19). Moreover, what Christ said was none other than the word of God. He asserted that He not only did the will of His Father, but the words He spoke were the words of God. It is written: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63). Not only has the kingdom of God drawn nigh to men by the incarnation (Luke 10:9), but God Himself has drawn nigh. As men are estimated and known by their words and deeds, so God may be estimated and known—so far as human capacity, enabled by the Spirit, may serve—by the words and deeds of Christ.

(b) " *"Justified in the Spirit."* This declaration indicates that all that Christ undertook was wrought in that perfection which justified it—both in heaven and on earth—being achieved through the eternal Spirit. He was led of the Spirit (Luke 4:1), He wrought in the power of the Spirit (Matt. 12:28), and in His death He offered Himself to God by the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14). It is significant, in this connection, that to Him the Spirit was given *without measure* (John 3:34).

(c) *"Seen of Angels."* In this expression, it is indicated that in His incarnate life on earth the whole of the angelic hosts were concerned. From their viewpoint, having known Him from the time of their creation as their Creator and the Object of their ceaseless adoration, His descent from realms

of infinite glory to the dark sphere and confines of human existence was the occasion of the deepest interest to the angels.

(d) *"Preached Unto the Gentiles."* Beyond the range of all former covenants, Christ became the way of salvation to every member of the race. The assertion is not restricted to an elect few. The term "the Gentiles" could not be more inclusive. The importance of this movement from the confines of an elect nation—to whom He had bound Himself by immutable testaments—to a redemption as limitless as the human race, cannot be estimated.

(e) *"Believed on in the World."* While Christ was here in the world a very few sustained this relationship to Him, but they were the beginning of an unnumbered host from every kindred, tribe, and nation who have believed to the saving of their souls. What that means in heavenly realms cannot be known in this world.

(f) *"Received Up into Glory."* Christ removed His abode from this *cosmos* world and ascended into heaven where His redeeming work was accepted by His Father who had sent Him into the *cosmos* world. His reception into glory was a public acknowledgment of the work He had accomplished.

Though coming late in point of time, but perhaps with reference to its actual beginning, the prophetic ministry of Christ was attested on the Mount of Transfiguration by a voice from heaven, as was His priestly office at His baptism, and as His kingly office will be attested when He comes again (Ps. 2:7). It is of special import that in each of the three reports of the transfiguration the voice not only declares "This is my beloved Son [Matthew adds here, 'in whom I am well pleased']," but adds the words—indicative of the prophetic office—"Hear ye him," or "Hear him."

(2) Christ Forthtelling and Foretelling. In the most integral sense, Christ fulfilled the prophetic ministry of forthtelling and foretelling.

(a) *Christ Forthtelling.* As for Christ's preaching and teaching, a vast amount was delivered in three and a half years to those who heard Him. Only the merest fragment of this ministry has been preserved in the Gospels. However, under the guidance of the Spirit, precisely that is preserved which is needed for a permanent representation of the message which He gave. Here the claim of Rome to the possession of truth from Christ not contained in the Gospels is proved to be spurious, for no item of

truth not found in the Gospels has been demonstrated to be of equal importance with the body of truth found in the Bible. An analysis of all that fell from the lips of Christ belongs to another line of theological discipline. Suffice it to say that, above and beyond the many brief conversations or averments of truth which are recorded—such as John, chapters 5 to 9, which portion is so strongly apologetical in its nature—there are three major discourses, and these should be attended most faithfully by all who would know the surpassing import of Christ's prophetic ministry.

Matthew 5:1–7:29. This discourse, identified as *The Sermon on the Mount*, was delivered by Christ in His early ministry and at a time in that ministry when He was offering Himself to Israel as their anticipated Messiah. This discourse was given at the time when it was being proclaimed that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and when Christ was sending forth His disciples with explicit instructions that they were not to go to the Gentiles, or to the Samaritans, but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 10:5–7). The most casual reader must be impressed with the change in these directions as later directions are declared by Him (cf. Matt. 13:38; 28:19; Acts 1:8). This discourse presents the King's own pronouncement on the terms of admission into the yet future earthly kingdom and prescribes the required manner of life in that kingdom. That the yet future earthly kingdom, which is covenanted to Israel, was first offered to them, then rejected by them, and on that ground postponed until the second advent will be more fully examined under Eschatology. The offer of the kingdom and its rejection by Israel, which was signified by the crucifixion of the King, was God's predetermined (Acts 2:23) way of accomplishing the sacrifice of His Lamb, and in no sense a jeopardizing of the redemptive purpose which has been in view from all eternity (Rev. 13:8). Nevertheless, by the crucifixion, not only was the redemption wrought out, but the sin of rejecting the King, which was latent in the hearts of men, became a concrete, overt act, and, therefore, subject to judgment as such. A reigning monarch with a rule over all the earth is the assured prediction in connection with His second advent. However, if the setting up of the kingdom was by divine intention postponed until the return of the King, the application of that which this discourse enjoins is deferred until the kingdom is established on the earth. The Sermon on the Mount is characterized—among other features—by the absence of those elements

which are distinctly Christian—redemption by the blood of Christ, faith, regeneration, deliverance from judgment, the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. The absence of these vital elements cannot but arrest the attention of those who are awake to, and jealous for, the faith once delivered to the saints. Nevertheless, this great discourse presents, as divinely intended, the future kingdom relationships with the perfection which characterizes all Scripture.

Matthew 24:1–25:46. The Olivet Discourse, delivered by Christ on the Mount of Olives but a very few days before His death, concerns Israel primarily and assumes the form of a farewell message to that nation. Like the Sermon on the Mount, this discourse is partially recorded by both Mark and Luke, and its extended record is found in Matthew's Gospel. The dominant themes in this discourse are the great tribulation and Israel's warnings concerning it (Matt. 24:9–28); the glorious appearing of Messiah in relation to Israel (24:29–25:30), including exhortations to "watch" (24:36–25:13), judgments upon Israel (24:45–25:30), and judgments upon the nations because of their treatment of Israel (25:31–46). No reference is made in this discourse to the Church—her beginning, her course, her ministries, her departure from this *cosmos* world. Similarly, no reference is made to salvation by grace or the security of those thus saved (cf. 24:50–51; 25:30). In like manner, no reference is made to the Person and work of the Holy Spirit.

John 13:1–17:26. These sublime teachings, not intimated in the Synoptic Gospels, are identified as *The Upper Room Discourse,* and usually include the High Priestly Prayer, chapter 17. This message is spoken to the eleven after the dismissal of Judas, for the most part, and they are no longer reckoned to be Jews under the Law (cf. 15:25), but are those who are "clean" through the Word spoken unto them (cf. 13:10; 15:3). As for its application, it is dated by Christ beyond His death, beyond His resurrection, beyond His ascension, and beyond the Day of Pentecost. The discourse embodies, in germ form, every essential of that system of doctrine which is distinctively Christian. Being addressed to Christians, it does not present truth which is peculiar to Israel, and being addressed to those who are saved, it does not present any feature of salvation by grace which is made possible through the death and resurrection of Christ, which truth is implied. This portion is like a seed plot in which all is found that is later

developed in the epistles of the New Testament. It serves as Christ's farewell address to believers—those whom the Father has given Him out of the *cosmos* world (17:6).

When these three major discourses are diligently compared, it is discovered that they present the widest differences in objectives, subjects, and terminology. The recognition of these variations is, naturally, the inception of the discernment of much vital doctrine. However, the same discriminating study should be given to every word which Christ in His forthtelling prophetic ministry has declared.

(a) *Christ Foretelling.* In this field of truth, Christ excelled all other prophets that ever have spoken. It cannot but stimulate awe and wonder when specific attention is given to the character and extent of Christ's predictive ministry. With reference to His own message He stated that the Holy Spirit would not only bring His words to the disciples' remembrance, but that He would show them things to come (John 14:26; 16:13). The foretelling ministry of Christ included the immediate future actions of individuals; His own death, resurrection, and ascension; the advent of the Spirit; the works of the Spirit in this age; the fact and character of the new age; the Church; the removal of the Church from the world; His second coming, preceded by the great tribulation; the presence of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet; the judgments of Israel and her kingdom glory; the judgment of the nations and their destiny; and the future state of both the saved and the unsaved.

c. The Ministry from Heaven. In this classification may be included the forty-day postresurrection predictions and teachings of Christ. In this He spoke primarily of the kingdom of God (Acts 1:3) and, evidently, of its future aspects; so, also, of Israel's "times and seasons" which the Father has kept in His own power (Acts 1:7). He then anticipated the world-wide proclamation of the gospel (Acts 1:8). From heaven He spoke to the seven churches which were in Asia (Rev., chapters 2–3), which portion of Scripture bears a prophetic forecast of the course of church history throughout this age. Much of direct utterance from the glorified Christ is recorded in the Revelation, which book closes with His words of assurance, "Surely I come quickly." There is a sense, also, in which Christ, as Prophet is forthtelling throughout all this age in and through His messengers. This is

implied in Acts 1:1, where His earthly proclamation is seen to be but the beginning of that which is now in progress. He, too, is speaking through the Holy Spirit, for it is to His voice that the Spirit listens with a view to reproducing the same (John 16:12–13).

2. Priest. No fact concerning Christ is more established than that of His priesthood. It is seen in various Old Testament types, and is the essential truth set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Messiah, it is declared, is to be a Priest after the order of Melchizedec (Ps. 110:4). Aside from this specific declaration, Israel could have had no recognition of a priesthood which did not come by Levi and the Aaronic line. Public consecration at the age of thirty was prescribed by the Law of Moses (Num. 4:3) and the precise manner in which it was to be accomplished was indicated (Num. 8:7 ff.). By His consecration, Christ fulfilled all righteousness and, as on the Mount of Transfiguration when His prophetic office was attested and as it will be when He takes the Davidic throne that His kingly office will be attested, so at His baptism His priestly office was attested by the voice from heaven. Added confirmation was given His priestly consecration by the descent of the Spirit, in the appearance of a dove upon Him, and by the recognition of John, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). But Christ was of the tribe of Judah, and no high priest would be willing to consecrate as priest one from any other tribe than Levi. The mission of John the Baptist was twofold: He was to make ready a people prepared for the Lord (Luke 1:17), and to manifest the Messiah. Of the latter he said: “But that he [Christ] should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water” (John 1:31). John identified the Messiah by pointing to Him as the “Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29, R.V.), and by inducting Him into His public ministry by baptism. It is significant that no question was raised relative to John’s baptizing of the people, or of his baptism of Christ. Objection would have been raised had it been outside the demands of the Mosaic system. It is certain that Christ is a Priest and as such He must be consecrated. John was the son of a priest and himself eligible to consecration. That John served in a specific way in the baptism of Christ is most evident. The baptism of Christ by John is to be distinguished from “John’s baptism.” The latter was unto repentance and remission of sin, all of which was wholly foreign to

Christ. The former was a compliance with prescribed ritual, and therefore a fulfilling of the Law.

It is obvious that the Melchizedec priesthood expectation was free from all tribal issues. Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedec (Heb. 7:17). In but one respect did He conform as antitype to the Aaronic pattern, namely, He made an offering unto God. It is true that the offering was Himself and thus He became both the sacrificer and the sacrifice. He was both the officiating priest—after the pattern of Aaron —and the sacrificed lamb. He "offered himself without spot to God" (Eph. 5:2; Titus 2:14; Heb. 9:14; 10:12). In one notable feature, Christ did not follow the Aaronic pattern. Of Aaron, as of all subsequent high priests, it was required on the Day of Atonement that he offer a sacrifice for his own sins (cf. Lev. 16:6; Heb. 9:7). That Christ offered Himself to God does not contradict the added truth that He was offered by the Father (John 3:16; Rom. 8:32; 2 Cor. 9:15; Isa. 53:10), or that He was offered by the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14).

In respect to the Melchizedec priesthood, Christ followed that pattern in three particulars:

a. In His Person. Whatever may be the identification of Melchizedec — whether he be a Gentile priest to whom typical significance is accorded, or whether he be recognized as one of the theophanies of the Old Testament— it still remains true that the type is declared to be a king-priest, which type finds its antitype only in the Lord Jesus Christ—the final Priest of the most high God, and the King of Peace. So marked is this twofold distinction, that it is said of those who are *in Him* that they are a "kingdom of priests," or, more accurately, kings and priests (Rev. 5:10). By this designation, the closest possible union to Christ and partnership with Him is asserted. It is by this designation, also, that the Church will be identified in all ages to come. Of Israel it may be said that she had a priesthood; but of the Church it may be said that she *is* a priesthood, and that she is appointed to reign with Christ (Rev. 20:4, 6). Similarly, as there was a high priest over Israel's priesthood, so, in like manner, Christ is High Priest over the Church. He is Priest over those who are themselves priests. It is said, "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points

tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace; that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need" (Heb. 4:14–16). A summarization of the doctrine of New Testament priesthood is given by Dr. C. I. Scofield thus:

> (1) Until the law was given the head of each family was the family priest (Gen. 8:20; 26:25; 31:54). (2) When the law was proposed, the promise to perfect obedience was that Israel should be unto God "a kingdom of priests" (Ex. 19:6); but Israel violated the law, and God shut up the priestly office to the Aaronic family, appointing the tribe of Levi to minister to them, thus constituting the typical priesthood (Ex. 28:1). (3) In the dispensation of grace, all believers are unconditionally constituted a "kingdom of priests" (1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6), the distinction which Israel failed to achieve by works. The priesthood of the believer is, therefore, a birthright; just as every descendant of Aaron was born to the priesthood (Heb. 5:1). (4) The chief privilege of a priest is access to God. Under law the high priest only could enter "the holiest of all," and that but once a year (Heb. 9:7). But when Christ died, the veil, type of Christ's human body (Heb. 10:20), was rent, so that now the believer-priests, equally with Christ the High Priest, have access to God in the holiest (Heb. 10:19–22). The High Priest is corporeally there (4:14–16; Heb. 9:24; 10:19–22). (5) In the exercise of his office the New Testament believer-priest is (1) a *sacrificer* who offers a threefold sacrifice: (*a*) his own living body (Rom. 12:1; Phil. 2:17; 2 Tim. 4:6; 1 John 3:16; Jas. 1:27); (*b*) praise to God, "the fruit of the lips that make mention of His name" (R.V.), to be offered "continually" (Heb. 13:15; Ex. 25:22; "I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat"); (*c*) his substance (Heb. 13:16; Rom. 12:13; Gal. 6:6; 3 John 5–8; Heb. 13:2; Gal. 6:10; Tit. 3:14). (2) The N.T. priest is also an *intercessor* (1 Tim. 2:1; Col. 4:12).—*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 1313–14

The essential truth remains that, in every conceivable particular, Christ in His Person is a King-Priest, and that believers, though constituted kings and priests unto God, are such by virtue of their union with Him.

b. By Appointment. The Priesthood of Christ is not self-assumed, but is rather the appointment of His Father. It is written: "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.… Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec" (Heb. 5:5–6, 10). Thus, also, it is written of Christ in heaven: "Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (Heb. 6:20).

c. Eternal Duration. In contrast to the crisis ministry of Christ as Priest after the Aaronic pattern, it is declared of His priesthood which was after the

Melchizedec order, that it is eternal and is sealed as such by the oath of Jehovah. This is the assertion of both Testaments:

> "The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4); "And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest: (for those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore" (Heb. 7:20–28).

Thus it is seen that, in its duration and its unchanging value, Christ's priesthood follows that of Melchizedec who was the God-designed type of Christ's priesthood—being king of peace, without recorded father or mother, and without recorded beginning or ending of days. The inspired record declares: "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually" (Heb. 7:1–3).

3. KING. A partial recognition of Christ's office as King has been included above. A greater body of Scripture relates Him to the Davidic throne, and asserts that He will yet reign on that throne forever. An extended treatment of the doctrine of Christ's kingship is deferred at this point, to be resumed under Eschatology. Citation, however, of two passages which record the divine purpose in His birth respecting the throne of David, follows: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end,

upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (Isa. 9:6–7); "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:31–33). The extent of Christ's kingship is seen in His birth—"born King of the Jews" (Matt. 2:2), as rightful Heir to David's throne, and so recognized by the people (John 12:13); He claimed to be a king (Matt. 27:11); He died under that accusation (Matt. 27:37); and He comes again as "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Rev. 19:16).

III. The Sonships of Christ

As a further step in the general investigation into who the Savior is, consideration should be given to the sonships which He sustained while here on earth. There are four.

1. THE SON OF GOD. Various theories which contend that Christ was: (a) Son of God by virtue of His incarnation—a Being comprising in Himself both Deity and humanity and who could not have merited the title either as God alone or as man alone; (b) that He was Son of God by virtue of His resurrection; or (c) that He was Son of God by mere title or official position, break down before the volume of Biblical testimony which asserts that He was Son of God from all eternity. It is not a question of the eternal existence of the Second Person, but rather of whether the sonship feature was a reality in all eternity past. Not all that enters into the human conception of father and son relationship is represented between the First and Second Persons of the Godhead. In no sense is the Second Person inferior to the First Person. They are One with respect to eternal existence, and every attribute and capacity. It is almost wholly in the sphere of manifestation—the *Logos* character— that the sonship of the Second Person is exercised. It is true that He, for purposes of incarnation and redemption, assumed while here on earth a place of subjection to the First Person, and that He was pleased to work in the power of the Third Person; but this subordination enters in no

way into the truth of His sonship. The theological term *eternal generation* implies that without beginning or ending, the Second Person is the manifestation of the Godhead. It is thus that the "only begotten Son" hath declared God to man (John 1:18). The Son said, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world" (*cosmos*—John 17:6; cf. 1 John 1:2; 4:9). He was Only Begotten in the uniqueness of His begetting. In like manner, He was First Begotten, being first in point of time, as well as in His essential Being, above all others begotten. God gave to the world for its salvation Him who ever was His Son. The One who was given did not become a son by the process of being given, but was a son before and when He was given. Isaiah declares, "For unto us a child is born," which relates to His humanity; and "Unto us a son is given," which not only relates to His Deity, but implies that, though a child born, He is a son, and as such not born, but given. After the same manner it is announced that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son." As He was and what He was, such indeed, was that Gift which was given, namely, the Son of God.

2. The Son of Man. This aspect of Christ's sonship, with due sanction, also terms Him *the Son of Adam*, or *the Son of Mary. The Son of man* title, used about eighty times in the New Testament, was Christ's own almost universal designation for Himself, and its primary significance is of His humanity. In several notable instances, the appellation *Son of man* is used in association with divine undertakings, as, in like manner, the appellation *the Son of God* is used a few times in association with human features. An interesting question arises at this point, asking why Christ placed a striking emphasis upon that name for Himself which so clearly designates His humanity. Could it be that, from the divine viewpoint—and quite outside the range of human appraisals—the element which was *new*, and therefore to be made impressive, was His humanity? The statement, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:14), indicates the beginning of an eternal reality in Christ. What is true about His incarnation is equally true of His association with His people, since they, being in Him, can never be separated from Him. The two facts, then, of His humanity and of His identification with His people cannot but demand a supreme recognition both on earth and in heaven. To the same end it will be seen that the

redemption which Christ supplies is made possible through His humanity, and, though there is no redemption apart from both His Deity and His humanity, the Deity, being from everlasting, is not the immediate theme for public proclamation. It is *the Son of man* that has come to seek and to save that which was lost (Luke 19:10).

Of the title *the Son of man*, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes thus:

> Our Lord thus designates Himself about eighty times. It is His racial name as the representative Man, in the sense of 1 Cor. 15:45–47; as Son of David is distinctively His Jewish name, and Son of God His divine name. Our Lord constantly uses this term as implying that His mission (e.g. Matt. 11:19; Luke 19:10), His death and resurrection (e.g. Matt. 12:40; 20:18; 26:2), and His second coming (e.g. Matt. 24:37–44; Luke 12:40), transcended in scope and result all merely Jewish limitations. When Nathanael confesses Him as "King of Israel," our Lord's answer is, "Thou shalt see greater things … the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." When His messengers are cast out by the Jews, His thought leaps forward to the time when the Son of man shall come, not then to Israel only but to the race (Matt. 10:5, 6 with v. 23). It is in this name, also, that universal judgment is committed to Him (John 5:22, 27). It is also a name indicating that in Him is fulfilled the O. T. foreview of blessing through a coming man (Gen. 1:26, *note;* 3:15; 12:3; Psa. 8:4; 80:17; Isa. 7:14; 9:6, 7; 32:2; Zech. 13:7). —*Ibid.*, p. 1006

In another context, Dr. Scofield states:

> "Son of man," used by our Lord of Himself seventy-nine times, is used by Jehovah ninety-one times when addressing Ezekiel. (1) In the case of our Lord the meaning is clear: it is His racial name as the representative Man in the sense of 1 Cor. 15:45–47. The same thought, implying transcendence of mere Judaism, is involved in the phrase when applied to Ezekiel. Israel had forgotten her mission (Gen. 11:10, *note;* Ezek. 5:5–8). Now, in her captivity, Jehovah will not forsake His people, but He will remind them that they are but a small part of the race for whom He also cares. Hence the emphasis upon the word "man." The Cherubim "had the likeness of a *man*" (Ezek. 1:5); and when the prophet beheld the throne of God, he saw "the likeness as the appearance of a *man* above upon it" (Ezek. 1:26). See Matt. 8:20, *note;* Rev. 1:12, 13. (2) As used of Ezekiel, the expression indicates, not what the prophet is in himself, but what he is to God: a son of man (*a*) chosen, (*b*) endued with the Spirit, and (*c*) sent of God. All this is true also of Christ who was, furthermore, the representative man—the head of regenerate humanity.—*Ibid.*, pp. 841–42

3. The Son of David. The theme of Christ's kingship has received previous, though partial, consideration. Extended investigation into the Davidic covenant, with all that the name *Son of David* connotes, must await a fuller treatment under Eschatology. Like the term *Messiah*, the designation *Son of David* is wholly Jewish in its import. As Christ is Lord and Head over the Church, so He is King and Messiah over Israel. Later, indeed, He

will be King of kings, but that supreme authority will be exercised from the Davidic throne and in connection with His immediate relation to Israel.

4. The Son of Abraham. Though the Davidic sonship is restricted to David's house and David's people, the Abrahamic sonship extends to "all families of the earth," in whose redemption they are blessed (Gen. 12:3). It is significant that the order of truth in the Gospel by Matthew is indicated in the opening verse, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." This gospel of the King is primarily of His relation to Israel (Matt. 10:5–7; 15:24, 26); but, following His rejection, He turns to that redemptive work described in the closing chapters of this Gospel, and in this redemptive service Christ —the Son of Abraham— procures blessings for all the families of the earth (Matt. 28:18–20).

IV. The Hypostatic Union

The uniqueness of the incomparable Person who is the Savior, as has been indicated, is exhibited in His union in His one Person of two natures. He is Deity in the full and absolute sense. In this He is comparable to the Father and to the Spirit. Notwithstanding, He took upon Himself a perfect and complete human nature, and in this respect He was comparable to unfallen Adam, and to other men—except for the injury which sin imposes. That, then, which isolates the God-man from all other beings—whether it be in the Godhead Three, or in the realm of created beings—is this union of two natures in one Person. None other of such character has ever existed, and none other will exist; for no need for such could ever arise. He is the eternal satisfaction of all that requires such a union.

In coming to know Christ as enjoined by the Apostle Peter (2 Pet. 3:18) and thus to be gaining conviction about who it is that undertakes the salvation of men, the mind must ever be alert to recognize both His Deity and His humanity. All thought of this theanthropic Person must be adjusted to the presence in Him of that latitude of Being which completes an uncomplicated participation on His part in two spheres—Deity and humanity. Both of these natures were present in every moment of His existence, beginning with His birth of the Virgin Mary; but it is evident that, when considering any particular act or utterance of Christ's, such will be

found to arise either from His divine nature or from His human nature, but in no instance will such action or utterance arise from a combined action of these two natures. It is recognized that theologians differ widely with regard to their beliefs on this particular point. Probably there are situations presented which defy any final analysis by finite minds; yet much light may be gained by any thoughtful reader of the Gospels, and this investigation will take the student far along in the never ending procedure of coming to know the Savior. Since the two natures which together constitute the one and only theanthropic Person are distinct, the Spirit of God, in bringing to the believer’s attention the things of Christ (John 16:14), is pleased to make the Savior more real to those who preserve with utmost care the recognition of these two natures which are, in themselves, as dissimilar as are things infinite and things finite.

Conclusion

Having reached the termination of this somewhat extended investigation into who the Savior is, this thesis may now proceed to the contemplation of the next theme under the first major division of Soteriology, namely, *The sufferings of Christ.*

Chapter III

Introduction to the Sufferings of Christ

As MOSES, in the presence of the burning bush, was commanded to remove the shoes from off his feet since he stood on holy ground, thus an approach should be made, with such a degree of holy awe and reverence as may be possible to those who are subject to human limitations, to the mysterious, sublime, and solemn revelation concerning the sufferings and death of Christ. On the plea that they transcend the range of human understanding, it would be easy to relinquish all attempts to penetrate into these inscrutable and unfathomable verities, were it not for the fact that the theme is so extended as set forth in the Bible—first by type and later by antitype. It is necessary to conclude, since it is thus set forth, that it is the divine purpose that these aspects of truth shall be pursued with intent and zeal, and be as much comprehended as it shall please the Spirit of God to reveal them to the waiting, attentive heart. The theme sweeps the broadest field of reality. On the one hand, the theme of the sufferings and death of Christ reaches out to the solution of the greatest problem of the universe itself, whereas, on the other hand, it reaches down to the level of the lowliest among men. It is also asserted that He who suffered and died learned, or entered experimentally into, obedience through the things which He suffered (Heb. 5:8; Phil. 2:8). Thus, also—and strangely indeed—He was perfected as an efficient Savior (Heb. 2:10), and, having been thus tested, He is able to succor them that are tested (Heb. 2:18). The individual heart may rejoice with eternal joy over the truth that its own needs are answered in the sufferings and death of Christ, but it is well to remember that the solution of the problem of the universe is in itself an achievement as much greater in extent than the issues related to the individual as the universe exceeds the interests of a single person. There are features in each case which relate themselves to infinity, but one exceeds the other by knowledge—surpassing magnitude; and what may be said of all that lies in between these extremes of mass benefits such as redemption of Israel, the purchase of the Church by His precious blood, the judgment of principalities and powers, and that marvelous achievement

by which the eternal and holy God is free to satisfy the compassion of His own heart toward a lost world! The challenge of this inexhaustible thesis is yet further extended when it is remembered that the theanthropic Person who suffered and died is none other than "God manifest in the flesh." It was God who suffered and it was the blood of God that was shed (Acts 20:28).

The fact that the sufferings and death of Christ reach out to the universe and into the restricted sphere of the immediate need of one human life in but one of its testings, impels the devout mind to the query why so great a need could have ever arisen. The need is apparent and its answer in Christ's sacrifice is perfect, but why should such a need arise in a universe which God has created as holy as Himself and as holy as are all the works of His hands—a universe over which He is supreme and ever must be? In this connection, it is equally as perplexing to note the truth that the intrusion of sin into the universe was, as He foreknew, to cost Him the greatest of all sacrifices that even God could make—the death of His Son. The evangel that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3) is indeed wonderful, but the Bible does not limit the purpose of Christ's death to the need of a human soul. There are larger issues in the Word of God, and to these consideration must be given. That evil would become a reality and need to be judged was clearly anticipated in the mind of God from all eternity, for, in the divine purpose, Christ was a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8). Sin was in anticipation and is in reality of such a nature that only the sufferings and death of Christ could answer its claims. If God could have saved a sinner from one sin by a mere release, discharge, or leniency, then He might have temporized with the problem of the universe and spared Himself the immeasurable sacrifice of His Son; but neither the problem of one sin in one life nor the problem of a universe could be answered apart from that sacrifice. When entering upon the contemplation of the sufferings and death of Christ, it is important that this truth respecting its necessity should be emphasized.

Though there is immeasurable inequality in their importance, the general theme of the sufferings and death of Christ is divided into (a) His sufferings in life and (b) His sufferings in death. In that order these themes are to be considered.

I. Sufferings in Life

Far beyond the mere fact of Christ's suffering in various ways during His ministry of three and a half years is the theological importance of those sufferings, first, because of the typical significance of those sufferings, and, second, because they have been overstressed in a number of respects, being supposed to achieve what is plainly not designed for them.

In type, the paschal lamb was proved to be without blemish by being confined—a symbol of suffering—from the tenth day of the month to the fourteenth (Ex. 12:3, 6). Thus, also, the life sufferings of Christ served to give full proof of His sinless character, even in the midst of manifold testings, for He was "in all points tested like as we are"—apart from the sin nature (Heb. 4:15). Though unrelated to this immediate theme, it is also to be observed that the four days of confinement of the paschal lamb typified the truth that Christ was "foreordained before the foundation of the world" and was "manifest in these last times for you" (1 Pet. 1:20).

The life sufferings of Christ—too often misrepresented—are well classified as (a) sufferings due to His *character*, (b) sufferings due to His *compassion*, and (c) sufferings due to His *anticipation* of the supreme ordeal of His sacrificial death. However, before these three aspects of life sufferings are taken up separately, it should be noted that in none of them, nor in any other feature of Christ's life, did He undertake any aspect of that work upon which the salvation of a soul depends. Only dire confusion of doctrine results when it is not conceded that, whatever His life-ministry under divine appointment may have been, the *finished work* did not begin until He came to the cross and that work was consummated when He died. The distinctive, efficacious character of the doctrinal aspect of the sufferings of Christ in death cannot be preserved from confusion unless this division of truth is observed.

1. Sufferings Due to His Holy Character. If Lot's righteous soul was vexed by seeing and hearing the unlawful deeds of the dwellers in Sodom (2 Pet. 2:7–8), how much more distressed was the spotless Son of God in the midst of the moral darkness and corruption of fallen men! Such suffering could be estimated only by one who is infinite purity and holiness; yet there is no saving value in these sufferings. What He suffered because of His holiness finds no parallel with His sufferings in death. In the one instance, the unique purity of His holy nature was offended, yet preserved

in the midst of surrounding evil. In the other instance, He took the sinner's place and was Himself "made sin," even He who knew no sin (2 Cor. 5:21). All that evil men or Satan might inflict upon Him in His lifetime was suffered because of His own holy character. Had He been one with fallen humanity and in league with the enemy of God, there would have been no occasion for Him to suffer in this respect. This truth is the basis of His warning to His own who, as He was, are now in this *cosmos* world. He said to them, "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep your's also" (John 15:18–20). At no time in Christ's earth ministry could it be implied that He was forsaken of His Father. But once, and only once, did He cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Only inattention will assume that Christ was bearing sin as a substitute at any other time than those darkest hours of Calvary. On the contrary, the voice from heaven, both at His baptism and on the Mount of Transfiguration, declared that in Him—the Son—there was infinite pleasure. Though Christ always did His Father's will—even in death—He was not always making His soul "an offering for sin" (Isa. 53:10). The precise line of division between the life sufferings and the death sufferings is not easy to determine. In Isaiah 53, all that enters into His death as the immediate preparation for it, is included. He is there said to be *wounded*, *bruised*, *chastised*, and subject to *stripes* by which there is healing. In the minds of those who inflicted the death sufferings of Christ, it is probable that the scourging, the buffeting, the spitting, and the crown of thorns, like the nails and the spear, were but parts of the whole project. If this be true, the stripes are included in the death sufferings and it would be without controversy that "with his stripes we are healed."

2. Sufferings Due to Christ's Compassion. Christ was in every respect the manifestation of the Father (John 1:18). The Psalmist declares, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him" (103:13), and in this the Lord Jesus Christ was a perfect representation of the Father's heart. All His miracles of healing and restoration were

prompted by His compassion. In Matthew 8:16–17 it is written: “When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.” Much error is abroad because of a form of teaching which avers that Christ when healing was bearing as a substitute the diseases of those whom He healed. It is true that Matthew relates the physical healing described in this text to Isaiah, chapter 53, but a careful examination of this chapter will disclose that Isaiah refers to both the life sufferings of Christ (vss. 1–4a), and the death sufferings (vss. 4b–12). The turning point is in verse 4 and is marked by the word *yet*, which verse reads: “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.” If this division be accepted, the bearing of disease and sickness, reported in Matthew 8:16–17, which is there based on Isaiah 53:4, belongs to His life sufferings and is wholly in the realm of His compassion, which compassion, due to His infinite perfection, was beyond human measurement. Isaiah 53:4a was fulfilled by Christ when He, moved by this boundless compassion, healed those who came before Him. Not all the sufferers in that land or in the world were healed by Him, and no such offer is ever extended to them. Compassion naturally is drawn out toward those immediately observed. None could deny the reality of physical healing on the part of God today, but it is properly based on His compassion for His own and not on the death sufferings of Christ.

3. Sufferings Due to Anticipation. The anticipation of the cross was constantly before Christ. The words, “For this cause came I unto this hour” (John 12:27), are but one of His recorded forward looks into the dark shadow which was before Him. His predictions concerning His own death (Matt. 16:21; 17:12, 22–23; Mark 9:30–32; Luke 9:31, 44, etc.), the inauguration of the Lord’s Supper, the cup to be emptied, and the sufferings of Gethsemane, all belong to His sufferings in anticipation. On this aspect of Christ’s sufferings, C. H. Mackintosh in his *Notes on Leviticus* states:

> We find the dark shadow of the cross casting itself athwart His path, and producing a very keen order of suffering, which, however, must be as clearly distinguished from His atoning suffering as either His suffering for righteousness or His suffering by sympathy. Let

> us take a passage, in proof—"And He came out, and went, as He was wont, to the mount of Olives; and His disciples also followed Him. And when He was at the place, He said unto them, 'Pray that ye enter not into temptation.' And He was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, 'Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from Me: nevertheless not My will, but Thine, be done.' And there appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him. And being in an agony, He prayed more earnestly: and His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground" (Luke 22:39–44). Again, we read, "And He took with Him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith He unto them, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.'… He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, 'O My Father, if this cup may not pass from Me, except I drink it, Thy will be done'" (Matt. 26:37–42). From these verses, it is evident there was a something in prospect which the blessed Lord had never encountered before,—there was a "cup" being filled out for Him of which He had not yet drunk. If He had been a sin-bearer all His life, then why this intense "agony" at the thought of coming in contact with sin and enduring the wrath of God on account of sin? What was the difference between Christ in Gethsemane and Christ at Calvary if He were a sin-bearer all His life? There was a material difference; but it is because He was not a sin-bearer all His life. What is the difference? In Gethsemane, He was *anticipating* the cross; at Calvary, He was actually *enduring* it. In Gethsemane, "there appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him"; at Calvary, He was forsaken of all. There was no angelic ministry there. In Gethsemane, He addresses God as "*Father,* " thus enjoying the full communion of that ineffable relationship; but at Calvary, He cries, "My *God*, my *God*, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Here the Sin-bearer looks up and beholds the throne of Eternal Justice enveloped in dark clouds, and the countenance of inflexible Holiness averted from Him, because He was being "made sin for us."—2nd ed., pp. 64–65

At this point, occasion demands that a return be made to the subject of Christ's baptism because of the fact that His baptism is too often deemed to be an act of Christ's which identified Him as Sin-Bearer with those He came to save. This conclusion is based on the conception of water baptism, that it signifies the death of Christ rather than the all-transforming baptizing work of the Spirit, and that, by His baptism, Christ anticipated His death sufferings and was in the act of baptism taking His place with sinners. In harmony with this, it is believed that Christ received "John's baptism." It is true He was baptized by John, but it is not true that He received what is identified in the New Testament as *John's baptism*, which was a well-defined, specific baptism unto repentance and unto the remission of sin. The following from George Smeaton (*The Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 99) serves to illustrate the manner in which this theory is usually set forth: "Impurity of His own He had none. But He had truly entered into humanity, and come within the bonds of the human family; and, according to the law,

the person who had but touched an unclean person, or had been in contact with him, was unclean. Hence, in submitting Himself to baptism as Mediator in an official capacity, the Lord Jesus virtually said, 'Though sinless in a world of sinners, and without having contracted any personal taint, I come for baptism; because, in my public or official capacity, I am a debtor in the room of many, and bring with Me the sin of the whole world, for which I am the propitiation.' He was already atoning for sin, and had been bearing it on His body since He took the flesh; and in this mediatorial capacity promises had been made to Him as the basis of His faith, and as the ground upon which His confidence was exercised at every step." Over against this, the words of Dr. James W. Dale (*Christic and Patristic Baptism*, pp. 27–28) serve to discover the weakness and error of the contention that Christ was baptized by "John's baptism":

> It is one thing to be baptized by John and quite another thing to receive the "baptism of John." Therefore, while the Scriptures teach us that Jesus came to the Jordan to be baptized by John, they do not teach us that he came to receive John's baptism. Indeed it is impossible, in any just aspect of the case, that he could have received it. Whatever involves an absurdity must be impossible and untrue. That an absurdity is involved in such a supposition is thus shown: "The baptism of John" was for sinners; demanding "repentance," "fruits meet for repentance," and promising "the remission of sins." But the Lord Jesus Christ was not a sinner, could not repent of sin, could not bring forth fruit meet for repentance on account of sin, could not receive the remission of sin. Therefore the reception of "the baptism of John" by Jesus is impossible, untrue, and absurd. Again: The baptism of John was "to prepare a people for the Lord." But to address such a baptism to the Lord (preparing the Lord for himself) is absurd. Therefore the reception of John's baptism by the Lord Jesus is impossible, untrue, and absurd. It is just as absurd to suppose that he received this baptism formally but not substantially. A baptism exists only while its essence exists. The essence of John's ritual baptism is found in its symbolization of purification in the soul through repentance and remission of sin. But in the Lord Jesus there was no basis for such symbolization, and consequently there was no basis for the baptism of John. The idea that John's baptism could be received representatively is just as impossible. To the glory of God in the highest, the Lord Jesus did "bear our iniquities," was "made sin for us"; but he was not hereby the more qualified to receive John's baptism. The Lord Jesus did not represent penitent sinners, nor sinners whose iniquities were remitted. He came as the Friend of publicans and sinners, to call sinners to repentance, to give repentance to Israel; there was no adaptation in the baptism of John to such Sin-Bearer. He must accomplish a baptism for himself; it must be of blood and not of water; "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin" such as Jesus bore. In his character as Bearer of the sins of others, he neither had nor could have anything to do with John's baptism.

Reference is made at this point to Christ's baptism only because of the fact that His baptism is the event which, as often interpreted, serves more

than any other to confuse the issues of Christ's life and ministry with the issues of His death. It must be recognized that He anticipated His death from the beginning of His public service—as did the Baptist (John 1:29); but no contribution was made to His redeeming, reconciling, and propitiatory work by His baptism. The efficacious work which His Father gave Him to do was inaugurated at the cross; there it was prosecuted, and there it was consummated. If the distinction between that which Christ wrought in His life and that which He wrought in His death—and many are apparently not awake to it—is not observed, only confusion of doctrine will result.

Yet another consideration arises, namely, a distinction which devout men have made between what is termed the *active* obedience of Christ and His *passive* obedience. By the word *active* they refer to that obedience in which the Savior maintained a perfect rectitude of life, keeping every divine requirement in infinite perfection. By the word *passive* they refer to that obedience which endured suffering both in life and in death. He not only did not do wrong, but He fulfilled perfectly every right action belonging to man. Later it will be demonstrated that, in His substitution, Christ not only bore the penalty of sin, but also presented His own infinitely perfect character to God. This offering included His earth life in which He fulfilled all the will of God in the sense that His own character would have been incomplete without it. Similarly, it is asserted by some that His *passive* obedience entered into every privation which He endured while in this *cosmos* world, and by this aspect of His obedience as much as by the death sufferings, souls are saved. Jonathan Edwards declared that the blood of Christ's circumcision when He was eight days old was as efficacious as that which flowed from the thrust of the spear. The weakness of such a claim is exposed in the fact that the Word of God does not assign saving value to any obedience of the sufferings of Christ other than that connected with His death. The declaration that He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. 2:8), intimates that a particular obedience was exhibited, or one peculiar to its own purpose, in the cross. It is true that salvation for sinners depends upon Christ's passive obedience in His death sufferings and the offering of Himself without spot to God. Salvation is based on the blood of the cross and not on the blood of circumcision or even the blood which

He sweat in the garden. He provided no redemption, reconciliation, or propitiation when circumcised or when baptized.

II. Sufferings in Death

The centrality of the cross has been acknowledged by all devout minds from its day to the present hour. The unregenerate see in it little more than a "stumblingblock"—which it is to the Jew—and "foolishness"—which it is to the Gentile; but to those who are the called, both Jews and Gentiles, it is the power of God—since by it His saving power is released—and the wisdom of God—since by it the greatest problem is solved which ever confronted Him, namely, How can God remain *just* and yet justify the ungodly who do no more than to believe in Jesus (1 Cor. 1:23–24; Rom. 3:26; 4:5)? When it is asserted that the cross is to the Gentiles *foolishness*, it is not implied that they are ridiculing it, but rather it is indicated that the interpretations they give to Christ's death are foolish in that those interpretations are not worthy of the Son of God; and such is every interpretation save the one assigned in the Word of God, which is that of a blood sacrifice for sin offered by a substitute who dies in the room and stead of sinners. To the Apostle Paul, the cross became the supreme theme of his boasting. He said, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14).

In the opening paragraph of his book *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*, Dr. James Denney asserts: "It will be admitted by most Christians that if the Atonement, quite apart from precise definitions of it, is anything to the mind, it is everything. It is the most profound of all truths, and the most recreative. It determines more than anything else our conceptions of God, of man, of history, and even of nature; it determines them, for we must bring them all in some way into accord with it. It is the inspiration of all thought, the impulse and the law of all action, the key, in the last resort, to all suffering. Whether we call it a fact or a truth, a power or a doctrine, it is that in which the *differentia* of Christianity, its peculiar and exclusive character, is specifically shown; it is the focus of revelation, the point at which we see deepest into the truth of God, and come most completely under its power. For those who recognise it at all it is Christianity in brief; it

concentrates in itself, as in a germ of infinite potency, all that the wisdom, power and love of God mean in relation to sinful men." A like emphasis was given by the great Calvinistic theologian, Francis Turretin (1623–1687), when he wrote regarding the importance of that death, that it was "the chief part of our salvation, the anchor of Faith, the refuge of Hope, the rule of Charity, the true foundation of the Christian religion, and the richest treasure of the Christian Church. So long as this doctrine is maintained in its integrity, Christianity itself and the peace and blessedness of all who believe in Christ are beyond the reach of danger; but if it is rejected, or in any way impaired, the whole structure of the Christian faith must sink into decay and ruin" (cited by R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*, 4th ed., p. 3). Not only does the theme of Christ's sufferings and death exceed all others, as these witnesses testify, and not only is it central in Biblical truth, but it is eternal with respect to its past—Christ a slain Lamb before the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8)— and eternal with respect to its future, being as it is the theme of coming glory, "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing" (Rev. 5:9–12).

In approaching the theme of Christ's sufferings and death, certain truths of general import about which there has been much misunderstanding, should be considered.

1. Contrast Between the Crucifixion and the Cross. There is the distinction to be drawn between the crucifixion—the greatest of all crimes —and the cross—contemplated as the sign of God's redeeming grace: that which Dr. R. W. Dale describes as "the sublimest moment in the moral history of God" (cited by Henry C. Mabie, *The Meaning and Message of the Cross*, p. 23). Could a greater contrast be conceived? It is possible to think of the death sufferings of Christ only as that which originated with men and

was executed by men. Such a restricted conception may result in strange reasoning. Dr. Henry C. Mabie cites the following statement illustrating this impression:

> In the correspondence column of Rev. R. J. Campbell of London in *The British Weekly*, an enquirer recently put this question: "I have a Bible class, some of the members of which are fine, thoughtful young fellows. We are studying the life of Christ, and will shortly reach the crucifixion. How can I make clear that the act of crucifying Christ was a *crime*, while at the same time it is *the hope* on which the Christian builds?"And Mr. Campbell, before proceeding to answer, remarks: "This difficulty occurs far more generally than I should have thought." Lord Beaconsfield is said once to have caricatured the Atonement in the following terms: "If the Jews had not prevailed upon the Romans to crucify our Lord, what would have become of the Atonement? The immolators were preordained like the victim; and the holy race supplied both. Could that be a crime which secured for all mankind, eternal joy?" A leading Unitarian minister in New York City, in a sermon preached in his own church a few years since, touching this subject, used these words: "What does atonement mean to the world? It means that the Eternal Father either will not, or cannot receive back to His heart His own erring, mistaken, wandering children, unless the only begotten Son of God is *slaughtered*, and we, as the old, awful hymn has it, 'are plunged beneath this ocean of blood.'" A supposedly evangelical American minister in his recoil from certain misconceptions of evangelicalism against which he was protesting, once went so far as to say,— "Strictly speaking, the death of Christ was not necessary to human salvation … He was not a suicide; He was *murdered.* To say that His death was an indispensable condition to human salvation is to say that God's grace had to call in the aid of murderers in order that it might find a way to human hearts. I am not willing to acknowledge any indebtedness to Judas Iscariot for the forgiveness of my sins."—*Ibid.*, pp. 21–22

It would seem probable that the Satan-imposed blindness of the unregenerate respecting the gospel (2 Cor. 4:3–4), and the illumination which the regenerate receive, center at this crucial point, on the meaning of Christ's death. In the one instance, men see only a brutal murder, and, since the victim was innocent—a lovable, admirable character— there is a field for meditation on certain lessons which may be drawn from that tragic death. By so much and with sincerity the cross is made *foolishness.* In the other instance, the regenerate by illumination granted them are able to see in the cross the whole scope and plan of redeeming grace. It is declared—and how many passages might be cited—that Christ was "set forth" (which is evidently a reference to His position as a victim on the cross) to declare the righteousness of God, that "he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:25–26).

Since the sufferings and death of Christ are central in all revealed truth and since these may be estimated so differently—on the one hand as the

major crime, and on the other hand, as “the sublimest moment in the moral history of God”—His sufferings and death demand a careful and prayerful consideration above all the facts of the universe. Probably no writer has more faithfully set up this great contrast with all it involves than Dr. Henry C. Mabie. Though somewhat extended, the following quotation (*Ibid.*, pp. 25–30) is a contribution needed at this point in this discussion:

> In this study I start then by pointing out that the tragedy of Christ’s crucifixion in its awful criminality, and the cross of the divine reconciliation in its unique moral majesty, are in character wholly distinct. The crucifixion on the human side was incipient in the sin of the race; and the reconciliation on the divine side, since God is what He is in His long-suffering holiness, was ever eternally in the heart of God waiting to be enacted. It is true that in those last hours upon the cross, the deep, spiritual work of the reconciliation was being consummated *simultaneously* with the crime which Christ’s crucifiers were perpetrating upon Him: in spirit, however, and in moral character, the two enactments were at the farthest possible remove from each other.… A concrete picture drawn from the New Testament account of the crucifixion may make clearer the distinction treated in this chapter. In observing the record of the execution of Jesus, a careful reader will notice the varied mental attitudes of the several types of people who stood before the cross. There are at least five classes of people whose attitudes were fundamentally the same; the common crowd, that “passed by wagging their heads”; the Jewish rulers who had connived at the crucifixion; the railing malefactor who rejected Christ; the Roman soldiers, who knew no king but Caesar; and the half-superstitious beholders, who in the cry of “Eli, Eli,” supposed Jesus to be calling for Elias. Each of these five classes appealed alike to Christ to demonstrate that He was really the Messiah, by coming down from the cross and saving His life. The crowd said, “Ha, Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save Thyself and come down from the cross” (Mark 15:29). The rulers said, “He saved others, Himself He cannot save; let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe” (Mark 15:31–32). The malefactor said, “Art not Thou the Christ? Save Thyself and us” (Luke 23:39). The soldiers said, “If Thou art the king of the Jews, save Thyself” (Luke 23:37). The superstitious said, “Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take Him down” (Mark 15:36). Each of these, observe, in effect said to Jesus, *“Save Thyself.”* These all saw chiefly the tragedy of the crucifixion, they supposed the cross in that sense to be finality in the life of Jesus. Unless Jesus should use His miraculous power to take Himself off the scaffold,—supernaturally keep Himself alive,—they would have no faith in Him; the demonstration to their minds would be complete that He was not what He claimed to be, the Son of God, the Messiah of Israel, the Saviour of the world. Now, over against these five classes, there is a single shining exception, of one whose position radically differed from that of these types just noted, and he expresses himself differently: The dying penitent was the first and only one among all that spoke out at the execution of Jesus, who did not say, *“Save Thyself.”* He did cry, *“Save me.”* And he said “Jesus”; that is, he used the saving name, with discernment of who and what He really was. He and he alone saw there was something deeper transpiring than the crucifiers recognized; that Jesus really was allowing the sanctuary of His body to be taken down, in order that it might be rebuilt. He discerned that if Jesus would save others from the spiritual necessities of the case, He could not “save Himself”; He must endure what sin would impose on Saviourhood; he saw that Jesus really was “the King of Israel,” “the

> chosen of God," "the good shepherd," laying down His life for the sheep, so laying it down that He "might take it again." This penitent was the first and only one at the crucifixion that saw a whole new kingdom lying beyond the impending death of Jesus, of which he might become a member. That kingdom, however, was to be built upon the divine side of what was going on. He saw at least in principle the coming resurrection, and the glorious possibilities involved in it… Doubtless he was spiritually, preternaturally endued with the insight of one on the borderland of the celestial world; and thus saw both sides of the crucifixion event, the basely human and the nobly divine. But he especially saw with great vividness the reality of the reconciliation, saw it from the heaven-side, as God sees it—as we all should learn to see it;—and he exclaimed in that model prayer, marked with its peculiar illumination, "Jesus, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom" (Luke 23:42);—a kingdom conditioned on what was now being borne by Christ. This man and this one only, so far as we know, of all that stood about the Christ on Calvary, apprehended the reconciliation, God's act,—an act as both deliberate and permissive,—the reconciliation as distinguished from man's criminality in the crucifixion. There was probably not a disciple that stood there, not one of the women, not even the Saviour's own mother Mary, that would not, if possible, in their sheer inability to perceive what God was achieving, have prevented the completion of Christ's purpose on the cross. As yet, none of these disciples understood as they did afterwards in the light of Pentecost—the cross of the redemption. This dying man so unfortunately stigmatized in the common epithet, as "the dying thief," is really the ideal penitent. He and he only, had the vision of the cross of reconciliation. He alone looked beyond the tragic horrors of the crucifying deed. He was absorbed with the larger reality, that Christ, despite man's treatment of Him, was really bearing away the sin of the world, preparatory to a spiritual kingdom which lay beyond the climacteric of His dying hour. The penitent sought membership in that kingdom, a privilege of grace instantly assured by the reply of Jesus, "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43).

As before intimated, the unenlightened, unregenerate people can discern nothing in Christ's death beyond the human tragedy that it was, and in vain do they with sincerity attempt to invest it with some spiritual significance. It is dramatized, crucifixes are multiplied, pictures are painted, preachers and poets dwell upon the physical aspects of that death and, too often, discover nothing beyond the bodily anguish which was His. However, none have wrought more confusion than has the Church of Rome by her asserted transubstantiation and the approach to idolatry which her use of images provides. Rome is the supreme example of a religion based on the *crime* of the crucifixion, which, at the same time, is void of any conception of the glory of the cross. There was a tragedy in the crucifixion which none should minimize, but it is not the ground of redemption. God is not basing His immeasurable love-gift on the supreme crime of all crimes. He bases it upon the sublime truth that He so loved the world that He gave His only

begotten Son to be His own, provided sacrificial Lamb. Christ was God's Lamb—not Pilate's. God provided the redeeming blood—not Caiaphas.

As is to be expected, there is no point in human history where the divine sovereignty and human responsibility, or free will, come into more vivid juxtaposition than they do in the crucifixion of Christ. On the divine side, Christ's death was predetermined in such a way that God assumes all responsibility for it, nor could He share its achievement with another. It was His purpose from all eternity. It was foreshadowed in God-wrought types. All its details were predicted by Spirit-empowered prophets. In Psalm 22 there is recorded the cry of suffering: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? why art thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roaring?" (vs. 1); the precise words the tormentors would utter: "He trusted on the LORD that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him" (vs. 8); the acknowledgment of the divine responsibility: "And thou hast brought me into the dust of death" (vs. 15); the piercing of the hands and feet: "They pierced my hands and my feet" (vs. 16); and the parting of the garments and casting lots for His vesture: "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture" (vs. 18). To the same end, there is in Isaiah, chapter 53, the recital of the truth that it was Jehovah who bruised Him, who put Him to grief, who made His soul an offering for sin (vs. 10). Likewise, the sovereignty of God is reflected in the more than forty times the word *fulfilled* occurs in the New Testament and in reference to the realization of the purpose of God in the death of His Son. On the human side, men were doing and saying precisely what was predicted of them, yet in such a way as that the responsibility fell alone upon them. Christ was rejected by the Jews, betrayed by Judas, condemned by Herod, and crucified under Pontius Pilate. Beyond all this human action it is declared that it was God who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself (2 Cor. 5:19). It is written that Christ was *made* sin (by the Father—certainly not by Judas Iscariot), that lost souls might be made (by the Father—certainly not by Pontius Pilate) the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. 5:21). Two immeasurable facts—as far removed from each other as the east is from the west—were spoken by Peter in his Pentecostal sermon, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23). In precisely the same manner in which there is no

gratitude due Judas, Herod, or Pontius Pilate, there is no doctrine based on what they did. The transforming power of Christ's death is not in the human tragedy; it is in the divine reconciliation. The death and resurrection of Christ are counterparts of one divine undertaking. None will predicate of man that he had any part in the resurrection; yet the divine accomplishment in the cross is as void of human cooperation as is the resurrection.

2. Who Put Christ to Death? Closely related to the contrast between the divine and human sides of Christ's death, is the question: Who put Christ to death? As already indicated, the Scriptures assign both a human and a divine responsibility for Christ's death—not a co-operation or partnership, for each is treated, in its own sphere, as wholly answerable. In all, eight individuals or groups are held accountable. Four of these are named in Acts 4:27–28: "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." Here, again, the Holy Spirit safeguards the all-important truth that these individuals and groups were doing precisely what the hand and counsel of Jehovah determined. The fifth responsible individual is Satan—though he may have been aided by uncounted cohorts of evil spirits. In the great protevangelium of Genesis 3:15, it is stated that not only would Christ bruise the serpent's head, but that the serpent would bruise His heel. Thus it is implied that Satan did what he could in the exercise of his power—directly, or indirectly, through human agents—against the Savior. There is much Scripture which reveals that a mighty conflict was waged between Christ and the powers of darkness. It is written: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John 12:31); "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30); "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:11); "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (Col. 2:14–15). What transpired between the Son of God and Satan at the cross is related to heavenly spheres and cannot be comprehended by men.

The remaining three who are said to be accountable for Christ's death are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The action of the Father is presented in types, in prophecies, and in direct declarations. It is written: "God will provide himself a lamb" (Gen. 22:8); "Thou hast brought me into the dust of death" (Ps. 22:15); "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Ps. 22:1); "Reproach hath broken my heart" (Ps. 69:20); "Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin" (Isa. 53:10); "Behold the Lamb of God" (John 1:29); "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23); "For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done" (Acts 4:28); "He that spared not his own Son" (Rom. 8:32); and "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son" (John 3:16).

The action of the Son is typified in the nonresistance of Isaac on Mount Moriah; also in prophecy by the words "But thou art holy" (Ps. 22:3), and "Yet he opened not his mouth" (Isa. 53:7); and in direct statement: "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (John 10:18); "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost" (Luke 23:46); "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it" (Eph. 5:25); "Who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20); "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14); "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28); "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" (1 John 3:16). The willingness of the Son in the Father's hand is the answer to the contention that it is immoral for God to offer His Son. Such an act on the part of God, it is freely admitted, might be the most terrible crime or the most glorious consummation of divine grace. All depends on the one issue of whether the sacrifice is imposed upon the Son against His will or whether He is in agreement and cooperation with His Father. That He was in agreement is assured in the above Scriptures, which indicated that He offered Himself, and in every passage in which He is seen to be subject to His Father's will, notably,

“Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God” (Heb. 10:7).

The action of the Holy Spirit in the sufferings and death of Christ is revealed in one passage in particular: “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (Heb. 9:14).

3. What Christ Suffered at the Hands of Men and What He Suffered at the Hands of His Father. Still more closely related to the major distinction between the crucifixion as a crime and the cross as the supreme manifestation of divine compassion, is the difference to be seen between that which Christ suffered at the hands of men and that which He suffered at the hand of His Father. Human hands might inflict physical suffering and death as any victim would die, but only the hand of God could make Christ a sin offering, or could lay on Him the iniquity of others (2 Cor. 5:21; Isa. 53:6). No more impossible notion has been formed into verse than the line of a hymn which reads, “I lay my sins on Jesus, the spotless Lamb of God.” It is not in the power of any man to lay his sins on Jesus, or to lay anyone’s sins on Jesus. Had Pontius Pilate been moved with superhuman compassion for lost souls and had he crucified the Savior with that in view, he could have done no more than to crucify Him. God alone might provide a sin-bearer and God alone could impute sin to the One He provided.

4. The Value of Christ’s Sufferings to the Father. Yet another vital distinction—essential, indeed, to a clear understanding of the nature of the sufferings and death of Christ—is that which may be seen when the value of Christ’s sufferings and death, as pertaining to the Father, is compared with that value as it pertains to those who are saved by it. An exact computation of those values is not possible by any human being. That the one who is saved will not perish, but is in present possession of eternal life, that he is united to Christ to share His peace and glory, and that he shall, when he sees his Savior, be like Him, could never be accurately appraised by men. Over against this is the truth that, regardless of His infinite love which would bless the creatures of His hand, the moral restraint on God which sin imposes could not be removed even by a sovereign decree; it was necessary,

in the light of His holy character and government, that the price of redemption should be required at the hand of the offender or at the hand of a substitute who would die in the offender's place. By the death of Christ for sinners, the moral restraint is removed and the love of God is free to act in behalf of those who will receive His grace and blessing. No measurement may be placed on the meaning of this freedom which the cross has secured for God. It is revealed, however, that, when thus untrammelled, God, in the satisfaction of His love, accomplishes the greatest thing that God can do, which is, so to transform the sinner who trusts Him that the sinner will appear in eternal glory conformed to the image of Christ. There is nothing conceivable that would be a greater achievement than this; but it is wrought, primarily, to satisfy the love of God for the sinner. Those who trust Him will not perish, but have everlasting life. However, all this was made possible because of the fact that God so *loved* that He gave His only begotten Son. What the freedom to exercise such love, which is secured by the death of Christ, means to God is as incomprehensible as the divine love itself.

To the same end, it may be added that, as the salvation of a soul demonstrates the exceeding grace of God, which grace could not be exhibited by any other means, the death of Christ has secured and made possible that exalted experience on God's part of the exercise of His superabounding grace. Again, all human estimations are incapable of any adequate knowledge of the value to God of Christ's death.

5. The Wisdom, Power, and Sacrifice of God. A reasonable approach to the contemplation of the sufferings and death of Christ requires that due thought be given to the wisdom, power, and sacrifice which God has exercised in devising and achieving the plan by which the lost may be saved. As before observed, the cross is to the Jew a stumbling block and to the Gentile foolishness, but to those who are called—whether Jew or Gentile—Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:23–24). Thus it is asserted that God's power is set free to act in behalf of the lost, and His wisdom is demonstrated in the plan of salvation—all through the cross of Christ. As for His power, it is noticeable that, according to Psalm 8:3—"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers"—creation is said to be but the finger-play of God; but, when He would save

the lost, according to Isaiah 53:1—"to whom is the arm of the LORD revealed?"—the great right arm of Jehovah, the symbol of all His strength, is made bare and called into action. As for His wisdom, it is disclosed that, by the death of His Son, He has solved His greatest problem, namely, how He might be just and yet justify the ungodly (Rom. 3:26; 4:5). As for His sacrifice, no greater immolation could be designed than is indicated by the words, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all" (Rom. 8:32). It would be folly indeed for men to suppose that it is within their capacity to comprehend the *power* of God, the *wisdom* of God, or the *sacrifice* of God as revealed in the salvation of a soul.

6. THE UNIFIED ACTION OF THE THREE PERSONS. Still another introductory word concerns the unified action of the three Persons of the Godhead in saving the lost. The three Persons are seen achieving the creation of the universe. To each this vast work is accredited separately and with the implication that each acted alone and when so acting was wholly sufficient and responsible. In the greater work of redemption—specifically the sufferings and death of Christ—it is the Son who suffers and dies, but the Father gives the Son and the Son is offered by the Eternal Spirit. Here is revealed the deepest unified action and cooperation. The Son cries, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Ps. 22:1; Matt. 27:46), yet it is affirmed that it was the very God to whom He cried that was, at that precise moment, "in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). To finite minds all this is paradoxical, yet it serves to emphasize anew the deeper truth that, though there are three Persons in the Godhead, there is but one essence. Neither the Father nor the Spirit became incarnate. The action of the Son was always according to the will of the Father and never more so than in His death (Phil. 2:8). All the Son wrought was in the power of the Spirit and never more perfectly than in His death. Objectively, not only did the Father *give* the Son (John 3:16), but He *sent* the Son (John 3:17), He *loved* the Son (John 3:35), He is *glorified* in the Son (John 14:13), and He *glorified* the Son (Acts 3:13); yet wholly consonant is this truth with a deeper reality, namely, that the Father and the Son are one (John 10:30; 14:9–11; 17:21). Thus in the larger revelation, which men may not comprehend, the triune God is the Savior of the world. Neglect of this aspect of truth has always resulted in notions respecting God which are

injurious. When specific attributes are assigned to one Person over the other Two, a theology arises which conceives of the Father as the arbiter of justice, the defender of holiness, while the Son is the manifester of that divine love which would rescue the sinner from the judgments which the Father requires. The Son does not save from the Father, He saves from righteous judgments against sin; and of the Savior it is said that into His hands all judgment has been committed (John 5:27; Acts 10:42; 17:31). The Father is not the condemner of the world. He it was who sent His Son into the world, that the world through Him might be saved (John 3:17). It still remains true that the Father gave the Son, the Son died, and the Spirit applies the value of that death to those who believe.

7. Two Major Features of Soteriology. And finally, by way of words of introduction, there are two major features of Soteriology—(a) the finished work of the Savior on the cross, and (b) the application of that work to those who believe. Each of these factors is declared to have been determined divinely from a dateless past. Of the Savior's work it is written that He was a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8). Of the saved one it is said that he was "chosen in him before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4). To this will be added under Ecclesiology a third aspect of the eternal purpose, namely, that the good works of the saved one are foreordained that he should walk in them (Eph. 2:10). These three—a foreordained Savior, a foreordained salvation, and a foreordained service—constitute the essential elements in the eternal counsels of God respecting the Church which is His body. Confusion too often characterizes the treatment men give to the first two of these eternal purposes. The Savior has finished the work and it only remains for the sinner to *believe* and be saved. What Christ has done on the cross and what He will do now for the one who believes are widely different aspects of truth. On the one hand, there are those who teach that it is equivalent to the salvation of a soul if Christ dies for that soul. On the other hand, there are those who direct the unsaved to plead with God for their salvation. Certainly the unsaved are not called upon to ask Christ to die for them; and as certainly they are not called upon to urge the Savior to apply His salvation. The promise is not to those who ask, but to those who *believe.* Since, through the death of Christ, God is propitious, saints may be restored and sinners saved without reproof or

punishment from God—no blow is struck and no condemnation is uttered. The Savior has died. That may be believed, and such belief leads to the salvation of the soul; but what He did for the sinner two millenniums ago should not be confused with that salvation which is wrought now when the sinner believes. Hypothetically considered, the Savior might have died, thus providing every ground for a perfect salvation, and no one have believed; for the cross compels no one to believe. It is the sovereign election of God, that which made choice of men for salvation before the foundation of the world, which insures the salvation. In the execution of that sovereign election, the Spirit calls, illuminates, engenders faith, and applies all the value of Christ's death to the one who thus believes.

Chapter IV

THINGS ACCOMPLISHED BY CHRIST IN HIS SUFFERINGS AND DEATH

WHEN ANTICIPATING His cross Christ said, "For this cause came I into the world" (John 18:37), and, again, "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10). In the light of these sayings, it may be concluded that, as before asserted, the theme of the sufferings of Christ in death is the ground of all right doctrine and the central fact in this cosmic universe. It exceeds the importance of the material universe—in so far as the universe provides a sphere wherein evil may be tested, judged, and banished forever. Of all that the cross of Christ achieved in angelic realms and toward the final judgment of evil as a principle, somewhat has been said previously under hamartiology; yet it is clear that unaided finite minds cannot follow far in this vast domain of reality. Some revelation is recorded with respect to these immeasurable issues, and to this attention will be directed in due time. The general theme of that which Christ accomplished in His death sufferings and in His death may, in an attempt at clarity, be divided into the following fourteen divisions: (1) a substitution for sinners, (2) Christ the end of the law principle in behalf of those who are saved, (3) a redemption toward sin, (4) a reconciliation toward man, (5) a propitiation toward God, (6) the judgment of the sin nature, (7) the ground of the believer's forgiveness and cleansing, (8) the ground for the deferring of righteous divine judgments, (9) the taking away of precross sins once covered by sacrifice, (10) the national salvation of Israel, (11) millennial and eternal blessings upon Gentiles, (12) the spoiling of principalities and powers, (13) the ground of peace, (14) the purification of things in heaven. To the end that the student may be encouraged to pursue these limitless themes more exhaustively, an introductory outline or condensed survey of each is here undertaken.

I. A Substitution for Sinners

Though it underlies much of all that Christ accomplished, His vicarious sufferings and death, being the foundation of all truth respecting the divinely provided cure for sin, will first be treated separately and recognizing five particulars, namely, (1) the words which imply substitution, (2) vicarious suffering in general, (3) mediation, (4) substitution with respect to the judgment of sin, and (5) substitution in the realms of divine perfection.

1. The Words Which Imply Substitution. Two prepositions are involved in this aspect of this theme—ἀντί and ὑπέρ. On the meaning and force of these words, Archbishop R. C. Trench, in his *New Testament Synonyms* (9th ed., pp. 290–91), writes thus:

> It has been often claimed, and in the interests of an all-important truth, namely the *vicarious* character of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, that in such passages as Heb. 2:9; Tit. 2:14; 1 Tim. 2:6; Gal. 3:13; Luke 22:19, 20; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18; 4:1; Rom. 5:8; John 10:15, in all of which Christ is said to have died ὑπὲρ πάντων, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων, and the like, ὑπέρ shall be accepted as equipollent with ἀντί. And then, it is further urged that, as ἀντί is the preposition first of equivalence (Homer, *Il.* ix. 116,117) and then of exchange (1 Cor. 11:15; Heb. 12:2, 16; Matt. 5:38), ὑπέρ must in all those passages be regarded as having the same force. Each of these, it is evident, would thus become a *dictum probans* for a truth, in itself most vital, namely that Christ suffered, not merely *on our behalf* and *for our good*, but also *in our stead*, and bearing that penalty of our sins which we otherwise must ourselves have borne. Now, though some have denied, we must yet accept as certain that ὑπέρ has sometimes this meaning … but it is not less certain that in passages far more numerous ὑπέρ means no more than, on behalf of, for the good of; thus Matt. 5:44; John 13:37; 1 Tim. 2:1, and continually. It must be admitted to follow from this, that had we in the Scripture only statements to the effect that Christ died ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, that He tasted death ὑπὲρ παντός, it would be impossible to draw from these any irrefragable proof that his death was vicarious, He dying in our stead, and Himself bearing on His Cross our sins and the penalty of our sins; however we might find it, as no doubt we do, elsewhere (Isa. 53:4–6). It is only as having other declarations, to the effect that Christ died ἀντὶ πολλῶν (Matt. 20:28), gave Himself as an ἀντίλυτρον (1 Tim. 2:6), and bringing those other to the interpretation of these, that we obtain a perfect right to claim such declarations of Christ's death *for us* as also declarations of his death *in our stead.* And in them beyond doubt the preposition ὑπέρ is the rather employed, that it may embrace both these meanings, and express how Christ died at once *for our sakes* (here it touches more nearly on the meaning of περί, Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; 1 Pet. 3:18; διά also once occurring in this connexion, 1 Cor. 8:11), and *in our stead;* while ἀντί would only have expressed the last of these.

As intimated by Archbishop Trench, there is no problem connected with the word ἀντί. In as definite a manner as language may be made to serve, this word means *substitution*—one taking the place of another. The word

ὑπέρ, however, is broader and does mean in some instances no more than a benefit provided and received; yet, in other instances, it as certainly becomes the equivalent of ἀντί. The way is therefore open to some extent for those who would belittle the doctrine of *substitution* to stress the more general use of ὑπέρ, while those who heartily defend this doctrine stress its vicarious meaning. The reasonable attitude is to allow ὑπέρ its full latitude to the extent that when, according to the context, it seems to express actual substitution, to give it the same force as ἀντί. If, by the restriction of ὑπέρ to the idea of mere *benefit,* the doctrine would be eliminated, the case would be different; but as long as ἀντί serves its specific purpose and cannot be modified, the truth is only clarified and strengthened by the more specific and wholly legitimate use of ὑπέρ as implying an actual *substitution.* Philemon 1:13—"Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel"—and 2 Corinthians 5:14—"For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead"—may serve to demonstrate the truth that ὑπέρ does convey, when the context sustains it, the thought of actual substitution. This twofold meaning of ὑπέρ serves a real advantage, for Christ died in the sinner's place and as a benefit to the sinner. The word ἀντί appears in such a declaration as, "The Son of man came … to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28), and the absolute character of *substitution* is seen in such Scriptures as Matthew 2:22; 5:38; Luke 11:11. However, in a much larger body of Scripture the word ὑπέρ occurs and in these the deeper meaning should be read: "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Luke 22:19–20); "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John 6:51); "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13); "Christ died for the ungodly … while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:6–8); "He … delivered him up for us all" (Rom. 8:32); "If one died for all, then all died" (2 Cor. 5:14–15, lit.); "He hath made him to be sin for us" (2 Cor. 5:21); "Being made a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13); "Christ … gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God" (Eph. 5:2, 25, R.V.); "The man Christ Jesus … gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:5–6); Christ did "taste death for every man" (Heb. 2:9); Christ "suffered … the just for the unjust" (1 Pet. 3:18).

2. Vicarious Suffering in General. As the term *vicar* refers to a deputy or agent who acts in the place of another, thus the word *vicarious* means that one takes the place of another, serving or acting as a substitute. In the case of an obligation between man and man, the law permits the debt to be discharged by a third party, provided no injustice to others is wrought. However, the divine permission for a substitute to act for man in his relation to God is one of the most fundamental provisions of saving grace. As fallen man stands obligated to God as an offender—both in his federal head and in himself—against his Creator and against the divine government, he owes an obligation which he could never pay in time or eternity. Unless a vicar shall intervene there is no hope for any member of this fallen race. No sin-laden human being could be vicar for a fellow being. The vicar must be sinless as well as prepared to bear those immeasurable judgments which divine holiness must ever impose upon sin. In God there are two attributes which are at once involved when a creature sins. These are justice and mercy. Justice imposes, and continues to impose, the undiminished judgment which sin entails. Not for one instant is justice softened or curtailed in the interests of mercy. Because of His holy character, God cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance. The truth abides, that the soul that sinneth, it shall die. No greater misrepresentation could be formed against the holy character of God and the government of God than the implication that His justice is ever softened or modified in the interests of mercy. To contend that God could save one sinner from the judgment of one sin by the exercise of mercy, is to accuse God of the greatest folly that could be known in the universe; for if one sin could be cured by mercy alone the principle would be established by which all sin could be cured and the sacrificial, vicarious death of Christ would be rendered wholly unnecessary. When Christ died at the hand of His Father as an offering for sin, it is evident—except God be deemed the example of infinite foolishness, if not infinite wickedness—that there was no other way by which sinners could be saved. The Bible teaches without deviation that Christ by His death met the demands of justice in behalf of the sinner—in the sinner’s room and stead—and those who will come unto God by Him are saved without the slightest infringement upon divine holiness. If it be inquired relative to where divine mercy appears, the answer is that it is manifested in the provision of a Savior to meet the demands of infinite justice.

Theologians are wont to distinguish between *personal* and *vicarious* satisfaction to God for sin. When the sinner bears his own penalty, he is lost forever and his achievement, though a failure, is a thing which originates in him and which he offers to God. This is *personal* satisfaction to God. On the other hand, when a sinner accepts the vicarious Sin-Bearer, he is saved forever and the achievement originates with the Savior and is offered to the sinner. This is *vicarious* satisfaction to God. These two principles—personal and vicarious satisfaction to God—are better known by the terms *works* and *faith*. The principle of works represents all that man can do for himself; the principle of faith represents all that God can do for man. The one is void of mercy; the other is the greatest possible display of mercy. The one has no promise of blessing in it; the other secures every spiritual blessing in Christ Jesus. None have stated the value of Christ's sacrifice more clearly than Augustine. He states: "The same one and true Mediator reconciles us *to* God by the atoning sacrifice, remains one *with* God to whom he offers it, makes those one in himself *for* whom he offers it, and is himself both the offerer and the offering" (*Trinity*, IV. 14:19, cited by Shedd, *Theology*, II, 400). The doctrine of the Bible is that God saves His own people—those who trust Him—from His own wrath (cf. Ps. 38:1; Isa. 60:10; Hos. 6:1; Job 42:7–8). Unconfused and without counteraction the one against the other, God experiences both wrath and love at the same time and each to the extent of His infinite Being. Ezekiel portrays Jehovah as beating His breast in lamentation over the fall of Lucifer who became Satan (Ezek. 28:12); yet there is no redemption for that angel and the lake of fire forever awaits him (Rev. 20:10). How great is Jehovah's wrath and indignation against Israel as seen in the chastisements which fall upon them! Yet He loves them with an everlasting love. The Christian, likewise, discovers that the grace by which he is saved is exercised toward him by the very tribunal which condemned him. A throne of awful judgment has become a throne of grace. Upon these two characteristics in God—wrath and love—Dr. Henry C. Mabie writes thus:

> The whole Deity is behind the atonement, within it, and at the root of it. Grace is after all God's grace. When our sin arose, it created an antinomy, a self-opposition, so to speak, in God. God, as holy, must oppose and condemn sin, otherwise He could not be God. That side or polarity of the divine nature must judge and punish sin. But there is another side, or polarity to God's being called love. And as such it just as eagerly and spontaneously yearns

> to pardon and save. How then could these opposite polarities which even the anticipation of sin as well as its actual occurrence called into exercise in one and the same Trinity, be reconciled, and so reconciled as to save the guilty? We answer at once, God Himself, reconciled them by His own voluntary vicarious suffering, whatever it was. This was the essential reconciliation—the cosmic reality—the divinely satisfying thing to God Himself. But He could not so manifest it as to give the needed assurance and help that man needed, except as it came to concrete and visual and God-human disclosure of its reality, in Christ on the Cross. Nor could the historic fact of sin without it be met and demonstrated upon the same earth where the sin had occurred but by an adequate answering historical event.… Thus only evidently could God be *exhibited* as "just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26). Hence, the atonement conceived in any way that separates the Father from the fullest participation in it is but a partial view. Grace in the nature of the case, is something that must be construed as an expression of *government* —it is a governmental function—and also has reference to a unified divine government. The source of grace can never be divided. Yet the Trinity is not excluded thereby, and the Trinity is not tri-Theism. Dual relations, *rapports* arise in God as the expression of two moral poles of His being; and the reconciliation made necessary by the incoming of sin is conceived as immanent in God, in His very unity. So God on one side of His nature *provides* what on another side of His nature He *exacts.* That is, God may do one thing in order to another.—*Under the Redeeming Aegis*, pp. 89–92

As certainly as God foresees and predetermines, the event of Calvary was ever as real to Him as it was in the hour of its enactment—the hour of the greatest of all achievements, the answering of all that an offended God demanded to the end that He might be free to exercise His love unhindered in behalf of the objects of His affection. These opposites in God were ever reconciled in His anticipation of the cross; yet there was the necessity—the thing He anticipated—that the cross should become historical, an actual doing of that which could not be avoided. In truth, if the heart of God could be seen as it is now, and always has been, not only would infinite hatred for evil be discovered, but the same willingness to give His Son to die for the ungodly and His enemies would be discerned. Calvary was, then, the necessary working out in time of that which was eternally in the heart of God. It is the fact that within God a reconciliation was anticipated from all eternity, made real in time, and to be recognized by Him in all eternity to come, that forms the basis of His grace. Grace and love are not the same. Love may long to save, but, because of the immutable demands of justice, be powerless to do so. On the other hand, grace in God is that which love accomplishes on the ground of the truth that Christ has met the demands of justice. The self-reconciliation in God, which the cross provides, opens a field for divine achievement in the salvation of the lost which otherwise

must be impossible. Doubtless God was free to act toward sinners in grace in past ages on the ground of His anticipation of the cross; but with great assurance it may be believed that He is free so to act since the cross. By its very character, grace is related to divine government. It is a way of getting things done. Whatever God does in grace He is free to do because of the cross. In ages to come He will display His grace by means of that salvation of sinners which He will have achieved (Eph. 2:7). To those thus saved He says: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. 2:8–9). This incomparable grace is not only wrought out *by* God, but is wrought out *in* God. He is "the God of all grace." Peace is sealed by the Holy Spirit in the heart of those who believe and because of the fact that they are right with God and God is right with them.

3. MEDIATION. In the broadest significance of the term, *mediation* implies at least two parties between whom it functions. The lament of Job reflects the need of a mediator as that need existed in the world before the advent of Christ. Job said: "For he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment. Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both" (Job 9:32–33). The separation between the righteous God and sinful Job is recognized when Job said, "For he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment"; and the case was even more hopeless since no "daysman" existed "that might lay his hand upon us both." The English term *daysman* means 'arbitrator' or 'umpire.' The thought in Job's mind is of an established and accepted mediator between God and man. Job's conception, which pictures this intermediate agent as having the right to lay his hand on each party, is exceedingly clear, reaching, as it does, far beyond the range of conditions which might arise between men. The laying on of the hand, which Job visualizes, speaks of inherent equality between the daysman and the one on whom the hand is placed. Since Job has indicated that the estranged parties are God and himself, the placing of the daysman's hand upon God requires that the daysman shall be equal with God, and the placing of the daysman's hand on Job requires that the daysman shall stand, also, on the same level with Job, having the inherent right which belongs to a fellow man—a representative of actual kin. Thus,

in terms which breathe more of the wisdom and purpose of God than is common to man, Job has declared the fundamental features which of necessity are found in the theanthropic Mediator. Sin caused an estrangement between God and man, and since all have sinned, the need is universal. That God is offended by sin need not be argued. It is less recognized, however, that sin has hardened the heart of man, befogged his mind, and caused him to be full of unreason and prejudice. When Adam and Eve sinned, they hid, not from each other, but from God.

There is a *public* or general sense in which Christ's reign as King will be mediatorial in that, standing between God and man, He will put down authority and every enemy of God, thus restoring peace in a universe torn and distressed by sin (1 Cor. 15:25–28); but His *personal* mediation is the combined functioning of His work as Prophet and Priest. In the one He represents God to man, while in the other He represents man to God. In the priestly office He offers a sacrifice which answers the demands of divine justice and the uttermost need of the doomed sinner. He thus puts His hand upon God and upon man. He is the true Daysman. In its relation to the sinner, the work of the Mediator is none other than the substitutionary work of Christ, and, to avoid repetition, the theme need not be pursued separately at this point.

4. Substitution with Respect to the Judgment of Sin. A previous paragraph has lent itself to the consideration of the force of the doctrine of substitution as expressed by the words ἀντί and ὑπέρ This doctrine is not only clearly taught in the Bible, but its truth has done more to engender trust in God for the pardon of sin than all the ethical teachings of Christ, as such, and His life-example combined. It is well to note, also, that it is not the doctrine of Christ's death for sin but rather the death itself that provides relief to the burdened heart. The study of theories becomes the student of theology, but that which the burdened sinner needs is the truth that Christ actually died in his room and stead.

Perhaps more has been written on the theme of Christ's death than any other subject in the Bible. Passages have been classified and analyzed with utmost care. The Biblical assertions are convincing and confirming, that "Christ died for our sins"; "He bare our sins"; "He was made to be sin for us"; "He was made a curse for us." Remission of sin and deliverance from

wrath are said to be wholly through His death for sin: “He gave his life a ransom for many.” His death was a redemption, a reconciliation, and a propitiation. Every objection that human learning could devise has been hurled against these declarations, but to no avail. The truth is self-justifying, and it is difficult indeed to argue against that which always produces the blessing it proffers. In this connection a statement from William Ellery Channing (1780–1842), “the apostle of Unitarianism,” is of interest. He declared:

> We have no desire to conceal the fact, that a difference of opinion exists among us (Unitarians) in respect to an interesting part of Christ’s mediation; I mean in regard to the precise influence of his death on our forgiveness. Many suppose that this event contributes to our pardon, as it was a principal means of confirming his religion, and of giving it a power over the mind; in other words, that it procures forgiveness by leading to that repentance and virtue which is the great and only condition on which forgiveness is bestowed. Many of us are dissatisfied with this explanation, and think that the Scriptures ascribe the remission of sins to Christ’s death, *with an emphasis so peculiar that we ought to consider this event as having a special influence in removing punishment*, though the Scriptures may not reveal the way in which it contributes to this end. Whilst, however, we differ in explaining the connection between Christ’s death and human forgiveness, *a connection which we all gratefully acknowledge*, we agree in rejecting many sentiments which prevail in regard to his mediation.—*Complete Works*, cited by John Stock, *Revealed Theology*, pp. 149–50

The fact that One who demonstrated His Deity, in ways which candid minds cannot reject, came into this world and died a sacrificial death—asserting with unimpeachable truthfulness that it was to the end that men might be saved from their sins, that satisfaction might be made to God, that man might be pardoned and justified on the ground of His death, that in no other way might God’s moral government be upheld— has imposed a body of truth upon the thought of the world which is calculated to become the most dominant factor in their philosophy of life. If it fails to become this, the reason must be sought in the sphere of inattention, or incapacity, or wanton insincerity. It is near dishonesty for men to say, as they have done, that there is not a word in the Bible about the punishment due for our sins having been inflicted by a just God upon His own Son. Nor does it answer the demands of the revealed truth to assert that Christ shared human sin only in sympathy for the sinner, or that He offered some kind of a vicarious confession for the sinner, or that, as a man, He virtually took His share of the consequences of sin as it is in the world. All this suggests the foolishness of 1 Corinthians 1:23.

An extended classification of the passages which bear on that which is accomplished by Christ in His death was prepared in 1871 by T. J. Crawford in the volume *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement.* This analysis (as edited by R. W. Dale, *Atonement,* 4th ed., 443–58) is appended herewith:

I. Passages which Speak of Christ

(1) As *dying for sinners.*

Matthew 20:28; Luke 22:19a; 22:19b, 20; John 6:51; 10:11, 15, 18; 15:12, 13; Romans 5:6–8; 8:32; 2 Corinthians 5:14, 15; 5:21; Galatians 2:20; 3:13; Ephesians 5:2, 25; 1 Thessalonians 5:9, 10; 1 Timothy 2:5, 6; Titus 2:13, 14; Hebrews 2:9; 1 Peter 3:18; 1 John 3:16.

(2) As *suffering for sins.*

Romans 4:25; 8:3; 1 Corinthians 15:3; Galatians 1:4; Hebrews 10:12; 1 Peter 3:18; Isaiah 53:5, 8.

(3) As *bearing our sins.*

Hebrews 9:28; 1 Peter 2:24; Isaiah 53:6, 11, 12.

(4) As *being "made sin" and "made a curse for us."*

2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13.

II. Passages which Ascribe to The Death of Christ

(1) The *removal and remission of sins, and deliverance from their penal consequences.*

John 1:29; Hebrews 9:26; Matthew 26:28; 1 John 1:7; Luke 24:46, 47; Acts 10:43; 13:38, 39; Ephesians 1:6, 7; Colossians 1:13, 14; Revelation 1:5, 6; John 3:14–17; 1 Thessalonians 5:9, 10.

(2) *Justification.*

Isaiah 53:11; Romans 5:8, 9; 3:24–26.

(3) *Redemption.*

Matthew 20:28; Acts 20:28; Romans 3:23, 24; 1 Corinthians 6:19; Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14; Hebrews 9:12; 1 Peter 1:18, 19; Revelation 5:9.

(4) *Reconciliation to God.*

Romans 5:10, 11; 2 Corinthians 5:18, 19; Ephesians 2:16; Colossians 1:21, 22.

III. Passages in which The Lord Jesus Christ is Represented

(1) As *a Propitiation for sin.*

1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:10; Hebrews 2:17; Romans 3:25.

(2) As *a Priest.*

Psalm 110:4; Hebrews 3:1; 2:17; 10:21; 4:14; 7:26.

(3) As *a Representative.*

Hebrews 5:1; 7:22; Romans 5:12, 18, 19; 1 Corinthians 15:20–22, 45–49.

IV. Passages which Represent The Sufferings of Christ

(1) As "*sacrificial.*"

Under this head, "Behold the Lamb of God," etc., should reappear. To these may be added: 1 Corinthians 5:7; Ephesians 5:2; Revelation 7:14, 15; Hebrews 9:22–28; 10:11–14.

V. Passages which Connect Our Lord's Sufferings with his Intercession.

1 Timothy 2:5, 6; 1 John 2:1, 2; Revelation 5:6; already quoted, reappear, and Philippians 2:8, 9, 10.

VI. Passages which Represent The Mediation of Christ

(1) As *procuring the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit.*

John 7:39; 16:7; 14:16, 17; 15:26; 14:26; Acts 2:33; Galatians 3:13, 14; Titus 3:5, 6.

(2) As *conferring all Christian graces which are fruits of the Spirit.*

John 1:16; 15:4, 5; 1 Corinthians 1:4–7; 1:30; Ephesians 1:3, 4; 2:10; 4:7; Colossians 2:9, 10.

(3) As *delivering us from the dominion of Satan.*

1 John 3:8; John 12:31, 32; Hebrews 2:14, 15; Colossians 2:15.

(4) As *obtaining for us eternal life.*

John 3:14, 15; 5:24; 6:40, 47, 51; 10:27, 28; 14:2, 3; 17:1, 2; Romans 5:20, 21; 6:23; 2 Timothy 2:10; Hebrews 5:9; 9:15; 1 Peter 5:10; 1 John 5:11; Jude 21.

VII. Passages Which Indicate The State Of The Saviour's Mind In The Prospect And In The Endurance Of His Sufferings.

John 10:17, 18; Luke 12:50; John 12:27; Matthew 26:36–44; 27:46.

VIII. Passages Which Speak Of The Mediation Of Christ In Relation

(1) To *the free calls and offers of the gospel.*

John 14:6; 1 Corinthians 3:11; 1 Timothy 2:5; Acts 4:12.

(2) To *the necessity of faith in order to obtain the blessings of the gospel.*

John 1:12; 3:18, 36; 6:35; Acts 13:38, 39; 16:31; Romans 1:16; 3:28; 5:12; 10:4; Galatians 5:6; Ephesians 2:8, 9.

IX. Passages Which Speak Of The Mediatorial Work And Sufferings Of Christ In Relation

(1) To *His covenant with the Father.*

John 6:38–40, 51.

(2) To *His union with believers.*

John 15:4; Romans 6:5; 2 Corinthians 4:10; Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 2:5, 6; Philippians 3:10; Colossians 2:12; 3:3.

X. Passages Which Speak Of The Death Of Christ

(1) As *a manifestation of the love of God.*

John 3:16; Romans 5:8; 8:32; 1 John 4:9, 10.

(2) As *furnishing an example of patience and resignation.*

Hebrews 12:1–3; 1 Peter 2:20, 21; Luke 9:23, 24.

(3) As *designed to promote our sanctification.*

John 17:19; Hebrews 10:10; 13:12; 2 Corinthians 5:15; Galatians 1:4; Ephesians 5:25–27; Titus 2:14; 1 Peter 2:24.

It is natural that much that has been written regarding Christ's first advent should assume that His objective in coming is exhausted in the one purpose that He was to be a sacrifice for sinners. It is thus claimed by not a few that all His sacrifice, even His leaving heaven, and every privation and rejection, was vicarious in character, that is, it was wrought in behalf of others. No doubt others were benefited; but such sacrifice was not in any sense a substitution, since no other was ever appointed to the path which He pursued. All His life was a sacrifice, but by universal Biblical usage only that sacrifice by which He gave His life on the cross is vicarious and substitutionary. It will be remembered, also, that there was much accomplished in Christ's first advent in manifesting God, in bringing the nation Israel to trial, and in satisfying the love of God. The sinner gained a benefit, but God gained a benefit of infinite proportions. Similarly, the death of Christ reaches out in its effect to angelic spheres and to heaven itself. Therefore, it is not sufficient to assume that the substitutionary death of Christ for sinners contemplates all that His sufferings and death accomplished. Certain titles suggest the wide scope of Christ's interests and gracious undertakings. He is the Last Adam, Head, High Priest, Husband, Advocate, Propitiation, Intercessor; but in none of these is He taking the place of another as vicar or substitute.

In the midst of so great and complex a disclosure respecting the relationships and achievements of Christ, none is so constantly emphasized as that of His substitution in suffering and in death for sinners. If this great transaction—the Father offering His Son as the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world—were supremely immoral, as some declare (which it is not), it would yet stand on the pages of the Bible more sustained by repeated assertion than almost any other one subject. In other words, the doctrine of substitution is not only revealed to man by God as His gracious solution of the problem of sin, but is real, leaving but one obligation upon those for whom the Savior died, which is that they *believe.* It would be difficult indeed to explain the Savior's agony in the garden and on the cross —an agony far exceeding physical torture—if it is contended that sin was not laid on Him. On this aspect of truth Henry Rogers, in his third letter on the atonement, wrote: "And remember, that if you insist on the injustice of God's inflicting suffering on Christ, for the sins of others, you cannot escape similar difficulty, and greater in degree, on your own system; for, can it be less unjust to inflict such sufferings on Christ *for no sins at all?* If it be unjust to accept Him as sacrifice for the guilty, how much *more* unjust must it be to insist on the sacrifice for nothing, and when the victim thrice implored in agony, that, *if it were possible, the cup might pass from Him*" (cited by Stock, *op. cit.,* p. 156). The difficulty in accounting for the sufferings and death of Christ is greatly increased when it is considered that He was Himself the holy, undefiled, and spotless Lamb of God. In this there is no receding from the essential truth that Christ became a legal substitute, which undertaking demanded of Him that He meet the judgment due for the failure of those whom He represented. He became the voluntary Bondsman, their Surety (Heb. 7:22), meeting their liabilities and providing the required ransom. This is the precise import of the language employed in the Sacred Text. If it be inquired to whom the ransom was paid and whose demands are met by the payment, it is answered that the obligation is to God in respect to His holiness. There is a distinction to be seen between *pecuniary* and *moral* obligations; yet the Bible implies that an actual parallel exists between these when it speaks of the sacrifice and blood of Christ as a ransom and a redemption. A debt of obligation to a broken law or offended authority may be as real as a financial debt which is contracted with a fellow being. A criminal in prison, or when executed, is paying the debt he owes to outraged

law and government. The basis of all obligation is the duty of the creature to fulfill the purpose and will of the Creator. In this, all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. A sinless Substitute *purchased* the deliverance of sinners (Acts 20:28), He paid the required *price* (1 Cor. 7:23), a *ransom* (Matt. 20:28), and *redemption* (Eph. 1:7). The legal aspect of this revelation is that God required the sinner's obligation to be met. There could be no receding from this holy demand. The love of God is seen in the fact that Christ *voluntarily* consented to pay the debt, and in the fact that the Father accepts the payment at the hand of the Substitute. Thus the way of salvation for sinners on the ground of the sufferings and death of the Substitute is established; and, in addition to the indisputable reality which this revelation sets forth, the same truth is vindicated by the unfailing efficacy of it in the experience of those who believe. It is possible to disbelieve and reject God's provisions for the sinner in the Substitute, but it is puerile to assert that the Bible does not teach the doctrine of substitution. God is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity" (Hab. 1:13). He rather magnifies the law and makes it honorable (Isa. 42:21), and no more perfect upholding of the law of His holy Being could be conceived than is exemplified in the voluntary assumption of a qualified substitute taking on himself the discharge of the sinner's obligation. The Apostle Paul states: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: … to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. … For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:14, 19, 21).

The import of these and other Scriptures is not that Christ, in a commercial sense, bore the sin of the world. This would mean that had there been one more sinner His sufferings would have been increased by so much, or had there been one less sinner His sufferings would have been decreased by so much. In a *forensic* sense Christ made a legal sacrifice for sin the value of which is available for all who believe. Had it pleased God to terminate human sin immediately after the first human sin, it would have required precisely the same sufferings and death on the part of the Savior to save that one sinner from his one sin. On the other hand, the invitation is extended to a lost world of humanity, since Christ has borne the judicial

penalty of sin, to receive these provided benefits. On this vital truth, Dr. Augustus H. Strong writes: “Just as much sun and rain would be needed, if only one farmer on earth were to be benefited. Christ would not need to suffer more, if all were to be saved. His sufferings, as we have seen, were not the payment of a pecuniary debt. Having endured the penalty of the sinner, justice permits the sinner’s discharge, but does not require it, except as the fulfillment of a promise to his substitute, and then only upon the appointed condition of repentance and faith. The *atonement* is unlimited,—the whole human race might be saved through it; the *application* of the atonement is limited,—only those who repent and believe are actually saved by it” (*Systematic Theology*, p. 422). The Biblical illustration of forensic suffering and death is presented in type. A lamb might serve for an individual, as in the case of Abel; a lamb might serve for a family, as was true of the Passover; or a ram might serve for a nation, as on the day of atonement.

The value of the sacrifice is not to be discovered in the intensity of the Savior’s anguish but rather in the dignity and infinite worth of the One who suffers. He did not give more or less; He gave *Himself*, He offered Himself, but this self was none other than the Second Person of the Godhead in whom measureless dignity and glory reside.

Closely related to the above aspect of the substitutionary death of Christ is that held by earlier theologians, namely, that Christ actually became *sin*, rather than that He bore its penalty; that is, the actual estate of the Second Person ceased to be holy and became that which a fallen sinner is. What Christ bore or became cannot be measured by man, simply because of the fact that no man is able to contemplate these issues from the vantage point of the spotless lamb of God. Nevertheless, God not only invites men to be saved by faith in His Lamb but as faithfully declares that the salvation He offers is based on the substitution which Christ undertook—the Just for the unjust. Sin was *laid* on Him, He was *made* sin, He *bore* our sins, His soul was made an *offering* for sin, and He *gave* Himself for us (cf. Isa. 53:6, 10–12; Rom. 8:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; Heb. 9:28; 1 Pet. 2:24); thus it becomes man to seek to know *all* that God has spoken, believing that He means man to understand it and has greatly honored man by such a revelation. Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander, in his *System of Biblical Theology* (II,

102–6), discusses this feature of Soteriology in a manner well suited to this thesis. He writes:

> Beginning with those who look upon the atonement of Christ in the light of a legal satisfaction or judicial expiation, I remark that all agree in thinking that the work of Christ derives its worth from the union of the divine and the human natures in His person, and all admit that worth to be not only supreme, but infinite. There is a difference, however, between certain schools or classes of them as to the nature of the compensation rendered to the divine government and law on our behalf by Christ, His special purpose and intention in offering it, and the consequent extent to which His work was designed to be sufficient. Of these varying shades of opinion we notice the following: (1) *That of the Hyper-Calvinists*, —a name which has been given, not because those to whom it is attached are regarded as having gone beyond Calvin in their doctrine, but because they carry the views of Calvin on this head to their utmost extent, and hold them with unbending rigidity. *a.* According to them, the work of Christ was of the nature of a price paid for the release of man from penalties which he had incurred,—a price which bore a fixed and exact relation to the amount of debt which man had incurred by his sins. According to this view, what He rendered was strictly a *quid pro quo;* there was as much on the one side as on the other; the suffering obedience of the Saviour being an exact equivalent for the sins of the saved, and that not by a *solutio tantadem*, but by a *solutio ejusdem, i.e.* not by paying something of equal value of the same kind, but by paying the very thing that was due. This opinion cannot be ascribed to Calvin, who expresses himself in a very general manner as to the satisfaction made for man by Christ. "When we say," he remarks, "that favour was procured for us by the merit of Christ we mean this, that by His blood we have been cleansed, and that His death was an expiation for our sins." "This I take for granted, that if Christ satisfied for our sins, if He suffered the punishment due to us, if by His obedience He propitiated God, if, in fine, He, the just, suffered for the unjust, then salvation was procured by His righteousness for us, which is equivalent to our having merited it" (*Instit.*, 2:17.4, 3). These statements are so general that they might be advanced by any one holding the Satisfaction theory. Among Calvin's followers, however, both on the Continent and in this country, there were found some by whom the doctrine as above stated was asserted in all its rigidity. Not only was it maintained that Christ became "sponsor for those alone who by eternal election had been given to Him, … and them alone did He reconcile unto God" (*Form. Cons. Helvet.*, art. 13),—that He did not make satisfaction or in any way die save for all and only those whom the Father had given Him, and who are actually saved (Witsius, *Oecon. Foed.*, ii. c.9, Par. 6); but the opinion was broadly avowed that there was a transference of the sin of the elect to Christ, and that He actually suffered the same as they should have suffered, and thereby paid for their redemption exactly what the law demanded as the due penalty of their offences. Thus, Owen says of the satisfaction made by Christ: "It was a full, valuable compensation made to the justice of God for all the sins of all those for whom He made satisfaction by undergoing that same punishment which, by reason of the obligation that was upon them, they themselves were bound to undergo. When I say *the same*, " he goes on to explain, "I mean essentially the same in weight and pressure, though not in all accidents of duration and the like; for it was impossible that He should be detained by death" (*Death of Christ, Works*, vol. x. p. 269). Farther on, in the same treatise (*ibid.*, p. 285), he says, in reference to the laying of sins upon Christ, God "charged on Him and imputed to Him all the sins of all the elect, and proceeded against Him accordingly. He stood as our Surety, really charged with the whole debt, and was

to pay the utmost farthing, as a surety is to do if it be required of him; though he borrow not the money, nor have one penny of that which is in the obligation, yet if he be sued to an execution, he must pay all. The Lord Christ (if I may so say) was sued by His Father's justice unto an execution, in answer whereunto He underwent all that was due to sin." In another treatise the same great theologian gives the following as the expression of his view concerning the satisfaction rendered by Christ: "Christ paid the same thing that was in the obligation; as if in things real a friend should pay twenty pounds for him that owed so much and not anything in another kind."… "I affirm that He paid *idem*, that is, the same thing that was in the obligation, and not *tantundem*, something equivalent thereunto in another kind" (*Death of Christ, Works*, vol. x. c. ii. p. 438). And farther on he says, "The assertion I seek to maintain is this: That the punishment which our Saviour underwent was the same that the law required of us, God relaxing His law as to the person suffering, but not as to the penalty suffered" (*ibid.*, p. 447). These statements of Owen may be regarded as presenting clearly and in few words what were the views entertained by the English Puritans and early Nonconformists regarding the nature and extent of the atonement made for sin by Christ. They believed that to be in itself of infinite value; but they regarded it as limited both in design and in effect to the elect, and as being of the nature of a paying to the law of a *quid pro quo*, an enduring by Christ of the very penalty which they as sinners had deserved in order to secure their deliverance. By some the commercial character ascribed to the atonement was carried out still farther, and the idea of an actual and exact commutation of man's sins on the one hand, and Christ's righteousness on the other, was entertained and advocated. The principal representative of this school was Dr. Crisp, minister of Brinkworth in Wiltshire, about the middle of the 17th century; and it numbers the names of Chauncy, Saltmarsh, and Gill among its adherents. The republication of Dr. Crisp's works by his son at the close of the century led to his peculiar views on the subject of the atonement being commented upon by Dr. Daniel Williams, an English Presbyterian minister, in a work entitled, *Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated* (Lond. 1692), which passed through several editions, and gave rise to a somewhat violent controversy. Of the views advanced by Dr. Crisp a correct idea will be obtained from his own words, which I quote from the work of Dr. Williams. Writing of the laying of our sins on Christ, he says: "It is the iniquity itself that the Lord hath laid upon Christ; not only our punishment, but our very sin.… This transaction of our sins to Christ is a real act; our sins so became Christ's that He stood the sinner in our stead.… To speak more plainly: Hast thou been an idolater, hast thou been a blasphemer, hast thou been a murtherer, an adulterer, a thief, a liar, a drunkard? If thou hast part in the Lord, all these transgressions of thine become actually the transgressions of Christ." In another place he thus insists on the transfer of our sin to Christ and His righteousness to us: "Mark it well: Christ Himself is not so completely righteous, but we are as righteous as He; nor we so completely sinful, but Christ became, being made sin, as completely sinful as we. Nay more, we are the same righteousness, for we are made the righteousness of God; that very sinfulness that we were, Christ is made that very sinfulness before God. So that here is a direct change—Christ takes our person and condition and stands in our stead, we take Christ's person and condition and stand in His stead." These passages may serve to convey a clear view of the doctrines held by this school—a school which, though numbering among its adherents some of the best and holiest of men, has been the main support and promoter of antinomianism in this country. By the great body of the English Nonconformists these views have been and continue to be repudiated. Bates, Howe, Alsop, along with many other very decided Calvinists, joined at the time in denouncing them as unscriptural and dangerous; and in later times the vigorous pen of Andrew Fuller—not to mention less famous names—was

employed in exposing them and advocating Calvinistic views apart from them. Even Dr. Owen raised his voice against them, for in one of his greatest treatises, that on the *Doctrine of Justification by Faith*, he expressly says: “Nothing is more absolutely true, nothing is more sacredly or assuredly believed by us, than that nothing which Christ did or suffered, nothing that He undertook or underwent, did, or could, constitute Him subjectively, inherently, and thereon personally, a sinner or guilty of any sin of His own. To bear the guilt or blame of other men’s faults—to be *alienae culpae reus*—makes no man a sinner, unless he did unwisely or irregularly undertake it” (p. 201); and again: “Our sin was imputed to Christ only as He was our Surety for a time—to this end, that He might take it away, destroy it, and abolish it. It never was imputed unto Him so as to make any alteration absolutely in His personal state and condition” (p. 203). And, on the other hand, he strenuously maintains that “notwith-standing this full, plenary satisfaction once made for the sins of the world that shall be saved, yet all men continue equally to be born by nature ‘children of wrath,’ and whilst they believe not the wrath of God abideth on them, that is, they are obnoxious unto and under the curse of the law” (p. 216); and again: “The righteousness of Christ is not transfused into us so as to be made inherently and subjectively ours, as it was in Him” (p. 218). From these passages it is evident that Owen was far from holding the extreme views of Dr. Crisp and his school. The views of Owen were accepted and advocated by the great American theologian Jonathan Edwards, who, is his *Essay concerning the Necessity and Reasonableness of the Christian Doctrine of Satisfaction for Sin*, uses such language as the following: “Christ suffered the full punishment of the sin that was imputed to Him, or offered that to God that was fully and completely equivalent to what we owed to God’s justice for our sins” (p. 384). “The satisfaction of Christ by suffering the punishment of sin is properly to be distinguished as being in its own nature different from the merit of Christ. For merit is only some excellency or worth. But when we consider Christ’s sufferings merely as the satisfaction for the guilt of another, the excellency of Christ’s act in suffering does not at all come into consideration; but only these two things, viz. their equality or equivalence to the punishment that the sinner deserved; and secondly, the union between Him and them, or the propriety of His being accepted in suffering as the representative of the sinner” (p. 389).

In conclusion it may be observed that, in His sufferings and death, Christ bore more than the mere penalty—though it is clear that He bore the penalty, for the wages of sin is death, and the curse and condemnation fell upon Him. Other Scriptures indicate an identification on Christ’s part with the sinner and suggest that both sin and its penalty were laid on Him, but never to the injury of His own character or to the end that it could be said that He needed to be saved or forgiven. In fact, it was at this hour of His sacrificial death, as will presently be seen, that He was offering perfect merit to the Father in which the meritless sinner might be accepted forever. There is no ground for surprise that an inscrutable mystery is confronted when the infinite God is accomplishing His greatest undertaking, and in a way which is consonant with things eternal and celestial.

5. Substitution in the Realms of Divine Perfection. The words which make up this heading serve to introduce a much neglected feature of the gospel of God's grace. It is assuredly true that righteous forgiveness of the sinner is secured by the substitution of Christ as Sin-Bearer; but the salvation of a soul involves much more than that removal or subtraction of sin from the sinner which forgiveness achieves. A sinner minus his sins could hardly be counted a fully constituted Christian. In the saving of a soul much is *added*—eternal life is the gift of God, and the righteousness of God is imputed to those who believe (Rom. 5:17). Though eternal life is a sovereign gift, God no more legalizes a fiction when He imputes righteousness than when He forgives sin. It is conceded that there is no moral issue involved in the gift of eternal life and the imputation of righteousness as is involved in the forgiveness of sin; but a righteous ground for such blessings is imperative.

The two features of salvation—the gift of eternal life and the gift of righteousness—are counterparts of the one great fact of union with Christ. In the simplest of words—so far as the English translation is concerned—Christ referred to these two major facts of relationship when He said, "Ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). Of the first relation—*ye in me*—it is asserted that all spiritual blessing is secured by the Christian's position in Christ. It is written, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" (Eph. 1:3). And of the second relation—*I in you*—it is written, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John 3:36); "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life" (1 John 5:11–12).

Of the gift of God which is eternal life it may be said that it is one of two closely related benefactions—that Christ is thus given to the believer, and that the believer is given by the Father to Christ (John 17:2, 6, 9, 11–12, 24). Both of these gifts are the expression of the Father's love and are sovereignly bestowed when, through the work of Christ, the way is clear for the exercise of that love.

On the other hand, the believer's position in Christ is secured on a righteous ground through the substitution wrought by Christ on the cross.

Much has been presented in Volume II, Chapter XVIII, on the doctrine of imputed righteousness and its divine declaration when God pronounces the righteous one to be justified eternally. It has been stated on these pages that justification, grounded upon imputed righteousness, is not the legalizing of a fiction; it is the recognition of a fact, the fact being secured by infinite provisions to that end. In general, this provision is twofold: first, by the Spirit's baptism into Christ's body.

It is notable that the word βαπτίζω is used for both the ritual (water) and the real (Spirit) baptism, and, without reference to whatever convictions may be entertained respecting the mode of water baptism and what it signifies, the essential truth remains that the same word is used for both ritual and real baptism, the only variation being in respect to its primary and secondary meanings. The primary meaning is to *submerge*—not to *dip*, which verb implies two actions, that of putting in and taking out. Βαπτίζω means only to *put in*, and, when used to describe the Spirit's ministry of uniting the believer to Christ, the one thing desired is that there shall be no taking out again. The primary meaning of this word suggests a physical envelopment—an *intusposition.* The secondary meaning—evidently derived from the primary meaning—is that a thing is baptized if joined closely to that which exercises a determining influence over it. Such, indeed, is the baptism into repentance; into the remission of sins; into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; into Moses; and into Christ. In the case of none of these is there a physical intusposition; yet these are baptisms that are vital beyond measure. By bestowing the Spirit, Christ baptized with the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι—Matt. 3:11. Cf. Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5). Similarly, of Christ it was promised that He would baptize also with fire (Luke 3:16). In both the baptism with the Spirit, and that with fire, the secondary meaning obtains. Believers are by the Spirit baptized into Christ's body (1 Cor. 12:13; Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27), and, as has been stated, in this baptism there is no intusposition, though a vital union is secured which is defined as being *joined to the Lord*, and *becoming a member of His body.* This union determines that which qualifies life itself. To be placed *in Christ* is to have been taken out of the first Adam and his ruin and placed in the Last Adam and thus made partaker of all that He is. No change could be more real, nor could any be more transforming. It is the federal disobedience of the first Adam that has constituted men sinners, and it is the

federal obedience of the Last Adam that constitutes those who “receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness” righteous in the sight of God, by an imputation which is based on their new relation to the New Creation head—the resurrected Christ (Rom. 5:15–21). Christ is the righteousness of God and all that are in Him are, by the most arbitrary necessity, constituted what He is.

Though surgery has never yet joined members to the human body, that idea is employed in the New Testament as an illustration (Eph. 4:13–16; 1 Cor. 12:18). A most honorable man—even the president of the country or its king—having lost one of his hands, might be thought of as having acquired by surgery a hand amputated from the most notorious criminal, whose hand was stained with murder and whose fingerprints are recorded by the police. However, after being joined to the new organism, that hand, as a member not only loses its former evil association and dishonor, but is invested at once with all the virtue of the new organism to which it is joined. No member could be joined to Christ without partaking of that which Christ is—the righteousness of God. If difficulty arises when contemplating this marvelous truth, it will be from the inability to recognize the absolute union to Christ which the baptism with the Spirit accomplishes. Yet such an imputation of merit is not a matter of sovereign authority apart from the legal right thus to act. The legal view of this divine action is to be found in, second, that aspect of Christ’s death which is typified by the sweet savor offerings.

Reference has been made earlier in this discussion to the legal ground which the non-sweet savor offering aspect of Christ’s death provides for the forgiveness of sin, and it was observed that this one feature is too often deemed the sum and substance of the gospel of divine grace.However, no justification can be advanced for the biased discrimination which discovers so much in that which the two non-sweet savor offerings represent in Christ’s death, and yet almost wholly ignores that which the three sweet savor offerings represent. It will be found that the sweet savor aspect of Christ’s death secures the same sufficient legal ground for the bestowment of merit as is provided in the non-sweet savor offering aspect for the removal of demerit. In the one case, there is a displacing of sin through the Substitute bearing it for the sinner; in the other case, there is the placing of

righteousness through the Substitute releasing it, or making it available, through His death.

The three sweet savor offerings represent the truth that Christ offered Himself without spot to God (Heb. 9:14). Such an offering is wholly free from the thought of sin being borne; it is a sweet savor to the Father since He ever delights in His Son and in all that His Son is. In the nonsweet savor offering the Father's face is turned away and the Son is pleading, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" In the sweet savor offerings the worthiness of the Son is presented to the Father and in this He takes delight. Of these three sweet savor offerings, Dr. C.I. Scofield has written in brief and clarifying words in *The Scofield Reference Bible:*

> (a) The burnt-offering (1) typifies Christ offering Himself without spot to God in delight to do His Father's will even in death. (2) It is *atoning* because the believer has *not* had this delight in the will of God; and (3) *substitutionary* (Lev. 1:4) because Christ did it in the sinner's stead. But the thought of *penalty* is not prominent (Heb. 9.11–14; 10:5–7; Psa. 40:6–8; Phil. 2:8). The emphatic words (Lev. 1:3–5) are "burnt-sacrifice," "voluntary," "it shall be accepted for him," and "atonement."—P. 126
>
> (b) The meal-offering. The *fine flour* speaks of the evenness and balance of the character of Christ; of that perfection in which no quality was in excess, none lacking; *the fire*, of His testing by suffering, even unto death; *frankincense*, the fragrance of His life Godward (see Ex. 30:34); *absence of leaven*, His character as "the Truth" (see Ex. 12:8, *refs.*); *absence of honey*; —His was not that mere natural sweetness which may exist quite apart from grace; *oil mingled*, Christ as born of the Spirit (Mt. 1:18–23); *oil upon*, Christ as baptized with the Spirit (John 1:32; 6:27); *the oven*, the unseen sufferings of Christ—His inner agonies (Heb. 2:18; Mt. 27:45, 46); *the pan*, His more evident sufferings (e.g. Mt. 27:27–31); *salt*, the pungency of the truth of God—that which arrests the action of leaven.—P. 127
>
> (c) The peace-offering. The whole work of Christ in relation to the believer's *peace* is here in type. He *made* peace, Col. 1:20; *proclaimed* peace, Eph. 2:17; and *is* our peace, Eph. 2:14. In Christ God and the sinner meet in peace; God is propitiated, the sinner reconciled—both alike satisfied with what Christ has done. But all this at the cost of blood and fire. The details speak of fellowship. This brings in prominently the thought of *fellowship* with God through Christ. Hence the peace-offering is set forth as affording food for the priests (Lev. 7:31–34). Observe that it is the breast (affections) and shoulders (strength) upon which we as priests (1 Pet. 2:9) feed in fellowship with the Father. This it is which makes the peace-offering especially a *thank-offering* (Lev. 7:11, 12).—P. 128

If the question be asked why the Second Person is on a cross with the First Person's face turned away, the answer is that He is bearing sin and that God cannot look upon sin with any degree of allowance. If the question be asked why the Second Person is on a cross offering Himself with all His perfections to the First Person, the answer is not that He had some surprise-

revelation to make of Himself to the Father, but it is that He was releasing, or making available, His own infinite worthiness. This is substitution in the sphere of that which the most excellent of a fallen race could never present. Thus, when the Father would impute to the believer that righteousness of God which the Son is, and all His worthiness, He finds all this available and legally provided through that aspect of substitutionary death that is typified by the sweet savor offerings.

It is not commendable to ignore the sweet savor aspect of Christ's death, nor necessary to assume that imputed righteousness is an arbitrary sovereign act which rests on no defendable ground. No more assuring word could be spoken than that recorded in Romans 3:26, which is that God is Himself *just* when He justifies those among the ungodly who do no more than to *believe* in Jesus (cf. Rom. 4:5). The glorious achievement of all sin forgiven and the even greater achievement of a perfect standing before God —as perfect as Christ—being imputed, does not involve or jeopardize the character of God. He remains just when He justifies, not, indeed, on the ground of anything He ever finds in man, but on the ground of that which Christ has provided for those who believe. Such is the scope and reality of Christ's substitution for sinners on Calvary's cross.

II. Christ the Ending of the Law Principle in Behalf of Those Who are Saved

The more extended discussion of the law with reference to its inception, its purpose, its reign, and its termination, yet to be undertaken under Ecclesiology, is not in order here. The immediate issue is the truth that, by the death of Christ and for those who believe, the legal, meritorious system of works comes to an end. In its larger aspects, the law exists as two widely different realities, namely, the Law of Moses and inherent law.

The Law of Moses is that rule for conduct which God gave to Israel at Mount Sinai, which law ran its course for 1500 years and was then superseded by "grace and truth" (John 1:17). It is that covenant which God made with Israel (Ex. 19:5) when He "took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake" (Jer. 31:32). The law covenant was strictly a conditional agreement which conditioned divine blessings upon human faithfulness. The official and final statement of this

covenant is recorded in Deuteronomy 28. In the light of new blessings and relationships which were to follow in the present age of grace and in the yet future kingdom age, the Mosaic Law was an *ad interim* divine dealing until the Seed—Christ—should come. It was a παιδαγωγός, a child governor or disciplinarian, to lead to Christ. But after Christ, the object of faith, is come, "we are no longer under a schoolmaster [παιδαγωγός]" (Gal. 3:19–25). Nevertheless, though the legal principle is now done away—and of necessity, because of its incompatibility with the rule for conduct which grace provides—it will, when Israel returns to the land under Messiah's reign, be re-established. Of those requirements and concerning the return of Israel to the land, Moses said, "And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the LORD, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day" (Deut. 30:8). Though it is the very law which Moses commanded that Israel will do, their situation will be altered. Christ will be on the throne of David reigning over Israel and the whole earth; Satan will be in the abyss; and this law, rather than being merely addressed to Israel, will be written on their hearts (Jer. 31:33); but its legal character is not changed. It is that law which Moses commanded them. In passing, it is important to observe that this Mosaic rule, or governing code, did not exist before it was proclaimed by Moses at Mount Sinai; it was never under any circumstances addressed to Gentiles; and as certainly it is never addressed to Christians, though Christians and unsaved Gentiles may, because of ignorance of God's will for them, assume the obligations of the law system. These are reminded that, when thus assuming any portion of the Law of Moses, they are under self-committal to do the whole law. Being *ad interim* in its character, the law which Moses commanded came to its termination at the time and under the circumstances divinely decreed. An exposition of this great body of truth, which will justify these dogmatic assertions, will be undertaken in its proper place.

Inherent law is perhaps best defined as the Creator's right over the creature and, therefore, the creature's responsibility to the Creator. In his wicked assumption of independence of God, man has lost the sense of the Creator's rights and looks upon the authority of God as unjustifiable intrusion into the sphere of human autonomy. However, the philosophy of self-rule, which Satan persuaded Adam to adopt, though so indispensable to fallen man that he can think in no other terms, has never nullified the

inherent obligation of the creature to the Creator. “Be ye holy; for I am holy” is a reasonable, though drastic, requirement, being that which a holy God alone can require. Israel was condemned for having failed to keep the commandments of Moses —“which my covenant they brake”—but of man in general and as under inherent law it is said, “There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one” (Rom. 3:10–12). During a period of at least 2,500 years between Adam and Moses, only inherent law obtained; but that law was sufficiently definite that God judged men as offenders and purified the earth with a flood. More was known in that period of the demands of inherent law than is now recorded. God’s Word respecting Abraham’s obedience chronicled in Genesis 26:5 is most suggestive: “because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws” (cf. Gen. 18:19; Rom. 5:13). The requirement upon man that he be pleasing to his Creator is an obligation from which none may escape.

These two legal requirements—the Mosaic system and inherent law—are alike in one particular: they each aim at the establishing of human merit as the ground of divine blessing. Alike, these legal obligations impose upon man that only which a holy God might accept and which fallen man has never wrought—even as much as a semblance of them. The failure of Israel under the Mosaic system was such that the law, which in itself was “holy, and just, and good,” became a ministration of condemnation and of death (Rom. 7:12; 2 Cor. 3:7, 9), while the failure under inherent law is such that only retribution awaits those who are not saved from it.

These extended introductory words have been penned as a preparation for a right understanding of an extended body of Scripture bearing on this theme—Christ the end of the law for those who believe. The central passage will be first in order and this will be followed by a series of texts which disclose the precise nature of this aspect of Christ’s achievement in His death.

Romans 10:4. “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.”

The context, disregarding the intrusion of a chapter division, begins with Romans 9:30 and presents a strange paradox, which is, that the believing

Gentiles who followed not after righteousness have attained unto righteousness, while Israel, who followed after righteousness, hath not attained to righteousness: There is thus introduced two methods of gaining righteousness. Israel, by self-effort, which the law prescribed, and by ignoring faith, hath not reached the goal of righteousness. Their law-works were, as always, a miserable failure. Over against this, Gentiles who attended not on the law, since it was never their portion, but who did exercise faith, reached the goal of perfect righteousness. A deep truth respecting the divine purpose in the giving of the law to Israel is here disclosed. God is said to have given the law as "a stumblingstone and rock of offence" to the end that He might accentuate this very truth under discussion, namely, "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." The example of Abraham who *believed* Jehovah and it (his faith) was counted unto him for righteousness (Gen. 15:6) was ever before Israel, and David had described the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works (Rom. 4:6); nevertheless, Israel stumbled over the stumbling stone of human merit, as humanity is ever prone to do—even many who through faith are already in possession of infinite righteousness. The Apostle at once points out that Israel's difficulty was not a lack of zeal; for, he asserts, they had a great "zeal for God." Their trouble was *ignorance.* They did not know the truth that faith in God would, as witnessed by Abraham, David, and the prophets, bring about, through divine grace, an adjustment all-satisfying to God—even a righteousness as perfect as Himself. The student is reminded of the previous discussion concerning the equitable ground established by the sweet savor aspect of Christ's death whereon God is free to impute all that Christ is—even the righteousness of God—unto those who *believe*, and Himself to be *just* when He justifies the ungodly. Unfortunately, this devastating ignorance respecting imputed righteousness, which so injured Israel, has characterized the church of Christ also. Great multitudes of those who belong to the church as its members have never conceived of any relation to God beyond "the law of works." Their reprehensibleness is far greater than that of Israel; for, while Israel had the witness of Abraham and David, the church has the example of Israel's failure and, in addition, the great body of New Testament Scripture. The Arminian notion that people will not live righteous lives unless placed upon a works basis of relationship to God has permeated the church to a

large degree. This ignorance is manifested in the church by the fact that the greatest incentive to holy living that the human heart can know is ignored, which is, to “walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called” (Eph. 4:1). The individual who comprehends that he has attained by faith through grace to the perfect righteousness of God, will be incited by so great an honor and trust to walk more faithfully in the path of God’s own choosing than will the individual who hopes—against hope, for it is recognized as an impossible task—to satisfy a holy God by his ever-failing works.

But *is* the perfect righteousness of God secured as a standing, as a wedding garment, by those who do no more than to believe in Jesus? It certainly is, but the ignorance of Israel and of so many in the church does not make any place for so glorious a truth. Naturally, objection is not raised to the requirement that the individual should believe in Jesus. It would dishonor Him not to do so; but repentance, confession, consecration, good works, etc., must be added, it is claimed, to complete what is deemed to be reasonable, not understanding that the addition of one feature of human merit introduces a principle which, of necessity, is to misunderstand the entire character of that grace by which alone the soul is saved. Let the Scripture itself testify of this truth: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16–17); “Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference … to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:22, 26); “But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. 4:5); “For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:17); “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Gal. 3:22); “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth” (Rom. 10:4).

Returning to the central passage—Romans 10:4, just quoted—it will be seen that some difference of opinion obtains with respect to the sense in

which Christ is said to be *the end of the law.* Some see only that He, by His sufferings and death, paid the penalty the law imposed and thus discharged the indictment against the sinner, which is comprehended in forgiveness. Others see that Christ fulfills the law by supplying the merit which the holy Creator demands, which is comprehended in justification. Doubtless both of these conceptions inhere in this passage; but it will be observed that whatever is done is done for those who believe—with no other requirement added—and that belief results in the bestowing of the righteousness of God. As has been observed, the context of the passage under consideration contrasts two widely different principles of procedure, i.e., (1) an attempt to establish righteousness by zealous works, and (2) the securing of perfect righteousness by faith. One is a system of merit—the deadly enemy of grace—which offers self-righteousness to God with the hope that He will accept it by overlooking in generosity its imperfections; the other is a system based wholly on expectation toward God which receives in Christ Jesus the perfect righteousness of God, and, though works are wholly excluded from the ground upon which this righteousness is received, this plan secures the most serious concern on the part of the one who receives that righteousness that the daily life may be in harmony with the position and standing which has been attained by faith alone. Whether this superior incentive for a holy life is valued or not, it remains the unquestionable plan of God for those who are saved by grace through faith. The merit system has no termination, while the faith system seals its objective the moment the individual believes. The merit system represents the best that man can do, while the faith system represents the best that God can do. The merit system has never been, nor could it ever be, anything but ignominious failure, ending in eternal perdition, while the faith system never has been, nor could it ever be, anything but infinite perfection, ending in eternal glory.

How earnestly the great Apostle labors to make clear the truth that these two systems—law, works, and merit, on the one hand, and grace, faith, and promise, on the other hand—cannot coexist! He declares, “And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work” (Rom. 11:6); “I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain” (Gal. 2:21); “For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.

… And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3:18, 29).

It is in connection with the last passage quoted—Galatians 3:29—that the Apostle declares, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (vs. 27). The Spirit's baptism into Christ results in the "putting on" of Christ, and, as the most absolute necessity dictates, being thus in Christ, the blessing of Abrahamic *faith* and the position of an heir according to *promise* are gained on the most righteous ground. No doctrinal ground is set up in Genesis 15:6 in defense of the divine act of imputing righteousness to Abraham, but the imputation of righteousness to the believer, as has been observed, rests upon the absolute provision secured through the substitutionary death of Christ. The word to believers regarding the extending to them of Abraham's blessing on the ground of Abrahamic faith is assuring: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. 4:23–24).

Certain other passages which bear on the same contrast with law, works, or merit, should also be considered. These are:

Acts 15:10. "Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?"

This entire chapter forms the context of this one verse. The question before the first council of the church is that of the relation of the Mosaic system to those from among the Gentiles who are saved. The council determined that Gentile Christians were neither to be circumcised nor to keep the law (cf. vs. 24); and it was asserted by these Jews who were in authority in the church that the keeping of the law as a system of merit had been to those under its rule as "a yoke upon the neck" from which believers are free (cf. Gal. 5:1).

Romans 1:16–17. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith."

The notable contribution which this Scripture makes to this great theme is that the availability of the righteousness of God is a vital—so far as this text goes, *the* vital—feature of the gospel of divine grace.

Romans 3:21–22. “But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference.”

No greater human failure could be described than that recounted in Romans 1:18–3:20. From that dark background the Apostle turns abruptly, on the words “But now” (3:21), to the most glorious provision, which is, that perfect righteousness is available through simple faith in Christ. This blessing is secured wholly apart from and independent of any help the merit system of the law might contribute. This divinely provided righteousness is revealed unto all and comes upon all who believe. Twice this uncomplicated condition appears. It is through faith in Jesus Christ and extends to all who believe. Language could not more clearly assert that this is distinctly a righteousness *from* God and received by faith apart from anything or everything belonging to human merit.

Romans 3:31. “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.”

Two interpretations of this crucial passage have been advanced: (1) that, through the enabling power of the Spirit, the righteousness which the law demands may be fulfilled by the believer; and (2) that the unsaved may establish the law by standing in that fulfillment of it which Christ has accomplished. All that the law could ever require is satisfied in the one who is perfected in Christ. The former interpretation is only an exalted form of human works which are fulfilled in the believer and never by the believer; yet these works are credited to the believer, since for them he will receive a reward. The latter interpretation is in harmony with all revealed truth, but will be accepted only by those who have apprehended the doctrine of imputed righteousness.

Romans 4:5. “But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.”

The phrase “worketh not” does not imply carelessness in the believer’s daily life; it rather refers to the truth that he does not depend on works of merit. The passage reveals the important truth that believing is the opposite of works of merit. Believing is not doing a meritorious work; it is trusting the finished work of Another. Even the ungodly may be counted righteous on the ground of faith in Christ.

Romans 4:11. “And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.”

What Abraham received before being circumcised and centuries before the law was given cannot be said to have been a divine recognition of works of merit. Abraham is the pattern and, therefore, the father of all who receive imputed righteousness by faith.

Romans 4:13–16. “For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all.”

In Abraham’s case, as is the case of all who exercise Abrahamic faith, the promise of imputed righteousness is (1) by *faith* (nothing on man’s part—cf. vs. 5), that it might be by grace (everything on God’s part), to the end that the promise might be *sure*. Nothing could be so insecure as a righteousness based on human merit.

Romans 4:23–24. “Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.”

Let it be restated that Abraham is the pattern of a Christian under grace and not of a Jew under law. The character of his faith, as defined in verses 17–22, is worthy of most careful consideration. But righteousness received by faith is not alone the heritage of Abraham; it is “for us also.” This blessed truth is well expressed by the Apostle in Galatians 3:7, 9: “Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. … So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham” (cf. John 8:37, 39).

Romans 5:19. “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”

Here again, but in a different setting, is presented the truth before emphasized, that it is through the obedient, sweet savor offering of Christ

that the many are counted righteous. This, it should be observed, is far removed from the notion that true righteousness is by human works and merit.

2 Corinthians 5:21. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Associated closely with this passage is Romans 3:22. In both there is clear reference to the fact that there is a righteousness from God which is *made* the portion of those who do no more than believe in Jesus.

Galatians 3:8. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

Thus, again, the great benefit of imputed righteousness which came to Abraham in response to his faith is declared to be but a first-fruits, as it were, of that which God in the day of His favor is imputing to all who believe.

Galatians 4:19–31. "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you. Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

This extended allegory teaches what the Apostle asserts in Romans 11:6, namely, that the two systems—that of works and that of faith— cannot

coexist. The bondwoman, Hagar, who typifies the principle of human works, must be dismissed, for the freewoman, Sarah, who typifies promise and faith, and the bondwoman cannot share the inheritance.

Galatians 5:1. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

The priceless liberty of the Christian, which he is here enjoined to defend at any cost, is the deliverance he has experienced from the merit system, the law, and human works. If, after being thus delivered, he shall lapse into any form of law observance with a view to establishing his own righteousness, he has *fallen from grace* (vs. 4). To that extent, Christ, the bestower of a perfect righteousness in which he stands, has become of no effect. Thus the Apostle declares, "For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor" (2:18). This constitutes a most serious warning.

In conclusion it may be restated that, by His death in its sweet savor aspect, Christ secured the righteous ground upon which God is just when He justifies even the ungodly who do no more than to believe in Jesus. They are equally established before God by their union to Christ through the baptism of the Spirit. In these respects, Christ is the *end of the law*—the principle of law, works, and merit—for all those who believe. The entire merit system is, of necessity, dismissed, whether it be the Mosaic system or inherent law. No ground is left for an appeal for works of merit in the life of the one who through riches of grace is constituted as perfect in his standing before God as Christ is perfect. The injunctions of the grace portion of the New Testament are free from any appeal to the believer on the basis of merit. There is abundant ground for an appeal that such a glorious reality as imputed righteousness shall be adorned by a holy life. Such an appeal is indeed far removed from the practice of the ignorant Israelites who went about seeking to establish their own righteousness, not knowing—in spite of much revelation—that there is a righteousness available from God. No more imperious feature is embedded in this great body of Scripture than that this marvel of divine grace—imputed righteousness—is received on the one and only condition of believing on Christ.

III. A Redemption Toward Sin

This is closely related to divisions IV on reconciliation and V on propitiation, which follow. These are the three doctrines in each of which the value of the death of Christ is recognized as reaching out to the unsaved. Other doctrines related to the value to men of Christ's death —forgiveness, regeneration, justification, sanctification—are restricted in that they contemplate that death only in its relation to those who believe. However, the trilogy—redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation—is unique in that these parts by which it is constituted extend benefits to both saved and unsaved. The essential benefits which accrue to the Christian from these realities will be considered as the doctrines are contemplated separately. On the other hand, when the truth in each of these three doctrines as related to the unsaved is examined and segregated, and these three segregated portions are combined into one interrelated body of truth, the result is a declaration of all that enters into that which is termed *the finished work of Christ.* This term is derived from the words of Christ on the cross, namely, "It is finished" (John 19:30). There was no reference on Christ's part by these words to the truth that His own life, service, or sufferings were coming to an end. It is rather that a specific undertaking committed to Him by His Father, which could not have begun until He was on the cross, was consummated. It is true that the Father had given Him a work to do in His three and a half years of service. To this reference is made in the words, "Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (John 4:34); "But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me" (John 5:36). In contradistinction to this, a specific work was committed to the Savior which began with His cross sufferings and ended with His death. It is to this that His words "It is finished" refer. Of this same saving work of the cross the Savior in His priestly prayer spoke when He said, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" (John 17:4). That He could speak thus of a work which had not at that time even begun is explained by the fact that the whole of the Upper Room Discourse, including the priestly prayer, was dated by Christ in relation to the cross, the resurrection, the ascension, and the advent of the Spirit as though these momentous events were accomplished. What was wrought on the cross and finished when He died

will be discovered only through an investigation into that which was included in His redemption, His reconciliation, and His propitiation.

Redemption is the sinward aspect of Christ's work on the cross and as such is restricted in its meaning. In this thesis, redemption will be treated in this Biblical and specific meaning and not as modern theology has employed the term as a representation of all that Christ wrought in His sufferings and death. The work of Christ on the cross is far too extensive to be contemplated in any single phase of it. This work in its totality could as well be represented by either the term *reconciliation* or *propitiation*, as by *redemption.* Not one of these ideas, or all three together, could serve to indicate in its fulness so vast a theme. Perhaps the free use of the word *redemption* to represent the entire saving work of Christ is due, too often, to a failure to comprehend all that He wrought. Such a restriction is manifest when men speak of a *limited redemption,* as though Christ's work on the cross was restricted to, and so exhausted with regard to its value, His death for the elect who comprise the Church. Not only is the value of His death not limited to the Church or even to humanity, since it reaches to angelic spheres, but it would be as reasonable to speak of His work as a *limited reconciliation,* or a *limited propitiation,* as to style it a *limited redemption.* The student is cautioned against any assumption of limitation relative to the value of Christ's death. It will be seen that, while Christ died for the elect who comprise the Church—and at least five aspects of the value of His death are related to that body—He is as definitely said to have died for Israel as a distinct and unrelated people, for a judgment upon fallen angels, for a purification of heaven, and for the whole *cosmos* world. The fallacy of a so-called limited redemption is yet to be examined in a later division of this general theme.

Redemption is an act of God by which He Himself pays as a ransom the price of human sin which the outraged holiness and government of God requires. Redemption undertakes the solution of the problem of sin, as reconciliation undertakes the solution of the problem of the sinner, and propitiation undertakes the problem of an offended God. All are infinitely important and all are requisite to the analysis of the whole doctrine of Christ's finished work—a work finished, indeed, to the point of divine perfection. Though parts of one complete whole, these great themes should never be treated as synonymous. The specific character of each is obvious.

The redemption provided for and offered to the sinner is a redemption from sin, which estate, according to the Bible, is one of bondservitude concerning which both a liberating price must be paid and power be exercised in the deliverance of the slave. Divine redemption is by blood—the ransom price—and by power. Such was the release of Israel from Egyptian bondage—a type of bondslavery to sin. Israel was redeemed by the blood of the sacrificial lamb, and by almighty power was taken out from bondage into freedom. This order is never reversed either in the type or the antitype.

The Old Testament doctrine of redemption concerns, in the main, a redeemed nation, and, therefore, the theme is implied throughout the Jewish Scriptures. Exodus is the book of redemption and Ruth is a type-picture of the Kinsman-Redeemer. The word *gā›al* serves to express the thought of redemption—the act of setting free by payment of a ransom price. The thing redeemed might be a person or an estate (cf. Lev. 25:25, 47–48). Certain requirements, which were highly typical, were imposed upon the one who would redeem: (a) He must be a kinsman. This aspect of truth leads to the meaning of the title *Kinsman-Redeemer*, and is the basic requirement which brought the Son of God from heaven to earth and necessitated the incarnation that He might be a perfect Kinsman-Redeemer. (b) The *gā›al* individual must also be able to redeem. The price, whatever it might be in any case, was paid by the one who redeemed. This requirement was imperative in the type as it is in the antitype. Christ alone could pay the price of redemption—the blood of a holy, undefiled, and spotless Lamb. The blood of a man, especially of a fallen race, would not suffice. It must be the blood of God (cf. Acts 20:28). (c) The *gā›al* individual had to be free from the calamity which had fallen on the one who was to be redeemed. In this particular, Christ the Antitype was free from both the sin nature and the practice of sin. (d) The one who would redeem had to be willing to redeem. This feature Christ fulfilled perfectly. Boaz in the book of Ruth is thus a *gā›al* individual and the divinely provided type of Christ in redemption

In the New Testament, three different Greek words are used to translate *redeem* or *redemption*, and the distinctions which they set forth are naturally lost to the reader of the English text. These words are: (1) ἀγοράζω which means *to purchase in the market.* Here the essential truth appears that the unsaved are bondslaves to sin—“sold under sin” (Rom. 7:14), dominated by

Satan (Eph. 2:2; 1 Cor. 12:2), condemned (John 3:18; Rom. 3:19; Gal. 3:10). Whoever would redeem them must take the slave's place, be made a curse for him, and shed his blood as a ransom-price of redemption (Matt. 20:28). (2) ἐξαγοράζω, meaning to purchase *out* of the market. This is a distinct advance over ἀγοράζω, which implies no more than the payment of the requisite price. The addition of ἐξ supplies the added thought of *removing* or *taking out.* One thus taken out will never again be returned to the place of bondage and exposed to the lot of a slave. (3) λυτρόω, which indicates that the redeemed one is loosened and set free. Redemption, in its fullest meaning, as represented by this word, is assurance that Christ has not merely transferred the sinner's bondage from one master to another; He has purchased with the object in view that the ransomed one may be free. Christ will not hold unwilling slaves in bondage. All this is typically anticipated in Exodus 21:1–6 (cf. Deut. 15:16–17). A slave set free by his master was wholly free; but he could voluntarily remain as the slave of the master whom he loved. The new voluntary relationship was sealed by the master piercing the ear of the slave with an awl. Thus, according to type, the Christian is set free, but is privileged to yield himself wholly to the One who redeemed him. Of this, the Apostle said, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God" (Rom. 12:1–2). In like manner, Christ, on His human side, was the perfect example of voluntary yielding to the will of another. According to Psalm 40, quoted in Hebrews 10:5–7 and contemplating the sealing of the voluntary slave, Christ said, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart" (40:6–8). The phrase "Mine ears hast thou opened" may as well be rendered, "Mine ears hast thou bored," and reference is evidently made to the provision recorded in Exodus 21:1–6. He is in every respect—type and antitype—the yielded servant.

It is therefore to be observed that the doctrine of redemption as set forth by the terms used in the New Testament is a complete fulfillment of the

truth foreshadowed in the Old Testament, that there is a sense in which the price is paid but the slave is not necessarily released—which is the estate of all for whom Christ died who are yet not saved—and that, by a deeper and more abundant realization of redemption, the slave may be released and set free—which is the estate of all who are saved. The relation of the unsaved to the truth that by His death Christ paid the ransom price, is to believe what is declared to be true and is true. The relation of the saved to the truth that by His death Christ set them free is to recognize that marvelous freedom and then by self-surrender to become the voluntary slaves of the Redeemer.

IV. A Reconciliation Toward Man

The manward aspect of Christ's work on the cross is termed *reconciliation* and is strictly a New Testament doctrine, or, more specifically, a reality made possible by the death of Christ. The words *reconcile* and *reconciliation* occur as such twice in the English A.V. of the Old Testament—1 Samuel 29:4, where it is merely that one would make himself pleasing to another, and 2 Chronicles 29:24, where it refers to the making of an offering. The other Old Testament passages rendered thus—Leviticus 6:30; 8:15; 16:20; Ezekiel 45:15, 17, 20; Daniel 9:24—to be consistent with the original, should be translated *atonement.* Similarly, Hebrews 2:17 should be rendered *propitiation,* as Romans 5:11 should be rendered *reconciliation.* The New Testament doctrine is, however, of major importance. The one Greek root καταλλάσσω has but one meaning, namely, *to change completely.* Should these two pointed words be substituted in the New Testament text wherever the English words *reconcile* or *reconciliation* occur (excepting Hebrews 2:17), the true force of the passage would be preserved. It is written: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled [changed completely] to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled [changed completely], we shall be saved by his life" (Rom. 5:10); "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling [changing completely] of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" (Rom. 11:15); "But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled [changed completely] to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife" (1 Cor. 7:11); "And all things are of God, who

hath reconciled [changed completely] us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation [changing completely]" (2 Cor. 5:18); "And that he might reconcile [change completely] both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. 2:16); "And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile [change completely] all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled [changed completely]" (Col. 1:20–21).

The two aspects of reconciliation are best disclosed in 2 Corinthians 5:19–20. In verse 19 it is declared that the world (κόσμος, which term is never by any stretch of exegesis made to represent the elect who are saved out of it) is reconciled to God. This vital passage presents the truth that, in and through the death of Christ, God was *changing completely* the position of the world in its relation to Himself. The Bible never asserts that God is reconciled. If it be supposed that God is represented as having changed completely His own attitude toward the world because of Christ's death, it will be remembered that it is His righteousness which is involved. Before the death of Christ His righteousness demanded its required judgments; but after the death of Christ that same righteousness is free to save the lost. His righteousness is thus not changed nor does it ever act otherwise than in perfect equity. Thus God who sees the world changed completely in its relation to Himself by the death of Christ, is not Himself reconciled or changed. The same interpretation is required in Romans 11:15. There is no need to be overcritical on this point. There is in the cross an outward appearance of changed attitude on the part of God; but this belongs rather to propitiation than to reconciliation. The latter is no more God-ward in its objective accomplishments than redemption. Certainly redemption is not Godward, nor, in the final analysis, is reconciliation Godward; for God is immutable. He is always righteous, just, and good. Propitiation, it will be seen, does not infuse compassion into God; it rather secures the freedom on His part to exercise His unchanging compassion apart from those restraints which penal judgments would otherwise impose. There is a truth to be recognized concerning God, that in His own being and from all eternity His holiness and His love have found adjustment concerning the sinner through

the death of His Son; but this is only another approach to the same divine propitiation.

It has been claimed that for God to adjust the world in its relation to Himself, as is accomplished in the reconciliation aspect of Christ's death, is universalism. It is assumed, thus, that general reconciliation is equivalent to general salvation. To avoid such a conclusion, it is asserted that Christ died for only the elect. They alone were changed completely in the sphere of their relation to God. Most convincingly the Apostle goes on in verse 20 to state that Christ's messengers, to whom is committed the word of reconciliation, go forth, in His stead, beseeching the very men who according to verse 19 are already divinely reconciled, to be reconciled to God. The word *beseech* implies that they may or may not be reconciled in response to the messengers. What is it that men are thus implored to do? Simply this: God is satisfied with the solution of the sin question as consummated by Christ in His death, and the sinner is petitioned to be satisfied himself with that which satisfies God. Thus the element of faith is present, and it is never absent when the salvation of men is in view. It is evident, then, that whatever *complete change* is indicated—for the κόσμος, according to verse 19, is not equivalent to the saving of anyone—elect or non-elect—it has made the reconciliation of verse 20, which is equivalent to salvation, possible. The unregenerate are saved when they individually elect to stand adjusted to God through the death of Christ. This, indeed, is a thorough change from unbelief and rejection of Christ to belief and acceptance of Christ. In other words, the value of Christ's reconciling death is not applied to the sinner at the time of that death, but rather *when* he believes.

This twofold reconciliation—that of the world and that which is wrought when the individual believes—is in evidence again in Romans 5:10–11: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." In the first instance, the death of Christ is said to have reconciled "enemies" to God, which truth corresponds with the reconciliation of the world; in the second instance, "being reconciled" by a personal faith as well as by the fact of Christ's death, the

saved are to be kept saved by Christ's living presence as Advocate and Intercessor in heaven.

There can be no question raised about the fact that there are two aspects of reconciliation: one wrought for all by God in His love for the world and the other wrought in the individual who believes when he believes.

V. A Propitiation Toward God

The value to God of Christ's death as a vindication of His righteousness and law is indicated by the word *propitiation.* This intricate doctrine is set forth by the various forms and uses of this word. No more clarifying analysis of this doctrine has been found than that written by Dr. C. I. Scofield in his *Bible Correspondence Course*, which is here quoted in part:

> The word propitiation occurs in the English Bible, A.V., but three times. In 1 John 2:2, and 4:10, Christ is said to be "the propitiation for our sins." Here the Greek word is *hilasmos*, meaning, "that which propitiates." In Rom. 3:25 it is said of Christ: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the passing over of sins done aforetime, through the forbearance of God." Here the Greek word is *hilastērion*, meaning, "the place of propitiation." But in Heb. 9:5 *hilastērion* is the Greek word used by the Holy Spirit for "mercy seat" in referring to the ancient tabernacle worship of Israel: "And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy seat" (*hilastērion*). This, therefore, sends us back to the Old Testament. Whatever the mercy seat of the tabernacle was, typically, to the Israelite, *that* Christ is, actually, to the believer and to God.… Before turning to the Old Testament, the student will note two other New Testament passages. Heb. 8:12: "I will be merciful [*hileōs*, propitious] to their unrighteousness." Luke 18:13: "God be merciful [*hilaskomai*, propitiated] to me a sinner." (1) The mercy seat was the lid or cover of the ark of the covenant. The ark was an oblong box of acacia wood overlaid with gold, two and one half cubits long, and one and one half cubits high and broad. In this box or ark, were placed, along with a pot of the wilderness manna, and Aaron's rod, the "two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God"— the ten commandments, God's holy Law (Ex. 31:18). The cover, or "mercy seat," was made entirely of gold, the symbol of divine righteousness, and at each end, beaten out of the same piece of gold, was a figure with wings extended over the mercy seat, the cherubim. "And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be" (Ex. 25:20). The cherubims are set forth in the Old Testament as especially connected with the *glory* of God, and the guardians and vindicators of what is due to His glory (Ezek. 1:13, 14, 27, 28; Gen. 3:24). (2) The mercy seat (*hilastērion*) of the tabernacle worship was called in the Hebrew, *kapporeth*, place of covering, and is intimately connected with the Old Testament word atonement (Heb. *kaphar*, to cover sin). The sacrificial blood made atonement … for sin; the mercy seat was the "place of covering" for it was there the sacrificial blood was sprinkled. "And he [the high priest] shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward, and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with

his finger seven times" (Lev. 16:13). (3) Typically, therefore, the golden lid of the ark was a mercy seat because, in divine righteousness (gold), it "covered" from the eyes of the cherubim the broken law, while the sprinkled blood "covered" the worshipper's sins. It became, therefore, the meeting place of a holy God and a sinful man. "There will I *meet with thee*, and will *commune* with thee, from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims" (Ex. 25:22). "For *I will appear* in the cloud upon the mercy seat" (Lev. 16:2). "And when Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation to speak with him, then he heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy seat" (Num. 7:89). (4) It follows that Christ is the propitiation (*hilastērion*, mercy seat, "throne of grace," Heb. 4:16), because He is the meeting place and place of communion between a holy God and a sinful but believing human being. Meeting God in Christ, the believer may boldly say: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect; it is God that justifieth" (Rom. 8:33). And Christ is the *hilastērion*, or mercy seat, because He is the *hilasmos*, the propitiator, who "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9:26); and then, "an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands … neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" (Heb. 9:11, 12). He is Himself the mercy seat sprinkled with His own precious blood. (5) The question still remains: what or whom did He propitiate by the shedding of His own blood? It is the answer to this question which exposes the infelicity of the English word "propitiation" as a rendering of the Greek *hilastērion*, or the Hebrew *kapporeth.* For "propitiate" means *to appease*, and suggests the wholly false notion that God's wrath was appeased, satiated, by sacrificial blood. But the very fact that God Himself provides the mercy seat, the propitiation, should have banished that notion from human thinking. God is love, and holiness His highest attribute. His law is the expression of His holiness, the cross the expression of His love. And in the cross there is such a doing right by the moral order of the universe, such a meeting, in the sinner's behalf, of the inflexible demand of the law,—"the soul that sinneth it shall die"—that the love of God may flow unhindered to the sinner with no compromise of His holiness. What, else, must have been a judgment seat, becomes, for the believer in Christ, a mercy seat; a "throne of grace." Propitiation, then, relates to the law and what is due to God's holiness.—III, 482–85

The prayer of the publican (Luke 18:13) has been greatly misunderstood and misused. The translation of ἱλάσκομαι by the English word *merciful* rather than by the word *propitious*, which is to be indicated, is responsible for great error in the field of gospel appeal. God cannot be merciful toward the sinner in the sense of being generous or lenient, and the publican did not ask God to do such an impossible thing. He did ask God to be propitious. In this connection, it will be remembered that this record is of the experience of a man who stood on Old Testament ground, before the death of Christ. Having brought his offering— all did who approached God in prayer for forgiveness—he was justified in asking God to be propitious to him *the* sinner (Greek). The error consists in not recognizing that the death of Christ has changed all relationships to God. For an individual to pray to God now

that He be merciful toward a sinner is as impossible as it was in Old Testament days. For an individual to ask now that God be propitious is to reject the death of Christ and to ignore its value. It is to plead for something to be done when everything has been done. Men are not saved by coaxing mercy out of God; they are saved when they dare to believe God has been merciful enough to provide a Savior and that He *is* propitious.

As in the case of redemption and reconciliation, there are two aspects of propitiation. There is a propitiation which affects God in His relation to the κόσμος—with no reference to the elect—and one which affects His relation to the elect. This twofold propitiation is set forth in 1 John 2:2, which reads, "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our's only, but also for the sins of the whole world." No more transforming message could be uttered than the proclamation of the truth that God *is* propitious. On the ground of this gospel the unsaved are free to come by faith, knowing that they will not be punished or reproved, but rather received and saved forever. In like manner, the saved who have sinned, confessing their sin, are free to come to God for the needed forgiveness and cleansing, and are never turned away. The prodigal son, who is an illustration of a son returning to the Father for restoration on the ground of confession rather than faith, was kissed by his father *before* he had made his confession. Thus it is revealed that God *is* propitious, not when faith or confession has made Him so, but because of the death of His Son. Neither sinners nor sinning saints are appointed to the task of propitiating God. Christ has accomplished that perfectly, and the door into the grace of God is open wide.

When redemption, which is toward sin, reconciliation, which is toward man, and propitiation, which is toward God—all wrought by Christ in His death—are considered in their specific relation to the unsaved and these three are combined into one doctrine or body of truth, they together form what is properly termed *the finished work of Christ.*

VI. The Judgment of the Sin Nature

By His sufferings and death Christ wrought with equal definiteness and effectiveness in solving the problem of personal sins and the problem of the sin nature. He "died for our sins" (1 Cor. 15:3), and "he died unto sin" (Rom. 6:10). In preceding pages which deal with the doctrine of

substitution, Christ's death for personal sin, or "our sins," has been traced. At this point the deeper and more complex truth is confronted, namely, that Christ died *unto sin.* Light is thrown on this theme when it is observed that in Romans, chapters 6, 7, and 8, and in 1 John, chapter 1, there is a distinction indicated between sin which is personal failure or transgression, and sin which is a nature. Though the same term, *sin,* is used, the context and character of truth disclosed determines where and when one truth or the other is in view. As an illustration of this important distinction, it may be seen that 1 John 1:8—"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us"—relates to the sin nature, about which good people may easily be self-deceived; nevertheless the truth is not in the one who asserts that he has no sin nature. Over against this and as a wholly different claim, 1 John 1:10 states: "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." In this sphere of personal sin there can be no self-deception. The grieved Spirit, if not the conscience, in the believer has impressed him with the reality of his sin. He knows, also, that he has failed to comply with the instruction given in the Word of God and that God has plainly declared that none are free from sin in His sight. To declare of one's self that one has not sinned, is to make God a liar and not to be benefited by His Word.

The divine method, therefore, of dealing with the believer's sin nature is first to bring it into judgment. This was done by Christ when He "died unto sin once" (Rom. 6:10); but it can never be made too emphatic that this judgment does not consist in that nature being destroyed, nor is its essential power diminished. As Satan was judged by Christ on the cross (Col. 2:14–15; John 16:11) and is yet active—perhaps, as the god of this age, he is more active than before—in like manner, the sin nature is judged though its power is not, because of that judgment, decreased. The second provision in the divine dealing with the sin nature is that it is to be controlled in the believer by the superior power of the indwelling Spirit. It is a form of rationalism to contend that the sin nature is dismissed or eradicated in any believer, so long as he is in this world. This error, so prevalent in many quarters, will be analyzed at its proper place under Pneumatology. Enough will have been said here if it be observed that, as the Christian's enemies are three, namely, the world, the flesh, and the devil (the sin nature, or the "old man," is but a portion of one of these) and not one of them is ever removed

or eradicated, it is highly unscriptural and equally unreasonable to contend that the sin nature is thus deposed. Similarly, there might be a semblance of justification for a theory of eradication if anyone had ever demonstrated such a thing in experience. Over against all suppositions of such rationalism is the truth that the Word of God so clearly teaches that the Spirit of God is given to the Christian as the resource by which he may realize a victory over every foe, including the sin nature, which statement of Scripture, in so far as it concerns the sin nature, were eradication the will of God, would be without point or purpose.

The perfect judgment by Christ in His death of the sin nature, had in view the provision of a righteous basis upon which that nature may be wholly controlled by the Spirit of God. The problem is one that is related to God and His holiness. Being wholly evil, the sin nature can only be judged by God directly, or in a substitute of His choice. The Holy Spirit, being holy, could not deal with that evil nature in any life other than to bring upon it the awful judgment it merits, had it not been already judged. Since it is perfectly judged by Christ, all the power of the Spirit is free from restraint, to accomplish a day-by-day, or moment-by-moment, victory over the sin nature. To deal only with fruit of the tree—personal sins—and not with its root—the sin nature—would be almost a useless procedure. God has plainly declared His purpose and method of dealing with the root—the sin nature—and by giving attention to this the Christian may be intelligent in the steps he takes in the direction of an experimental sanctification of daily life. As unregenerate men may continue unsaved because of their failure to enter by faith into the truth that Christ died for their sins, in like manner regenerate men may remain undelivered from evil in their lives because of their failure to enter by faith into the truth that Christ died unto their sin nature.

Romans 6:1–8:13. The central passage bearing on the judgment of the sin nature, or "old man," by the death of Christ and the explanation of the new basis upon which, in view of that judgment, the believer's life may be lived, is Romans 6:1–8:13. As Romans, chapters 1 to 5, discloses the way of salvation into eternal life and a perfect standing, even eternal justification, for those among the unsaved who believe— and that because of the finished work of Christ as a redemption (3:24), as a reconciliation (5:10), and as a propitiation (3:25), thus Romans 6:1–8:13 discloses the way to a God-honoring manner of life for the one who is saved, and that manner of life

through what may well be termed *the finished work of Christ for the Christian.* For, by a judgment —infinitely perfect and complete—of the sin nature, the walk by a new life-principle, by the enabling power of the Holy Spirit (8:4), is made possible for the Christian, who by faith reckons himself to be dead unto the sin nature and alive unto God, and counts on the sufficient power of the Spirit. It is of surpassing importance that the "old man is [was] crucified with him [Christ]" (6:6). On this ground the body of sin, or sin's power to manifest itself, may be *disannulled*—not *destroyed*, as in the A.V. Though this great body of truth is but briefy considered in the present connection in relation to the death of Christ, it will be considered at length under Pneumatology and as related to the enabling work of the Spirit.

Both Christ's death *for* sins and His death *unto* sin are substitutionary to the highest degree, and in no Scripture is substitution so emphasized as in Romans 6:1–10. Four steps in which the believer participates are itemized —crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection. It is significant that the one most forcible and explicit context which deals with the death of Christ for the unsaved presents the same particulars, but without the crucifixion feature. This Scripture declares: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I deliveredunto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:1–4). In Romans 6:1–4, which presents the ground of the believer's experimental sanctification, or daily walk, in the enabling power of the Spirit, it is written, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." And to this is added in verse 6, "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." The whole context, Romans 6:1–10, is so sustained in its thought of substitution that a

partnership—cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection—is indicated. Since there could be no necessity for any one of these features to be enacted for Christ's own sake, it is altogether wrought in behalf of those whose sin nature He thus judges. This so vital passage on which the whole doctrine of the judgment of the Adamic nature rests, is but an enlarging on the one question with which the context opens, namely, "How shall we that are dead [who died] to sin, live any longer therein?" That is, the manner of His death *unto sin* involved a fourfold participation—cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection. Such, indeed, is the divinely wrought judgment of the "old man" (cf. vs. 6), which forms the basis of a perfect emancipation by the Spirit from the reigning power of the "old man"—the sin nature.

Considering the clear statement that this is a death for the believer in the sense that he partakes of that which Christ wrought in His death unto sin, it is to be deplored that some have interpreted this passage as enjoining self-crucifixion. Similarly, it should be remembered that if this passage is accepted as a directing in the matter of ritual, or water, baptism, as some have considered it, the vital truth respecting Christ's death as a judgment of the sin nature is dismissed, since the passage could not represent both ideas; and if the passage is a directing in the matter of ritual baptism, the one central truth which provides the ground of a possible freedom from the "old man" is sacrificed. The most ardent contender for the claim that ritual baptism is a representation of the death of Christ would hardly wish to relate that ordinance to sanctification or the victorious life by the Spirit, but would require that the ordinance be related to the salvation of the sinner, or Christ's death for sins. In this respect the passage—1 Corinthians 15:1–4—is a more reasonable basis for the ordinance, for Romans 6:1–10 is without question a setting forth of the death of Christ as the ground of experimental sanctification and not of the salvation of the lost. No ritual baptism ever so joins a person to Christ as that he is made to share vitally and perfectly in all that Christ is and all that He has done, but this is precisely what the baptism with the Spirit accomplishes. Thus by being baptized into Christ by the Spirit, an actual participation in crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection is secured.

In its major aspects, the development of the argument of Romans 6:1–8:13 is: (1) Christ died unto sin to the end that the believer should not

continue in sin. It is written, “Let not sin [the nature] therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof” (6:12). The implication cannot be avoided that, if unhindered, the sin nature, though judged, will assert its power in the mortal body. It is also implied that its reigning is not a necessity which it would be if it were unjudged, and likewise that the responsibility is now belonging to the Christian to “let not,” employing for this, of course, the divine means and resources available through the Spirit of God. (2) The whole merit system with its appeal to human works and effort as represented in law relationships has passed for the Christian, and those who employ this principle of walking in self-strength are defeated because of their inability to control the sin nature (7:1–25). (3) There is triumphant victory in which the whole will of God is fulfilled *in*, but never *by*, the believer (8:1–13). In this, the final division of this context, it is restated that the deliverance is by the power, or law, of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (8:2) and on the basis of the truth that a new principle of achievement is secured which is as much more effective as the power of God is greater than the power of impotent flesh. The whole truth is summarized in two verses (8:3–4) in which both the judgment death of Christ in respect to the old nature and the immediate energy of the Spirit are presented: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned [judged] sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.”

It may be concluded, then, that, in His death, and as a major objective, Christ secured a judgment against the sin nature on the basis of which the Holy Spirit can righteously deliver from the power of that nature, and will deliver, all those “who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (8:4). To walk after the Spirit is to walk in conscious dependence upon the Spirit. It is to walk by means of the Spirit (cf. Gal. 5:16).

VII. The Ground of the Believer’s Forgiveness and Cleansing

In the second volume and under the general division of hamartiology the specific and unique doctrine respecting the Christian’s sin has been considered at length. There it was observed that sin is always equally sinful by whomsoever committed, that it can be cured only by the blood of Christ,

and its cure, in the case of a Christian, is by *family* forgiveness and cleansing which is secured by confession of the sin to God. It remains to indicate, as is germane to this theme, that the Christian's forgiveness and cleansing are made righteously possible only through the blood of Christ which He shed in a specific sense for the Christian's sin.

1 John 1:1–2:2. There is much in the New Testament bearing on the forgiveness of the sin of the unsaved as a vital feature of their salvation. That forgiveness, it is assured, is accomplished when the sinner *believes.* The central passage related to the sin of the Christian, which forgiveness is conditioned on *confession,* is 1 John 1:1–2:2. In this context both the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself and the effect of his sin upon God are contemplated. In the first instance, the effect is that of *darkness* and the cure is that of *walking in the light* (1:6–7). To walk in the light is in no sense a matter of attaining to sinless perfection; that would be to *become* the light which God alone is. It is rather to be responsive to the light which God sheds into the heart. It is an attitude of willingness to confess immediately every sin as soon as it is recognized to be sin. Such confession brings the Christian at once into moral agreement with God. He shares God's denunciation of his sin and this becomes the basis of a renewal of fellowship with God. The promise is that, when thus walking in the light and thus adjusted to the light, the blood of Jesus Christ continually cleanses from all sin. This truth is amplified in verse 9 wherein it is said, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Thus it is revealed that both forgiveness and cleansing for the Christian are based on the blood of Christ. That no punishment is inflicted, that no blow is struck, that no word of condemnation is uttered, and that only perfect forgiveness and cleansing are extended from God on no other terms than confession, is due to the truth that Christ *is* "the propitiation for our [Christians'] sins" (2:2). God, through the death of His Son, *is* propitious.

In the second instance, namely, the effect of the Christian's sin upon God, the cure is said to be through the advocacy of Christ in heaven. As Advocate He appears in behalf of the sinning Christian and pleads, not the weakness of the Christian, but the sufficiency of His own sacrifice. That He bore that sin on the cross, answers all divine judgment against that sin, and, again, God is found to be propitious. No New Testament doctrine—save

that of salvation for the lost—is more perfectly grounded on the death of Christ than is the doctrine which sets forth the forgiveness and cleansing of the Christian; and it should not go unobserved that in 1 John 2:2 the sin of the Christian is designated as a specific and major objective in the propitiatory death of Christ on the cross.

VIII. The Ground for the Deferring of Righteous Divine Judgments

The preceding seven objectives accomplished by Christ in His sufferings and death, though eternal in their character, being foreseen from all eternity and with respect to certain of their features continuing their effect throughout eternity to come, are *personal* and to be valued largely in the light of their present benefit. The seven realities, including the one under consideration, which are yet to be attended are either of limitless application, of other ages, or of other spheres of existence than the earth.

The deferring of righteous judgments, though so obviously in operation throughout all ages, is not a matter of specific revelation. It is disclosed, however, that God, being holy, cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance, unless, indeed, that sin be seen by Him as judged in the death of His Son. By the eternal God—He who "calleth those things which be not as though they were" (Rom. 4:17)—every human sin, from the first to the last, is seen in the light of the sacrifice of Christ; and in that sacrifice and upon a plane far more extended than that employed in the saving of individual souls, He is free to defer those holy judgments which otherwise must fall with terrible swiftness upon each sinner. It may be observed, also, that deferred judgments are not abandoned or renounced judgments. The day of divine wrath cannot be escaped unless the offender is sheltered under the redeeming blood of Christ. But the patience of God—based ever upon a righteous ground, else His holy character is compromised with sin—is extended toward sinners in His long-suffering (Rom. 9:22; 1 Pet. 3:20; 2 Pet. 3:9, 15), and His striving (Gen. 6:3). The wise man has written, "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil" (Eccl. 8:11). The certainty of judgment for those who despise divine patience is assured (Matt. 24:48–51; Rom. 2:4–5). God is ever holy in character and righteous in action, whether it be in His long-suffering or His judgments.

IX. The Taking Away of Precross Sin Once Covered by Sacrifice

The divine economy with respect to the disposition of such sins as were represented in animal sacrifices during the extended period between Abel and Christ was one of *covering* as the Hebrew root *kāphar*, translated 'atonement,' indicates. Before the death of Christ, this divine economy based its righteous action with respect to sin upon the anticipation of that death, the animal sacrifice being a symbol or type of the death of God's Lamb. By the presentation of a sacrifice and by the placing of the hand upon the head of the victim, the offender acknowledged his sin before God and entered intelligently into an arrangement in which a substitute died in the sinner's place. Though, as stated in Hebrews 10:4—"it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins"—God did, nevertheless, provide a release for the offender, but with the expectation on His own part that a righteous ground for such release would eventually be secured by the one sacrificial death of His Son, which death the animal-slaying typified. The Hebrew word *kāphar* expresses with divine accuracy precisely what took place on the Godward side of the transaction. The sin was *covered*, but not "taken away," pending the foreseen death of Christ. To translate *kāphar* by 'atonement,' which etymologically may mean 'at-one-ment,' could truthfully convey no more than that the offender was 'at one' with God by a transaction which rested only on a symbolism. On the human side, the offender was pardoned; but on the divine side the transaction was lacking the one and only act which could make it conform to the requirements of infinite holiness. Two New Testament passages shed light on the restricted divine action respecting those sins which were covered by animal sacrifices. In Romans 3:25 the divine objective in the death of Christ is declared to be, "for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." In this text, πάρεσις, translated *remission* and used but once in the New Testament and far removed with respect to the force of its meaning from ἄφεσις (which indicates a full pardon), implies no more than the deferring of judgment and reveals that God pretermitted sin in view of the sacrifices. Likewise, in Acts 17:30 and with reference to the same divine economy, we read, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent." The Authorized translation of ὑπερεῖδον by the words 'winked at' today suggests

indifference, or a want of gravity, on the part of God toward the righteous judgments which sin must inevitably incur, whereas the real meaning of ὑπερεῖδον in this context is that unavoidable, impending judgments were only temporarily passed over.

A series of vital contrasts between the efficacy of the animal sacrifices of the old order and the efficacy of the final sacrifice of Christ is presented in the letter to the Hebrews. Among these, and as a consummation of the series, it is stated (10:2) that the worshipers of the old order never gained freedom from a "conscience of sins," returning year by year, as they did, with animal sacrifices. This was inevitable, the writer states, "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (10:4). Christ, we are told (10:9), took away the old order that He might establish the new. That the old order is done away is again declared (10:26) by the words, "There remaineth no more [the former] sacrifice for sins." This fact is likewise set forth in the following words: "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man [Christ], after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down [the task being finished] on the right hand of God" (10:11–12). Thus it is seen that the death of Christ was a righteous consummation of the old order as well as the foundation of the new. Since in the old order God had forgiven sins on the ground of a sacrifice that was yet future, that sacrifice, when accomplished, not only *took away* by righteous judgment the sins He had before forgiven, but proved God to have been righteous in deferring His judgments upon those sins. This is the testimony of Romans 3:25 where in referring to Christ's death it is stated, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission [passing over] of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Here that divine dealing which pretermitted the sins of the past was based on the forbearance of God, while the present dealing with sin is a completed transaction resulting in absolvence of the sinner and securing his justification upon a basis so righteous that God is said to be just in thus justifying a sinner who does no more than to believe in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). There being no ground provided under the old order for a complete absolvence of the sinner, that transaction is carried forward and becomes a part of the new testament which Christ made in His blood, and by it the

elect people of the old order received “the promise of eternal inheritance.” We read, “For this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance” (Heb. 9:15).

The conclusion to be drawn from this extended body of Scripture is that the sins committed in the period between Adam and the death of Christ which were covered by sacrificial offerings were taken away and perfectly judged in righteousness as a major objective in the death of Christ.

X. The National Salvation of Israel

The Scriptures bear testimony to the fact that Israel as a nation is to be saved from her sin and delivered from her enemies by the Messiah when He shall return to the earth. It is true that, in this age, the present offers of divine grace are extended to individual Jews as they are to individual Gentiles (Rom. 10:12), and that, without reference to Jehovah’s unchangeable covenants with Israel, which covenants are in abeyance (Matt. 23:38–39; Luke 21:24; Acts 15:15–18; Rom. 11:25–27), the individual Jew is now divinely reckoned to be as much in need of salvation as the individual Gentile (Rom. 3:9). These facts, related as they are to the present age-purpose—the calling out of the Church from both Jews and Gentiles alike (Eph. 3:6)—have no bearing upon the divine purpose for the coming kingdom age when, according to covenant promise, Israel will be saved and dwell safely in her own land (Deut. 30:3–6; Jer. 28:5–6; 33:15–17). In the progress of the argument which the Apostle Paul presents in the letter to the Romans, and after having set forth the present fact and plan of individual salvation for Jew and Gentile in chapters 1–8, he proceeds to answer in chapters 9–11 the inevitable question of what, under these new conditions, has become of the irrevocable covenants with Israel (Rom. 11:27–29). The reply to this question could hardly be stated in more definite or understandable terms than the following: “… Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved [Israel here could not be the Church, since the Church is already saved]: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my

covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the gospel, they [Israel] are enemies for your [Gentiles'] sakes; but as touching the election, they [Israel] are beloved for the fathers' sakes. For the gifts and calling of God [concerning Israel] are without repentance" (Rom. 11:25–29). It is obvious that Israel as a nation is not now saved, nor are any of the features of Jehovah's eternal covenants with that people now in evidence—the final possession of their land (Gen. 13:15), their national entity (Isa. 66:22; Jer. 31:36), their earthly throne (2 Sam. 7:16), their King (Jer. 33:15, 17, 21), and their kingdom (Dan. 7:14)—but not one of these features could ever fail, since God is faithful who hath promised. The nation, but for certain rebels who are to be "purged out" (Ezek. 20:37–38), will be saved, and that by their own Messiah when He comes out of Zion (cf. Isa. 59:20–21; Matt. 23:37–39; Acts 15:16). "All Israel" of Romans 11:26 is evidently that separated and accepted Israel that will have stood the divine judgments which are yet to fall upon that nation (cf. Matt. 24:37–25:13). The Apostle distinguishes clearly between Israel the nation and a spiritual Israel (cf. Rom. 9:6; 11:1–36).

Out of the facts stated above, the truth which is pertinent to this theme is not the future regathering into their land nor the deliverance of Israel from her enemies—both of which, according to very much prophecy, are yet to be—but rather the fact that Jehovah will, in connection with the second advent of Christ and as a part of Israel's salvation, "take away their sins." This, Jehovah declares, is His covenant with them (Rom. 11:27). It has been observed that, in the age that is past, Jehovah's dealing with Israel's sins—even the sins for which appointed sacrifices were presented—was only a temporary covering of those sins, and that Christ in His death bore the judgment of those sins which Jehovah had before passed over; but the final application of the value of Christ's death in behalf of Israel awaits the moment of her national conversion (cf. Isa. 66:8, a nation born "at once"—*pa·am*—literally, as a time measurement, 'a stroke,' or 'the beat of a foot'). It is then that, according to His covenant, Jehovah will "take away" their sins. In Hebrews 10:4 it is stated that it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should "take away" sin, and in Romans 11:27 it is promised that Israel's sins will yet be taken away. The Greek ἄφαιρέω is used in both passages, but, with great significance, the equivalent of the future form of the word appears in the latter passage concerning Israel's national salvation.

The induction to be drawn from these and other Scriptures is that Jehovah will yet in the future, in the briefest portion of time, and as a part of Israel's salvation, take away their sins. To no people on the earth has it been more emphatically revealed than to Israel that "without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22), and it is also as clearly stated that no blood could ever avail for any remission of sin other than the blood of Christ. We conclude, therefore, that the nation Israel will yet be saved and her sins removed forever through the blood of Christ. The word of Isaiah is "For the transgression of my people was he stricken" (53:8), and of Caiaphas it is said he gave counsel to the Jews that it was "expedient that one man should die for the people."

The complete regathering of Israel to her own land, which is accomplished at the time of her salvation and in connection with her Messiah's return (Deut. 30:3), is anticipated in prophecy as one of the greatest miracles in the entire history of the earth. In Jeremiah 23:7–8, the regathering of that people is said to surpass, as a divine undertaking, even the crossing of the Red Sea. In like manner, it is stated in Matthew 24:31 that this regathering shall be wrought through the ministration of angels.

Specific terms are employed in the Scriptures to describe the definite character of Israel's salvation, deliverance, and future blessing. None of these, it will be observed, has ever been fulfilled in Israel's history, nor could many of these promises be applied to the Church, composed as she is of both Jews and Gentiles, without employing destructive principles of interpretation. Jehovah promised that He would "turn" their captivity, "circumcise" their hearts (Deut. 30:1–6), write His law in their hearts, and "remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:33–34). Jehovah also said, "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people," and "All shall know me, from the least to the greatest" (Heb. 8:10–11). Assurance is given unto that nation, when reunited and blessed by Jehovah, that "his rest shall be glorious" (Isa. 11:10). They are to be comforted and their warfare will be accomplished (Isa. 40:1–2). Jehovah shall feed His flock like a shepherd, and gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom, and gently lead those that are with young (Isa. 40:11). Again, Jehovah has said to Israel, "Thy Maker is thine husband … and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel," "With everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee," "This is the heritage of the servants of Jehovah, and their righteousness which is of me,

saith Jehovah" (Isa. 54:5, 8, 17, R.V.). They who were scattered will be gathered (Ezek. 34:11–14); they who were "hated of all nations" will be supreme over all Gentiles (Matt. 24:9 with Isa. 60:12); they who were blind for an age shall see (Rom. 11:25); they who were broken off shall be grafted in (Rom. 11:13–24); and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away (Isa. 35:10). The anticipation of such blessings for Israel is the theme of all the prophets, and such, indeed, is the salvation which awaits that people; but God is righteously free to act in behalf of sinners only on the ground of the fact that the Lamb of God has taken away their sins. A major objective in the death of Christ is, therefore, the national salvation of Israel.

XI. Millennial and Eternal Blessings Upon Gentiles

The gospel of the grace of God is now being preached to Jews and Gentiles alike and heavenly riches and glories are promised to those who believe its message; however, these heavenly blessings for the Church should not be confused with the millennial earthly blessings which are assured to Israel, and to the Gentiles who share the kingdom with Israel. The presence of certain Gentile nations on the earth during the millennial kingdom is a theme of Old Testament prophecy. The selection of these nations and the basis of that selection is given from the lips of Christ and recorded in Matthew 25:31–46. Their relative position in the kingdom is to abide in the reflected glory of Israel and to serve (Isa. 60:3, 12; 61:9; 62:2). They are to be a people "upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord" (Acts 15:17). In like manner, these same nations are seen as inhabitants of the new earth that is to be and there they are designated as "the nations of them which are saved" (Rev. 21:24). The placing of these nations in the kingdom, the calling of Jehovah's name upon them, and the saving of them, can be accomplished only as God is free through the redeeming blood of Christ to bless sinners. The millennial and eternal blessing of Gentiles is thus seen to be a major objective in the death of Christ.

XII. The Spoiling of Principalities and Powers

Important, indeed, is the revelation that there are supermundane dignitaries who under divine permission are exercising transcendental authority. These beings are designated as principalities and powers. The title (used twice of earthly rulers—Rom. 13:1; Titus 3:1) does not necessarily imply that these beings are evil, though, according to the context, they are, in the majority of passages wherein this appellation appears, said to be evil. It seems evident that the word *principalities* (ἀρχή) conveys the fact of their dignity, and the word *powers* (ἐξουσία) conveys the fact of their authority. With reference to those angels who "kept not their first estate," Jude, by the use of ἀρχή, declares that they departed from the place of dignity, but no implication is advanced in this passage that they sacrificed any aspect of their power and authority (Jude 1:6). They are created beings (Col. 1:16), and their abode, though above the sphere of humanity (Heb. 2:9), is lower than the throne of God where Christ is now seated (Eph. 1:21; Heb. 10:12). Over these and all supermundane beings Christ Himself is now in supreme authority (Col. 2:10). The Church is now God's instrumentality by which He makes known unto these beings "the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10), as in the ages to come He will make known by the Church the "exceeding riches of his grace" (Eph. 2:7). These celestial dignities are now exercising their power in conflict with the saints on earth (Eph. 6:12), and the Apostle Paul states that among all the opposing forces not even the principalities and powers are "able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38–39). It is likewise revealed that Satan, who bears the title of *the prince of the power of the air* (Eph. 2:2), is the regnant authority over all fallen angels (Rev. 12:7–9; Matt. 25:41). It is evident that, from the time of his own fall in the dateless past, Satan and his heavenly hosts have been in undisguised rebellion against the will and authority of God, and that it was Satan himself who led the first man into the desire to be independent of God. The godly of all the ages have been given divine exhortations and warnings in view of Satan's opposition to God. Similarly, when offering his temptations to the Son of God in the wilderness, Satan disclosed his own antipathy to the revealed plan and purpose of God. In the end, Satan will be banished forever; but not until he, with his angels, has waged a losing battle against the holy angels (Rev. 12:7), and has been confined to the abyss for a thousand years (Rev.

20:1–3). His final and eternal abode is “the lake of fire” (Rev. 20:10) which is “prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt. 25:41).

This judgment of Satan, as outlined above, was first predicted, then gained as a legal sentence, and is yet to be executed. The prediction is by Jehovah Himself (Gen. 3:15; cf. Isa. 14:12; Ezek. 28:16–19), and discloses that in the consummation of the enmity between the Seed of the woman—Christ—and Satan, Christ would bruise Satan’s head and in so doing Satan would bruise Christ’s heel. The conflict was waged at the cross, and, while a legal sentence was there gained against Satan which anticipates its yet future execution or the bruising of Satan’s head, the heel of the Son of God was bruised when He died on the cross.

The combat between Christ and Satan which was waged on Calvary’s hill, involves issues and powers belonging to higher realms than this earth and things beyond the boundaries of time. The finite mind cannot hope to apprehend the scope and character of this illimitable encounter. It is not only implied that, in this conflict, Satan exercised his utmost power, but that the injury inflicted upon the Son of God, likened to the bruising of His heel, was from Satan. It should be observed, however, that Satan is not the only being who is said to bear responsibility for the death of Christ. Four groups or individual men stand accused (Acts 4:27). It is probable that these were only instruments in Satan’s power (Eph. 2:2; Col. 1:13). All this seeming unrestraint is, nevertheless, safeguarded by the assuring declaration that what was done either by Satan or by man was only the outworking of the “counsel determined” of God (Acts 4:28). On the divine side, the death of Christ was at the hand of His Father (John 3:16; Rom. 3:25; 8:32), by Christ Himself as a self-wrought sacrifice (John 10:18; Gal. 2:20), and through the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14).

When approaching His death, Christ said: “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out” (John 12:31); and, “Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:11). Similarly, the Apostle Paul in referring to the victory Christ gained over principalities and powers by His cross, states: “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it” (the cross—Col. 2:14–15). Though the law, which was administered by angels

(Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2), is not now the rule of life for believers of this age, agreement cannot be accorded to some who assert that it was the law rule which was here "spoiled" by the death of Christ. The *spoiling* is too manifestly of the principalities and powers. In addition to the direct legal sentence which Christ gained at the cross against Satan and his hosts, the issues of which are beyond our understanding, there are at least two factors in this victory which may be apprehended. (a) In their relation to the authority of God, Christ and Satan represent opposing principles. In the past ages Satan uttered five "I will's" against the will of Jehovah (Isa. 14:13–14), and, when coming into the world, Christ said: "Lo, I come … to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5–7). This utterance of Christ to His Father, it will be remembered, is made in connection with His anticipated sacrificial death. (b) Of Christ it was prophesied that He would open the door of the prison to them that are bound (Isa. 61:1), but of Satan it is said, "He opened not the house of his prisoners" (Isa. 14:17). The prisoners are Satan's and the release of them by Christ through His death constitutes a far-reaching achievement. Aside from the mere remnant whose sins were covered by animal sacrifices in the long period between Adam and Christ, the vast multitude of human beings stood related to God under the six unalterable indictments recorded in Ephesians 2:11–12. They were without God and without hope, because they were without Christ, in the world. No way of approach either for them to God or for God to them having yet been provided, Satan evidently assumed the rule over them which he could do on the ground of the fact that he had wrested the scepter of authority from Adam. During that extended period, had God approached one of these souls without a righteous provision having been either promised through animal sacrifices or made actual by the blood of His Son, Satan, it is probable, could have challenged the Almighty, charging Him with unrighteousness. Thus on the ground of man's sinfulness Satan held his prisoners bound. But since Christ died for all men, as He certainly did, there remains no barrier between God and man other than a lack of faith on the part of man in the Savior. The prisoners who otherwise would be "without hope" are now confronted with the gospel of divine grace—"Whosoever will may come."

Thus, it may be concluded that one of the major objectives in the death of Christ was the "spoiling of principalities and powers."

XIII. The Ground of Peace

But a slight conception may be had by finite minds of this boundless theme, which falls naturally into three general divisions. (a) The peace which has been secured for individuals who believe is closely related to both divine reconciliation and propitiation, but is, nevertheless, specified as a major objective in the death of Christ. Since the believer is cleared of every indictment and even justified because of the value of Christ's death—which value is received by faith—there is secured a lasting peace between God and the man of faith. The most illuminating passage related to this personal peace is Romans 5:1, which reads: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Thus, also, the same truth is declared in Ephesians 2:13–14a: "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace." And, again, in Colossians 1:20, having declared the broader outreach in securing peace by the blood of the cross, the Apostle continues with the more individual and personal application of that blood and the peace it secures. He writes, "And you, that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death."

(b) Of great importance, too, is that peace which obtains between Gentile and Jew—in spite of the agelong enmity between them and their disproportionate privilege as declared of the Jew in Romans 9:4–5, and of the Gentile in Ephesians 2:11–12—when these are brought by saving grace into the one Body of Christ. Of this the Apostle writes in Ephesians 2:14–18: "Who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." This aspect of peace is not alone dependent on a mere experience of grace, one toward another; it is *positional.* Being members of the same body, all distinctions are lost: "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in

all" (Col. 3:11). In the covenants, Israel was already in that place of privilege which is termed *nigh* (Eph. 2:17); but the Gentiles who by relationship were *afar* off are made *nigh* by the blood of Christ (Eph. 2:13).

(c) And, finally, there is a peace to be realized throughout the universe—foreshadowed in the thousand years under the Prince of Peace—which will be established by the judgment of Satan (Col. 2:14–15) and of all the forces of evil. It is written, "And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven" (Col. 1:20). The program which Christ will follow is clearly predicted: first, He shall judge the nations (Matt. 25:31–46), having crushed their resistance (Ps. 2:1–3, 8–9; Isa. 63:1–6); second, He shall put down all rule and authority, which will require a millennium of years and involve the subjection of both angelic and human spheres (1 Cor. 15:25–26); and, third, He shall restore to God a universal kingdom of peace in which the Son eternally reigns by the authority of the Father, and God is all in all (1 Cor. 15:27–28).

XIV. The Purification of Things in Heaven

Sin has wrought its tragic effects within the angelic hosts as it has within the human race, and the pollution of sin reaches beyond the angels in heaven and beyond men on the earth. Its defilement has extended to inanimate "things" in both spheres. It is stated in Hebrews 9:23 that it was necessary for heavenly "things" to be purified, and in Romans 8:21–23 creation itself, including earth's creatures, has been brought into bondage from which it will not be delivered until the time when the believer's body is redeemed. Because of this bondage, the whole creation now groans and travails in pain. Even the redeemed must "groan within themselves" during the present period in which we await the redemption of our bodies. The fact that defilement has reached to "things" in heaven as well as to "things" upon the earth is an exceedingly important revelation and is, in the Scriptures, considered quite apart from the effect of sin upon angels and men.

Among the contrasts set up in Hebrews, chapters 8–10, between the typical ceremonials which foreshadowed Christ's death and that death itself, it is pointed out (Heb. 9:23) that, as the tabernacle on earth was purified by

the blood of animals, so the heavenly "things" were purified on the ground of Christ's blood when He, as High Priest, entered the heavenly realms. We read: "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building [the old tabernacle]; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" (9:11–12). And, referring to the service of the high priest of old in the earthly sanctuary, the writer adds: "Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry [things]. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission" (9:21–22). Such was the type; but of Christ's own service in fulfilling the antitype it is stated: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens [the old tabernacle] should be purified with these [the blood of animals]; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands [the old tabernacle], which are the figures [ἀντίτυπος] of the true; but into heaven itself" (9:23–24). The contrasts and parallels thus set up between the type and the antitype are obvious. The old sanctuary was ceremonially cleansed by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood Christ entered into the holy place on high and on the ground of that blood the heavenly "things" were purified and by "better sacrifices" than that of the animals. The plural *sacrifices* as here used of Christ's one offering of Himself may be assumed to be categoric—comprehending its many parts within what is one category.

Various theories have been advanced to explain why the "things" in heaven, that is, in the sphere of the "holy place" which is heavenly (Heb. 9:23), should need purification. On this point Dean Alford quotes F. Delitzsch as follows: "If I see aright, the meaning of the Writer is, in its ground-thought, this: the supernal holiest place, i.e. as ver. 24 shews, *heaven itself*, the uncreated eternal heaven of God, although in itself untroubled light, yet needed a *purification* in so far as the light of Love towards man was, so to speak, outflared and obscured by the fire of wrath against sinful man; and the heavenly tabernacle, i.e. the place of God's revealing of His majesty and grace for angels and men, needed a *purification*, in so far as men had rendered this place, which was destined for them from the beginning, unapproachable by reason of their sin, and so

it must be changed into an approachable place of manifestation of a God gracious to men" (*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., *in loc.*).

This explanation of the problem is not without its difficulties. Not only has Delitzsch extended the grace of God to the angels which, so far as has been observed, is never even implied in the Scriptures, but he has made the purification of "things" to be the removal of the wrath of God against sinners of this earth by the reconciliation of the cross of Christ. It is true that "things in earth and things in heaven" are by the cross reconciled, to the end that peace is made (Col. 1:20)—which fact is far removed from the divine reconciliation of earth dwellers to God. Though the student is by this problem again confronted with supermundane issues too vast for finite apprehension, it may not be amiss to be reminded that sin in its most terrible aspect of lawless rebellion has by the sin of the angels entered heaven, or the abode of those celestial beings divinely designated as "the angels of heaven" (Matt. 24:36). Concerning the "uncreated heaven" to which Delitzsch refers, Scripture seems to be silent.

The revelation that "things in earth and things in heaven" are reconciled by the cross, or that "things" in heaven were purified on the ground of the blood of Christ as the blood of animals served to purify the furnishings of the earthly tabernacle, is no support whatever for the "universal reconciliation" notion. On the contrary, the Scriptures declare in no uncertain terms that all fallen angels and all unregenerate men go on to eternal woe.

Though in its essential features it transcends the range of human understanding, it is clear that the purification of "things" in heaven constituted one of the major objectives in the death of Christ.

Chapter V

The Sufferings and Death of Christ in Types

Dr. Patrick Fairbairn begins his valuable treatise on the types (*The Typology of Scripture*) with the following statement: "The Typology of Scripture has been one of the most neglected departments of theological science." This declaration is significant not only for the recognition of an inestimable loss to the Church of Christ, but for the fact that typology is, by this worthy theologian, given a rightful place in the science of Systematic Theology. Dr. Fairbairn does not assert that no attention has been given to typology in generations past. On the contrary, he goes on to show that from Origen's day to the present hour there have been those who have emphasized this theme, and that some have emphasized it beyond reason. The contention is that theology, as a science, has neglected this great field of revelation. Typology, like prophecy, has often suffered more from its friends than its foes. The fact that extremists have failed to distinguish between that which is typical and that which is merely allegorical, analogous, parallel, happy illustration, or resemblance may have driven conservative theologians from the field. When truth is tortured by faddists and extremists, an added obligation is thereby imposed upon conservative scholarship to declare it in its right proportions. It is obvious that to neglect truth is a greater error than to overemphasize it or to misstate it; and typology, though abused by some, is, nevertheless, conspicuous by its absence from works on Systematic Theology. That typology is neglected is evident from the fact that of upwards of twenty works of Systematic Theology examined, but one lists this subject in its index and this author has made but one slight reference to it in a footnote.

A type is a divinely purposed anticipation which illustrates its antitype. These two parts of one theme are related to each other by the fact that the same truth or principle is embodied in each. It is not the prerogative of the type to establish the truth of a doctrine; it rather enhances the force of the truth as set forth in the antitype. On the other hand, the antitype serves to lift its type out of the commonplace into that which is inexhaustible and to invest it with riches and treasures hitherto unrevealed. The Passover-lamb

type floods the redeeming grace of Christ with richness of meaning, while the redemption itself invests the Passover-lamb type with all its marvelous significance. While it is true that the type is not the reality, as is the antitype, the elements found in the type are, in the main, to be observed in the antitype. Thus the type may, and often does, guide specifically in the right understanding and structure of the antitype. The type is as much a work of God as is the antitype. Through the recognition of the relation between the type and antitype, like that between prophecy and its fulfillment, the supernatural continuity and plenary inspiration of the whole Bible is established. The field both in typology and prophecy is vast, there being upwards of one hundred legitimate types, fully one-half of which concern the Lord Jesus Christ alone, and there being even a greater field of prophecy wherein there are upwards of three hundred detailed predictions concerning Christ which were fulfilled by His first advent. There are three major factors which serve to exhibit the unity between the two Testaments: type and antitype, prophecy and its fulfillment, and continuity in the progress of narrative and doctrine. These factors, like woven threads running from one Testament into the other, bind them not only into one fabric, but serve to trace one design which, by its marvelous character, glorifies the Designer.

The two Greeks words τύπος and ὑπόδειγμα serve in the New Testament to express the thought of that which is typical. Τύπος means an imprint which may serve as a mold or pattern, and that which is typical in the Old Testament is a mold or pattern of that which is antitypical in the New Testament. Τύπος is translated by eight English words (*form*, Rom. 6:17; *fashion*, Acts 7:44; *manner*, Acts 23:25; *ensample*, 1 Cor. 10:11; Phil. 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:7; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1 Pet. 5:3; *example*, 1 Cor. 10:6; 1 Tim. 4:12; *figure*, Acts 7:43; Rom. 5:14; *pattern*, Titus 2:7; Heb. 8:5; *print* of the nails, John 20:25). Δεῖγμα means a *specimen* or *example*, and when combined with ὑπό indicates that which is shown plainly under the eyes of men. Ὑπόδειγμα is translated by two English words (*example* or *ensample*, John 13:15; Heb. 4:11; 8:5; James 5:10; 2 Pet. 2:6; and *pattern*, Heb. 9:23). Types are generally to be classified as of *persons* (Rom. 5:14; cf. Adam, Melchizedec, Abraham, Sarah, Ishmael, Isaac, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, etc.); of *events* (1 Cor. 10:11; cf. the preservation of Noah and his sons in the Ark, redemption from Egypt, the Passover memorial, the

Exodus, the passing of the Red Sea, the giving of manna, water drawn from the rock, the serpent lifted up, and all the many sacrifices); a *thing* (Heb. 10:20; cf. the tabernacle, the laver, the sacrificial lamb, Jordan, a city, a nation); an *institution* (Heb. 9:11; cf. the Sabbath, sacrifice, priesthood, kingdom); a *ceremonial* (1 Cor. 5:7; cf. all the Old Testament appointments of service). It is impossible in this space to list the recognized types found in the Old Testament.

In answer to the question how a type can be distinguished from an allegory or analogy, some rules have been advanced. Among these it is declared that nothing is to be deemed typical which is not sustained as such in the New Testament. This statement is subject to two criticisms. (a) In the light of 1 Corinthians 10:11, there is no definiteness to the boundaries of the words "all these things"; yet, whatever is included there is said to be *typical*. (b) There are many easily recognized types which are not directly sanctioned as such by any specific New Testament Scripture. Like the problem of primary and secondary application of the truth, the recognition of a type must be left, in any case, to the discernment of a Spirit-guided judgment.

It is the prerogative of the science of Systematic Theology to discover, classify, exhibit, and defend the doctrines of the Scriptures, and the precise features of typology are yet uncertain largely because of the fact that theologians have given their attention to other things; but who would dare to estimate the restriction imposed on the theological student's own spiritual life and blessing and, through him, upon all to whom he ministers, when the types which are God's great pictures of truth are deleted from every course of study designed to prepare him for a fruitful and worthy ministry of the Word of God! It is not enough to give these themes a passing recognition in the study of evidences; the student should be so saturated with these marvels of God's message that the whole being is set aglow with that spiritual radiance which can never be dimmed.

A true type is a prophecy of its antitype and, being thus designed of God, is not to be rated as so much human speculation, but as a vital part of inspiration itself. Naturally, Christ is the outstanding antitype since the supreme object of both the Old and New Testament is "the testimony of Jesus."

About fifty well-defined types of Christ are to be recognized in the Old Testament and a considerable portion of these are types of His sufferings and death. An exhaustive and conservative treatise on the types of the Old Testament has long been a *desideratum*, but such a work cannot be included here. On the contrary, the briefest survey only of the major types bearing upon Christ's death will be presented.

I. The General Sacrifices of the Old Testament

1. Abel's Offering (Gen. 4:4), which not only merits the favor of Jehovah, but indicates the fact that divine instruction on the importance and value of blood sacrifices had been given to the first of the race as they emerged from the Garden of Eden. By his sacrifice, Abel obtained witness that he was righteous. In this connection, attention should be given to Hebrews 11:4; 9:22b, as well as to all Scripture bearing upon the importance of sacrificial blood. The doctrine is not of human origin and as certainly its fulfillment in the death of Christ is alone the plan and purpose of God.

2. Noah's Altar and Sacrifice (Gen. 8:20–22). The necessity of blood sacrifice is the same as in the history of Abel; but the building of an altar is a new responsibility. The altar is one of the most important features of Old Testament doctrine. Man was taught by divine instruction (Ex. 20:24–26) that the altar represents no work of his own hands. It is the sacrifice on the altar which is blessed of God to the benefit of his soul. It is most significant that the divine instruction respecting the building of an altar follows immediately upon the giving of the Decalogue. Of the altar and its significance C. H. Mackintosh writes in his *Notes on Exodus* (3rd ed.):

> It is peculiarly interesting to the spiritual mind, after all that has passed before us, to observe the relative position of God and the sinner at the close of this memorable chapter. "And the Lord said unto Moses, 'Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel.… An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in all places where I record My name I WILL COME UNTO THEE, AND I WILL BLESS THEE. And if thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto Mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon'" (Ver. 22–26). Here we find man not in the position of *a doer*, but of *a worshiper;* and this, too, at the close of Exodus xx. How plainly this teaches us that the atmosphere of Mount Sinai is not that which God would have the sinner breathing,—that it is not the proper meeting-place

between God and man! “In all places where I record *My name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.*” How unlike the terrors of the fiery mount is that spot where Jehovah records *His name*, whither He “comes” to “bless” His worshiping people! But further, God will meet the sinner at an altar without a hewn stone or a step—a place of worship which requires no human workmanship to erect, or human effort to approach. The former could only pollute, and the latter could only display human “nakedness.” Admirable type of the meeting-place where God meets the sinner now, even the Person and work of His Son, Jesus Christ, where all the claims of law, of justice, and of conscience are perfectly answered! Man has, in every age and in every clime, been prone, in one way or another, to “lift up his tool” in the erection of his altar, or to approach thereto by steps of his own making; but the issue of all such attempts has been “pollution” and “nakedness.” “We all do fade as a leaf, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.” Who will presume to approach God clad in a garment of “filthy rags”? or who will stand to worship with a revealed “nakedness”? What can be more preposterous than to think of approaching God in a way which necessarily involves either pollution or nakedness? And yet thus it is in every case in which human effort is put forth to open the sinner’s way to God. Not only is there no need of such effort, but defilement and nakedness are stamped upon it. God has come down so very near to the sinner, even in the very depths of his ruin, that there is no need for his lifting up the tool of legality, or ascending the steps of self-righteousness,—yea, to do so, is but to expose his uncleanness and his nakedness. —Pp. 270–72

Under this general head may be grouped all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, all of which look on to the death of Christ.

II. The Prescribed Sacrifices of the Old Testament

1. The Paschal Lamb. Israel’s national and abiding redemption, as well as the safety of the firstborn in each home, was secured by the paschal lamb. So far-reaching is this redemption that Israel was required, in recognition of it, to re-enact the Passover throughout all her generations—not as a renewal of redemption, but as a memorial. The two general aspects of the meaning of the Passover are also well expressed by C. H. Mackintosh:

“And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side-posts and on the upper door-post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it. And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it. Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire; his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof” (Ver. 7–9). We have to contemplate the paschal lamb in two aspects, namely, as the ground of peace, and the centre of unity. The blood on the lintel secured Israel’s peace.—“When I see the blood, I will pass over you” (Ver. 13). There was nothing more required in order to enjoy settled peace, in reference to the destroying angel, than the application of the blood of sprinkling. Death had to do its work in every house throughout the land of Egypt. “It is appointed unto men once to die.” But God, in His great mercy, found an unblemished substitute for Israel, on which the sentence of death was executed. Thus God’s

claims and Israel's need were met by one and the same thing, namely, the blood of the lamb. That blood outside proved that *all* was perfectly, because divinely, settled; and therefore perfect peace reigned within. A shade of doubt in the bosom of an Israelite would have been a dishonor offered to the divinely appointed ground of peace—the blood of atonement.…

We shall now consider the second aspect of the passover, as the centre round which the assembly was gathered, in peaceful, holy, happy fellowship. Israel saved by the blood was one thing, and Israel feeding on the lamb was quite another. They were saved *only* by the blood; but the object round which they were gathered was, manifestly, the roasted lamb. This is not, by any means, a distinction without a difference. The blood of the lamb forms the foundation both of our connection with God, and our connection with one another. It is as those who are washed in that blood, that we are introduced to God and to one another. Apart from the perfect atonement of Christ, there could obviously be no fellowship either with God or His assembly. Still we must remember that it is to a living Christ in heaven that believers are gathered by the Holy Ghost. It is with a living Head we are connected—to "a living stone" we have come. He is our centre. Having found peace through His blood, we own Him as our grand gathering-point and connecting link.—"Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). The Holy Ghost is the only Gatherer; Christ Himself is the only object to which we are gathered; and our assembly, when thus convened, is to be characterized by holiness, so that the Lord our God may dwell among us. The Holy Ghost can only gather to Christ. He cannot gather to a system, a name, a doctrine, or an ordinance. He gathers to a Person, and that Person is a glorified Christ in heaven. This must stamp a peculiar character on God's assembly. Men may associate on any ground, round any centre, or for any object they please; but when the Holy Ghost associates, it is on the ground of accomplished redemption, around the Person of Christ, in order to form a holy dwelling-place for God (1 Cor. 3:16, 17; 6:19; Eph. 2:21, 22; 1 Pet. 2:4, 5).—*Ibid.*, pp. 137–38, 149–50

The six essential requirements to be found in the paschal lamb were: a lamb without blemish; a lamb that was tested; the lamb slain; the blood to be applied; the blood a perfect propitiation against divine judgments; the lamb partaken of as food. That Christ is the antitype in all this could hardly be doubted.

2. The Five Offerings (Lev. 1:1–7:38). The five offerings are: the burnt offering, the meal offering, the peace offering, the sin offering, and the trespass offering. These are properly classed as sweet savor offerings, which grouping includes the first three, and non-sweet savor offerings, which grouping includes the last two. Reference has been previously made to these five offerings, and it will suffice at this point to restate that the sweet savor offerings represent Christ offering Himself without spot to God (Heb. 9:14), and that this is substitutionary to the extent that, as the sinner is wholly void of merit before God (Rom. 3:9; Gal. 3:22), Christ has released and made available upon grounds of perfect equity His own merit as the basis of the

believer's acceptance and standing before God. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the non-sweet savor offerings represent Christ as a sacrifice for sin and as such the Father's face is turned away and the Savior cries, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Ps. 22:1; Matt. 27:46; Mark 15:34). The ground of a forgiveness both just and complete in the death of Christ is thus foreshadowed in the non-sweet savor offerings.

3. The Two Birds (Lev. 14:1–7). As on the Day of Atonement when two goats were required to fulfill the entire picture of Christ's death, so two birds are required in the cleansing of leprosy—the type of sin. The first bird slain speaks of Christ "delivered for our offences," while the second bird, dipped in the blood of the first bird and released, speaks of Christ "raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:25).

4. The Day of Atonement. Again the larger extent and accomplishment of Christ's death is set forth typically in magnificent detail by the events and specific requirements of the Day of Atonement. Of the typical meaning of the offerings prescribed for the Day of Atonement— the bullock for the high priest, and the two goats—Dr. C. I. Scofield states:

> The offering of the high priest for himself has no anti-type in Christ (Heb. 7:26, 27). The *typical* interest centres upon the two goats and the high priest. Typically (1) all is done by the high priest (Heb. 1:3, "by Himself"), the people only bring the sacrifice (Mt. 26:47; 27:24, 25). (2) The goat slain (Jehovah's lot) is that aspect of Christ's death which vindicates the holiness and righteousness of God as expressed in the law (Rom. 3:24–26), and is *expiatory.* (3) The living goat typifies that aspect of Christ's work which puts *away* our sins from before God (Heb. 9:26; Rom. 8:33, 34). (4) The high priest entering the holiest, typifies Christ entering "heaven itself" with "His own blood" for us (Heb. 9:11, 12). His blood makes that to be a "throne of grace," and "mercy seat," which else must have been a throne of judgment. (5) For us, the priests of the New Covenant, there is what Israel never had, a rent veil (Mt. 27:51; Heb. 10:19, 20). So that, for worship and blessing, we enter, in virtue of His blood, where He is, into the holiest (Heb. 4:14–16; 10:19–22). The atonement of Christ, as interpreted by the O.T. sacrificial types, has these necessary elements: (1) It is substitutionary —the offering takes the offerer's place in death. (2) The law is not evaded but honored—every sacrificial death was an execution of the sentence of the law. (3) The sinlessness of Him who bore our sins is expressed in every animal sacrifice—it must be without blemish. (4) The *effect* of the atoning work of Christ is typified (*a*) in the promises, "it shall be forgiven him"; and (*b*) in the peace-offering, the expression of fellowship—the highest privilege of the saint.— *The Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 147–48

The specific features thus required are: the bullock for the high priest, the substitution of the animal for the sinful person, the upholding of the law,

the perfect character of the sacrifice, the sin covered by the blood of the first goat, and the guilt taken away by the dismissal of the second goat.

5. The Red Heifer (Num. 19:1–22). The New Testament doctrine of cleansing for the believer is stated in 1 John 1:7, 9. Defilement is removed by the blood of Christ upon confession. The type of such cleansing, which also served a grand purpose in the economy of the Mosaic system, is seen in the ordinance of the red heifer. Of this J. N. Darby writes:

> The heifer was completely burned without the camp, even its blood, except that which was sprinkled directly before the tabernacle of the congregation, that is, where the *people* were to meet God. There the blood was sprinkled seven times (because it was there that God met with His people), a perfect testimony in the eyes of God to the atonement made for sin. They had access there according to the value of this blood. The priest threw into the fire cedarwood, hyssop, and scarlet (that is, all that was of man, and his human glory in the world). "From the cedar down to the hyssop," is the expression of nature from her highest elevation to her lowest depth. Scarlet is external glory (the world, if you please). The whole was burned in the fire which consumed Christ, the sacrifice for sin. Then, if anybody contracted defilement, though it were merely through neglect, in whatever way it might be, God took account of the defilement. And this is a solemn and important fact: God provides for cleansing, but in no case can tolerate anything in His presence unsuited to it. It might seem hard in an inevitable case, as one dying suddenly in the tent. But it was to shew that for *His* presence God judges of what is suited to His presence. The man was defiled and he could not go into God's tabernacle. To cleanse the defiled person, they took some running water, into which they put the ashes of the heifer, and the man was sprinkled on the third and on the seventh days; then he was clean.—*Synopsis of the Books of the Bible*, new ed., I, 264–65

The essential features of this ordinance were: an animal without blemish, the slaying of the animal, every part consumed by fire, the retaining of the ashes for cleansing, the mingling of the ashes with water, and the application of the water and ashes for the cleansing of defilement.

III. Miscellaneous Types of Christ's Death

1. The Coats of Skin (Gen. 3:21). Jehovah undertook in behalf of the first sinners of the human race. It is declared that He Himself clothed them with skins, the implication being that blood was shed. Reason rather than revelation asserts that animal sacrifice was then introduced by God and that it was from this action on Jehovah's part that Abel knew the truth by which he was guided in presenting an accepted sacrifice to Jehovah. Few types are as complete as this. God undertakes for man, the imputation of sin to a substitute is implied, and the covering of the sinner is revealed.

2. Noah's Ark (Gen. 6:14–8:19). The history of the flood is replete with suggestions of vital truth. Among these, the safety of those in the ark seems to be a definite preview of the safety of those who are in Christ Jesus. Pitch was used to cover the ark and by it the waters of judgment were resisted. The word translated *pitch* is from the same word everywhere translated *atonement.* The significance of the use of this word has been pointed out by many writers.

3. Bread and Wine at the Hand of Melchizedek (Gen. 14:17–24). Melchizedek bringing forth bread and wine to Abraham suggests two important truths, namely, (a) Abraham throughout the epistles of the New Testament is presented as a pattern of a Christian under grace and not of a Jew under the law. Grace on God's part is made possible only through the death of Christ, who said "Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad" (John 8:56). (b) The partaking of the bread and wine on Abraham's part may have been but dimly understood by either Melchizedek or Abraham—it is but dimly understood by the majority who partake today —but doubtless it all had great significance in the sight of God.

4. The Offering of Isaac (Gen. 22:1–14). In this memorable experience, Abraham appears as the type of the Father offering His Son. Abraham was spared the final ordeal, but, according to Romans 8:32, "God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all." Isaac is the type of the Son who is a willing sacrifice and obedient unto death. The ram caught in the thicket is the type of a substitute offered in the place of another.

5. Joseph (Gen. 37:2–50:26). Though Joseph as a type of Christ is exceedingly rich in its vital truth, only the placing of Joseph in the pit—a type of death—and the lifting him out—a type of resurrection— are germane to this thesis. However, to this may be added the truths that, like Christ, Joseph was beloved of his father and was hated by his brethren.

6. Manna in the Wilderness (Ex. 16:14–22). From the use Christ made, as recorded in John 6, of the manna as a type of Himself, none could doubt the typical import of the manna from heaven. Thus Christ as bread come down from heaven has given His life for the world.

7. The Smitten Rock (Ex. 17:5–7; Num. 20:7–13). According to 1 Corinthians 10:4, Christ is that Rock. By His death the water of life is released; but He could be smitten but once. The smiting of the rock the second time is estimated by God to be so great a sin that it precludes Moses from completing his task of taking the people of Israel into the promised land. The death of Christ is infinitely sufficient and admits of no re-enactment. It would be difficult to discover the exceeding sinfulness of Moses' sin apart from the antitype—Christ in His death.

8. The Tabernacle (Ex. 25:1–40:38). In this one structure with its details, the most extensive typology of the Old Testament is presented and there is much that is related to the death of Christ. The tabernacle itself is a type of Christ as the only way to God; the ark of the covenant sprinkled with blood is the place of propitiation; the shew-bread is another type of Christ as the Bread of Life given for the world; all references to silver speak of redemption; the brazen altar represents those judgments against sin which Christ bore in His death; the candlestick is a type of Christ the light of the world; the golden altar represents that aspect of Christ's death which was a sweet incense unto God; and the brazen laver foreshadows the cleansing of the believer-priest through the blood of Christ (1 John 1:7, 9).

IV. The Death of Christ According to Various Scriptures

It will not only be impressive to, but highly advantageous for, the student to observe the place which the death of Christ—both historically and doctrinally considered—occupies in the Bible. No further reference need be made to the typology which characterizes the early portions of God's Word, nor is there important teaching on this theme in the Old Testament historical books; and only major passages will be cited.

1. The Death of Christ According to Genesis. Genesis 3:15 is a preview of the death of Christ. In that Scripture the fact of Christ's death, its relation to angelic authorities, and its relation to sin and judgment are intimated. It is fitting that a recognition of the cross and its final triumph should appear in those chapters where all beginnings are recorded.

2. The Death of Christ According to Old Testament Prophecy. The Psalms which bear prophetically on the death of Christ are 22:1–21 and 40:6–7. In Isaiah 52:13–53:12 the outstanding prediction occurs.

3. The Death of Christ According to the Gospels. In this portion four extended accounts of Christ's death are found, as well as His own predictions concerning His death.

4. The Death of Christ According to Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians. Since the theme of salvation is so dominant in these books and since all salvation rests on the death of Christ, the New Testament doctrine is found largely in these four Epistles. Portions to be observed are: Romans 3:22–26; 4:25; 5:7–10; 6:1–15; 14:9, 15; 1 Corinthians 1:18–2:8; 15:3; 2 Corinthians 5:14–21; Galatians 1:4; 2:20; 3:10, 13; 6:14–15.

5. The Death of Christ According to Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. The following passages present the most vital truth: Ephesians 5:25–27; Philippians 2:5–8; Colossians 1:14, 20, which passage refers to the reconciliation of *things* and not creatures.

6. The Death of Christ According to the Epistle to the Hebrews. To a large degree, the Epistle to the Hebrews is a treatise on the death of Christ and with special reference to the truth that the old order with its sacrifices has been superseded by the one sacrifice of the cross. The book of Hebrews contributes more on the death of Christ than any other one New Testament book, as Leviticus contributes most of all the books of the Old Testament. Observe: Hebrews 1:3; 2:9; 5:1–10; 7:25–27; 9:12–15, 16–18; 10:1–21; 12:2, 24; 13:10–13.

7. The Death of Christ According to Other Books of the New Testament. In this more general classification certain passages are to be noted: Acts 17:3; 1 Thessalonians 4:14; 5:10; 1 Peter 1:18–21; 2:21; 3:18; 4:1; 1 John 2:2; Revelation 5:6, 9, 12; 13:8.

Chapter VI

Biblical Terminology Related to Christ's Sufferings and Death

In the General field of truth respecting the sufferings and death of Christ there are specific words employed by writers—some of which terms are Biblical and some are not—the meaning of which should be discerned by the student in their precise import. Thirteen of these are here considered:

I. Atonement

Whether it be accurately or inaccurately employed, the student will become aware of the fact that the word *atonement* (Lev. 5:10) is the term upon which men have seized to express the entire work of Christ upon the cross. That such a word is sorely needed cannot be doubted. The almost universal use of *atonement* for this purpose may go far to give it authoritative acceptance regardless of its inaptitude for the immense service thus thrust upon it. Objection to the use of the term as employed generally, arises from the fact that the word is not a New Testament term, and when used in the Old Testament some seventy-seven times it is a translator's attempt at interpretation and poorly represents the meaning of *kāphar*, which it purports to translate, which word originally meant *to cover.* Though etymologically the word *atonement* suggests *at-one-ment,* it feebly relates itself to the New Testament truth which presents Christ as the Lamb of God *taking away* the sin of the world.

II. Expiation

The New Standard Dictionary (1913 ed.) defines the meaning of this term thus: "The active means of expiating, or of making reparation or satisfaction, as for offense or sin; the removing of guilt by suffering punishment; atonement, or an atonement." In general, the term *expiation* is more inclusive and definite than *atonement.*

III. Forgiveness and Remission

Much having been written previously in this work on the doctrinal significance of these terms, no more need be added here than to restate that divine forgiveness of sin is made possible only through the cross of Christ, and is never exercised apart from expiation—whether anticipated, as it was in the Old Testament, or realized, as it is in the New Testament economy.

IV. Guilt

Guilt (Gen. 42:21; Rom. 3:19; 1 Cor. 11:27; James 2:10), which means that the guilty one has offended God's character and will, is predicated of every person and in two respects:

1. As personal and thus related to the historical fact of actual sin. Such guilt is nontransferable. History and its records can never be changed.

2. As an obligation to justice, which is the theological use of the term *guilt.* This is transferable in the sense that an innocent person may discharge the obligation of one who is guilty.

V. Justice

Generally speaking, whether as used in the Old Testament or the New Testament, the term *justice* is a synonym of righteousness. The conduct of one toward another is in view, and especially the truth that God acts toward men in justice. So perfect in itself is the plan of salvation through Christ, that God is said to be just (not, merciful) when He justifies the ungodly (Rom. 3:26; 4:5). God is ever just in all His ways.

VI. Justification

Theologically considered, the term *justification* means to be declared righteous. It is true that, being in Christ, the believer is righteous; but justification is the divine acknowledgment and declaration that the one who is in Christ is righteous. That which God thus publishes He defends. Justification is immutable.

VII. Penalty

Though immeasurable by the finite mind, both reason and revelation assert that the penalty for sin is no more than that which God's holiness requires. It is God's judicial authority expressed. It is that which Christ satisfied. Whatever these demands were, it is now to be believed that Christ has met these demands for those who trust Him.

VIII. Propitiation

As already stated, propitiation is the Godward effect or value of the cross. Since Christ has died, God is propitious. This truth is the heart of the gospel and that which is to be believed.

IX. Reconciliation

Similarly, but a brief added word concerning reconciliation need be offered here. It represents the manward effect and value of the cross. Since the word signifies a complete change, the term cannot be applied properly to God who is immutable, but it does apply to man, who by the death of Christ is placed in a changed relation to God and to His judgments against man. By his own choice man may be turned about or converted respecting the rightful claims of God upon him.

X. Redemption and Ransom

These two terms are practically the same in meaning. Redemption implies the payment of a ransom price, and, in the redemption which Christ has wrought, the divine judgments against sin having been measured out, these stand paid by Christ's voluntary sacrifice. This, again, is not something yet to be done; but, being already accomplished, is something to believe.

XI. Sacrifice

While this term usually means to relinquish that which one may hold in possession, its doctrinal meaning is that of an offering to God. Thus every animal slain in the Mosaic economy was a sacrifice, and these looked on in

anticipation to the one final and perfect sacrifice which Christ became for lost men (Heb. 9:26; 10:12).

XII. Satisfaction

The forces of modern thought have been for nearly a century arrayed against the doctrine of satisfaction. The offense of this doctrine is the claim that God, having certain holy, inherent demands against sin, which claims arise from His outraged righteousness and character, has accepted as satisfying the payment which Christ has made. This doctrine must be considered at length in the following chapter of this thesis.

XIII. Vicarious and Substitutionary

Again the two words being considered are identical in meaning and refer to the suffering of one in the place of another, in the sense that by that suffering on the part of one the other is wholly relieved. A vicar is an authorized or accepted substitute in office or service, and not merely anyone providing a benefit in general. Christ suffered and died that men might not be required to bear their burden of condemnation. To reject this truth is to reject the plainest doctrine of Scripture, to reject the gospel, and the only righteous ground on which God may exercise grace toward the lost.

Chapter VII

THEORIES FALSE AND TRUE OF THE VALUE OF CHRIST'S DEATH

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY introduces no theme more difficult than an attempted analysis of the values secured by Christ in His death—with respect to its necessity; its effect upon God, upon man, upon angels; and the principles involved in its application. In approaching this subject, it may clarify the main discussion if certain truths are stated upon which any worthy attention to this aspect of doctrine must be based.

I. Preliminary Considerations

1. GENERAL FACTS REVEALED. According to the Scriptures, the original harmony between God and man, from which Adam fell, must be treated as a fundamental reality. Though God was in the beginning in unbroken communion with man, He was, because of the sin of man, compelled to drive him from the garden and to proclaim that "without shedding of blood is no remission"; and though man was in the beginning in communion with God, he became estranged from God and is ever in unrest until through divine provisions he is restored to the righteousness of God. What may constitute the detail of those renewed relations has varied with different ages and in harmony with different divine purposes. The Israelite under his covenants, when restored to right relations with God, quite nearly duplicated the estate of unfallen man. He was in communion with God and blessed with a long life of tranquility on the earth. On the other hand, the Christian, when in that right relation to God which characterizes his saved estate, is conformed to Christ the Last Adam and all possessions, positions, life, and expectation are centered in that realm where his Living Head now is. Whether it be restricted to that estate which resembles the first Adam or whether it be the glorious transformation into the image of the Last Adam, the metamorphosis is a work of God for man, is wrought upon a righteous basis which God has constituted, and is available to man on such terms as God has determined. It may be reckoned as characteristic of both God and

man that God seeks the man—as He did in Eden—and that man hides from God and attempts—as symbolized by his apron of fig leaves—to clothe his nakedness from the eye of God. These three features of truth—God is man's Savior, God originates the plan by which man may be saved, and God determines the terms upon which man may be saved—are a reasonable starting-point for the study of the complex problem of those theories men have formed respecting the value of the thing which Christ accomplished by His death and the application of the value of that death to those who are estranged from God.

The fact that the Bible so exalts the importance of Christ's death—even making the world, if not the universe, *redempto-centric*—along with the corresponding human experience of sole relief and benefit in things spiritual by and through the cross, has compelled serious men to formulate theories respecting the whole divine undertaking. As the Bible offers no ready-made system of theology, in like manner it presents no ready-made theory of the value of Christ's work on the cross; however, there is little difficulty, comparatively, to be encountered when the plain teachings of the Word of God are taken in simple faith. The attempt to formulate a philosophy which purports to analyze God and all His works is fraught with insuperable problems. Inductions must be made and have been made with great care covering all that God has disclosed from Genesis 3:15 to the song of triumph with which the Bible closes. Out of such inductions certain truths emerge and these, when rightly arranged, might constitute a theory; but it is to be remembered that such a theory thus formed is, at best, characterized by the human element and is to that extent subject to error. A theory never creates a fact; it reaches its fruition when it explains a fact which already exists. Men have not originated any truth respecting the purpose and value of Christ's death; they have sought only to trace the meaning of that which God has accomplished. On this vital point, R. W. Dale has written:

> The Idea of an objective Atonement invented by theologians to satisfy the exigencies of theological systems! It would be almost as reasonable to maintain that the apparent motion of the sun was invented by astronomers in order to satisfy the exigencies created by astronomical theories. The Idea has perplexed, and troubled, and broken up successive systems of theology. It was precisely because they failed to account for it that theological systems which were once famous and powerful, and from which their authors hoped for an immortal name, have perished. If it had been possible to expel the Idea from the faith of Christendom, the task of theology would have been made wonderfully easier. *The history of*

> *the doctrine is a proof that the idea of an objective Atonement was not invented by theologians.* … It is true, and the truth has great significance, that the craving for a sacrifice for sin is one of the deepest instincts of the religious life of the race. It is also true that this craving is satisfied by the Christian Atonement. But that, apart from the clearest and most emphatic declarations of Christ Himself and His Apostles, the Church should ever have supposed that His Death could be the ground on which God forgives the sins of mankind, is incredible. … Had Moses perished at the hands of his inconstant and ungrateful and rebellious fellow-countrymen, I can imagine prophet after prophet insisting on his sufferings and death, in order to inspire the people with a fidelity to God like that which had been illustrated in the martyrdom of their great leader; and the Church might have made a similar use of His crucifixion. But what we have to account for is the universal prevalence of the idea that, while those who put Christ to death committed the greatest of human crimes, His Death was the Propitiation for the sins of the world. I can account for the prevalence of that idea in one way, and only in one way. It was a great and essential element in the original gospel which the Apostles were charged to preach to all nations. The Church received it from the Apostles. The Apostles received it from Christ.—*The Atonement,* 4th ed., pp. 299–300, 309–10

Primarily, the death of Christ answers a necessity and purpose in God. Human philosophy is strained beyond measure in its attempts to trace the majestic realities related to that death. Obviously, no theory can be formed by man respecting Christ's death that will be complete in all its parts. At best, what God has said should be received and believed. If such a procedure gives the intellectual pride of man no great latitude, perhaps by so much the truth may be preserved in its purity and simplicity.

2. The Death of Christ is Unique. Not only is Christ's death without a parallel in all human history both with regard to the way it was endured, and the measureless achievement said to have been wrought by it, but it was a *voluntary* crucifixion. He offered no resistance, for He had said, "No man taketh it [my life] from me, but I lay it down of myself" (John 10:18). It is far from natural for one who is innocent to an infinite degree, to project himself into a felon's death. Of no other could it be said that he is God's Lamb taking away the sin of the world, or that it pleased Jehovah to bruise him, and that Jehovah "laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6, 10). The philosophies of men are no more qualified to penetrate into this the most crucial of all divine undertakings than they are prepared to penetrate into the realms of infinity or into the Person of God. Nevertheless, the burden laid on the theologian is in evidence here as elsewhere. His is the task of systematizing and interpreting the precise revelation God has given. Mere speculation is debarred; yet, in spite of this obvious truth, very much

of the literature bearing on the meaning of the death of Christ is permeated with human conjecture.

3. Its Extent. The almost universal disposition to restrict the value of Christ's death to the one truth that it is a ransom or redemption from sin leads unavoidably to various errors. That His death is the ground of imputed righteousness and justification, that it is the basis on which a Christian may be forgiven and may walk in divine enablement, that it provides eternal blessedness for Israel, that it is the foundation on which an oncoming sinless eternity will rest, and that, objectively, it means more to God than it means to all men and angels combined, seems never to have occurred to many inventors of theories respecting the value of Christ's death. It is evident that a theory which comprehends no more than the forgiveness of sin—as glorious as that truth may be—will be more given to error than to truth.

4. Its Three Directions. The problem of sin when restricted to unregenerate men is met by the death of Christ and that value points objectively in three directions—a redemption toward sin, a reconciliation toward man, and a propitiation toward God. Though all originates in God, it yet remains true that He who originates provides and receives a ransom; that He who originates provides and acknowledges His own Lamb as the One who bears away sin, thus providing a reconciliation; and He who originates provides, by Christ's death, that by which He Himself is propitiated. Though rationalism condemns these truths as being contradictory, they are the very heart of the divine revelation regarding the saving work and grace of God. It is but another instance added to many already encountered in which revelation surpasses reason and the devout soul may know by simple faith what he otherwise could never know.

It hardly need be indicated that a theory which purports to set forth the value of Christ's death and yet omits any part or parts of this threefold division of Christ's work upon the cross can only mislead and deceive.

5. Divine Satisfaction Through Christ's Death is Not Personal Salvation. The satisfaction respecting the divine judgments against sin which Christ provided in His death does not itself constitute the salvation of those for whom He died. The unsaved are forgiven and justified not at the

time of the cross nineteen hundred years ago, but when they believe; and the saved who sin are not forgiven and cleansed on the date of Calvary, but when they confess. Regardless of the truth that the disposition to believe, in the one case, and to confess, in the other case, is wrought in the individual heart by the Holy Spirit, it yet remains true that these transforming blessings are conditioned on what is declared to be the elective choice of men. That treatment of the doctrine of satisfaction which invests it with those absolute provisions which necessitate the salvation of those for whom Christ died without regard for the element of human responsibility, is but another rationalistic deduction which is grounded on a partial revelation and, therefore, like all part-truth, is subject to great error.

6. Type and Antitype. None who accept the Scriptures as the Word of God can doubt the divine arrangement, purpose, and sanction of the truth as it lies paralleled between type and antitype. Since so much typology pertains to the death of Christ, this peculiar body of truth must be given its full import if the full value of Christ's death is to be recognized. That it is omitted from practically all theological discussions regarding Christ's death is a self-evident fact and the effect of its neglect is obvious.

7. Theories May Be Questioned. Strictly speaking, there could be no theory relative to the value of Christ's death. That death is a *fact* and the Bible asserts its manifold effectiveness. Human speculation is ever active and reason has raised its objections to every divine revelation. That deep mystery is present in the greatest of all divine undertakings, should be no surprise or cause for distress to devout minds. The heart of man—however much it may be disciplined—can and should do no more than believe the record God has given concerning His Son. The careful study of all that is revealed to the end that its true message may be comprehended, is certainly enjoined (2 Tim. 2:15); but rationalistic arguments which contradict revelation are foreign to a true theological method.

II. Historical Record

The multiplied and complex views respecting the value of Christ's death which have obtained within the Christian era may be divided into three

time-periods: (a) from the beginning to Anselm (c. 1100); (b) from Anselm to Grotius (c. 1600); and (c) from Grotius to the present time.

1. From the Beginning to Anselm. It appears that no very definite attempt was made by men of the early church to formulate a doctrine relative to the value of Christ's death. The teachings of Christ and the Apostles were received in simplicity of faith. The following from the *Epistle of Barnabas* (c. vii) will serve to indicate the belief of the men of earlier days: "If therefore the Son of God, who is Lord [of all things], and who will judge the living and the dead, suffered, that His stroke might give us life, let us believe that the Son of God *could not* have suffered except for our sakes." To this may be added a quotation from the *Epistle to Diognetus:*

> When our wickedness had reached its height, and it had been clearly shown that its reward, punishment and death, was impending over us; and when the time had come which God had before appointed for manifesting His own kindness and love—how the one love of God, through exceeding regard for men, did not regard us with hatred, nor thrust us away, nor remember our iniquity against us, but showed great long-suffering, and bore with us—He himself took on Him the burden of our iniquities, He gave His own Son as a ransom for us, the Holy One for transgressors, the Blameless One for the wicked, the Righteous One for the unrighteous, the Incorruptible One for the corruptible, the Immortal One for them that are mortal. For what other thing was capable of covering our sins than His righteousness? By what other One was it possible that we, the wicked and the ungodly, could be justified, than by the only Son of God? O sweet exchange! O unsearchable operation! O benefits surpassing all expectation! that the wickedness of many should be hid in a single Righteous One, and that the righteousness of One should justify many transgressors.—Chap. ix, both Fathers as cited by R. W. Dale, *Ibid.*, pp. 271–72

However, it was held from an early time and almost universally, in spite of voices raised against it, that the ransom which Christ provided was paid to Satan. Previously it has been pointed out (Chapter IV) that the death of Christ accomplished the judgment of Satan (John 12:31; 16:11; Col. 2:14–15), that Satan is that mighty foe who opened not the house of his prisoners (Isa. 14:17) and who was defeated by Christ in His death to the extent that Christ "opened the prison to them that are bound" (Isa. 61:1). It is evident that such Scriptures as these were given an exceedingly important place in the early days of the church. Here, as is so often recorded in all centuries of church history, confusion arises from the assumption that Christ wrought but one single thing in His death. Satan and his angels were judged, but the value of Christ's death is not restricted to that truth; nor is it given the

important place. Most certainly there is no basis for the notion that Christ paid a ransom to Satan for the redemption of lost men. As an illustration of the protest which certain men raised against this unfounded conception, the following from Gregory Nazianzen is cited:

> To whom and on what account, was the blood which was shed on our behalf poured out, that precious and illustrious blood of Him who was God, and both High Priest and Sacrifice? We were held fast by the devil since we were sold as slaves under sin, and had purchased pleasure by vice. If, now, the price of redemption is given only to him who has possession of the captives, then I ask, To whom was this ransom given, and on what ground? To the evil one? Oh, what a monstrous outrage! Then the robber received not merely a ransom from God, but received God Himself as the price of our redemption! Magnificent wages for his tyranny, on the payment of which justice required him to spare us! If, however, the ransom was paid to the Father, how, in the first place, can this be? for it was not God who had possession of us. And, in the second place, for what reason should the blood of His only begotten Son give any satisfaction to the Father, who did not even accept Isaac when his father [Abraham] offered him, but changed the sacrifice of a rational being into that of a ram? Is it not clear that the Father received the sacrifice, not because He Himself demanded or needed it, but for the sake of the Divine government of the universe …, and because man must be sanctified through the incarnation of the Son of God.—Opera. Cologne, 1680. I, 691–92, cited by Dale, *ibid.*, pp. 273–74

2. From Anselm to Grotius. The writing by Anselm in his *Cur Deus Homo* abruptly changed much of the former opinion. Anselm contended that the creature has wronged the Creator who has sovereign rights of ownership in that which He has made, and that a ransom was paid to God. The idea borders closely upon the truth of divine propitiation, and is, again, an almost exclusive emphasis upon one aspect of truth. The following quotations from *Cur Deus Homo* will indicate the positive character of the reasoning of Anselm, who is deemed the framer of the doctrine of satisfaction:

> *Sin is nothing else than not to render to God His due.* … The entire will of a rational creature ought to be subject to the will of God. … He who does not render to God this honour which is due to Him, robs God of what is His own, and dishonours God; and this is what it is to sin. … Every one who sins [is] bound to pay back the honour of which he has robbed God; and this is the satisfaction which every sinner is bound to pay to God (c. xi.) … Nothing is less tolerable in the order of things than that a creature should rob his Creator of the honour due to Him and not repay Him that of which he robs Him. … If nothing be more great or good than God, nothing can be more just than that which preserves His honour in the disposing of events, even the Supreme Justice, which is nothing else than God Himself (c. xiii.). … That God should lose His own honour is impossible; for either the sinner of his own will pays what he owes, or God takes it from him against his will. For either man of his own free will exhibits that subjection to God which is due from him, whether by not sinning, or by

> making amends for his sin, or else God subjects him to Himself by tormenting him against his will, and by this means shows Himself to be his Lord, which the same refuses of his own will to acknowledge.—C. xiv., all cited by Dale, *ibid.*, pp. 280–81

Anselm made much of the representative character of Christ as the God-man, that it is impossible for fallen man to render satisfaction to God, and that Christ as the representative man, as well as very God, did render that satisfaction as a substitute, and thus the satisfaction was rendered both by God who alone could compass so great a requirement and by the representative Man.

During the period which began with Anselm's influence, certain other important and closely related subjects were under discussion, one of these being whether Christ actually became the sin which He bore—the sum total of all sinners—or whether, in a forensic sense, He bore the judgment of sin as is foreshadowed in the typical truth that a lamb was efficacious for an individual, as in the case of Abel, or for a family, as in the Passover, or for the nation, as in the case of the Day of Atonement. Martin Luther vigorously contended for the idea that Christ became the sin of all men and not merely the bearer of their judgments. In his commentary on Galatians 3:13 he declares:

> The doctrine of the gospel (which of all others is most sweet and full of singular consolation) speaketh nothing of our works or of the works of the law, but of the inestimable mercy and love of God towards most wretched and miserable sinners: to wit, that our most merciful Father, seeing us to be oppressed and overwhelmed by the curse of the law, and so to be holden under the same, that we could never be delivered from it by our own power, sent His only Son into the world, and laid upon Him the sins of all men, saying, "Be Thou Peter, that denier; Paul, that persecutor, blasphemer, and cruel oppressor; David, that adulterer; that sinner which did eat the apple in Paradise; that thief which hanged upon the cross; and, briefly, be Thou the person which hath committed the sins of all men. See therefore that Thou pay and satisfy for them." Here now cometh the law, and saith, I find Him a sinner, and that such a one as hath taken upon Him the sins of all men, and I see no sins else but in Him, therefore let Him die upon the cross; and so he setteth upon Him, and killeth Him. By this means the whole world is purged and cleansed from all sins, and so delivered from death and all evils.—Cited by Dale, *ibid.*, p. 289

Another problem which received much consideration was one related to divine freedom as involved in the doctrine of satisfaction. If God must require just satisfaction—not being allowed to forgive sin as an act of sovereign leniency—is not His own freedom restricted and the exercise of His mercy limited? Francis Turretin (1682) contended that God's relation to

fallen man is not private; it involves public interests which cannot be disregarded if the government of God is to stand.

The Socinians, in defense of their rationalistic interpretation of the value of Christ's death, contended that if Christ actually rendered satisfaction to God for fallen men then those for whom Christ died would be automatically saved by that death, which is universalism. An answer to that challenge was the theory of a limited redemption, which asserts that Christ died only for the elect, or for those who were, according to God's purpose, to be saved. Since this so important question must yet receive extended treatment (Chapters VIII–X), it will not be pursued at this point.

3. From Grotius to the Present Time. The Rectoral or Governmental Theory of the value of Christ's death was originated by Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) of Leyden, Holland. This theory, soon to be discussed more fully, has held a strong influence over men of liberal minds, and has been, since its introduction, about the only notable competitor against the time-honored doctrine of satisfaction, which doctrine, though formulated by Anselm, has been the accepted view of the believers who form the church in all her generations.

III. Theories in General

Certain more or less well-defined theories or human philosophies have been set forth which attempt to explain that which Christ accomplished in His death. Each of these, in turn, has been subject to variations and modifications corresponding to the idea which any individual might wish to incorporate into a given scheme. Some writers have sought, even at great length, to list these theories. In the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge* (I, 349–56), Dr. B. B. Warfield presents the following fivefold classification of these theories:

> (1) Theories which conceive the work of Christ as *terminating upon Satan,* so affecting him as to secure the release of souls held in bondage by him. (2) Theories which conceive the work of Christ as *terminating physically on man,* so affecting him as to bring him by an interior and hidden working upon him into participation with the one life of Christ; the so-called "mystical theories." (3) Theories which conceive the work of Christ as *terminating on man, in the way of bringing to bear on him inducements to action;* so affecting man as to lead him to a better knowledge of God, or to a more lively sense of his real relation to God, or to a revolutionary change of heart and life with reference to God; the so-called "moral influence

> theories." (4) Theories which conceive the work of Christ as *terminating on both man and God, but on man primarily and on God only secondarily* … the so-called "rectoral or governmental theories." (5) Theories which conceive the work of Christ as *terminating primarily on God and secondarily on man.* … This theory supposes that our Lord, by sympathetically entering into our condition … so keenly felt our sins as His own, that He could confess and adequately repent of them before God; and this is all the expiation justice asks … the so-called "middle theory" of the Atonement.

As a further preparation for a right understanding of various theories regarding the value of Christ's death, certain schemes which assign little or no importance to the work of Christ should be identified by every student of Soteriology. Among these and quite unique in its claims is Universalism. With a positiveness that exceeds the Satisfactionists, this system declares that the whole race was ruined by sin. It also claims that Christ died for all men in the most absolute sense and that no other step is needed. All men are saved by the death of Christ. By some this salvation is made to extend to fallen angels, including Satan. Likewise schemes are proposed which claim that men may be forgiven by the sovereign act of God. This conception exists in the minds of multitudes and is the natural result of careless forms of preaching and writing which cast the unsaved directly on the mercy of God without reference to the imperative truth that divine mercy is possible only by and through the death of Christ as Redeemer, Reconciler, and Propitiator. The Scripture does not say, "Believe on the mercy of God and thou shalt be saved"; it rather asserts, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." That the sinful, whether lost or saved, of the old order or of the new, are never forgiven apart from the blood of Christ, or that which typified it, is the constant teaching of the Bible. It is well stated in Hebrews 9:22, "And without shedding of blood is no remission." This notion of forgiveness by divine generosity is not only indifferent to the value of Christ's death, but disregards the issues respecting the divine Person and government which that death so perfectly protects. This notion also fails to recognize that, if one soul were ever forgiven one sin by the sovereign act of God apart from the righteous ground provided by Christ in His death, a principle is introduced thereby which would make it possible for God to forgive all sin by a sovereign act and thus render the death of Christ unnecessary. It is this same loose thinking which assumes that the sovereign love of God may be depended upon to keep souls from eternal perdition; yet no soul may be saved from perdition apart from the work of

Christ. In this the Universalists are more consistent than those who magnify sovereign forgiveness. The Scripture most depended upon by the advocates of the idea of forgiveness by sovereignty is the parable of the "prodigal son." In that parable there is no efficacious blood, no regeneration, and no exercise of faith. There is confession and forgiveness such as is accorded a son restored to the Father's fellowship; and that forgiveness, it is assured, always rests upon the blood of Christ (cf. 1 John 1:7, 9).

Out of the welter of human opinion and the din of conflicting voices the Word of God brings a clear assurance regarding the value of Christ's death. However, several theories are to be considered specifically and the first three with brevity:

1. The Marturial Theory. The appeal of the Marturial theory is that the moral disability of man is encouraged by Christ's death as a martyr, and by His resurrection. It is asserted that Christ died as a martyr because of the truth He taught and the life He lived, that by His death He gave the ultimate confirmation to His doctrine, and that by His death He demonstrated His own sincerity. The theory lacks a recognition of the necessity of sacrifice and may well be classed with those schemes which avoid any reference to objective expiation. It is clearly taught in the New Testament that Christ's death was wholly voluntary. The words of Christ are a final refutation of the Marturial theory: "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day" (Matt. 16:21); "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (John 10:18). It is also recorded that when He died He, as the Sovereign of life, dismissed His own spirit: "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost" (Luke 23:46). Only the ethical aspect of Christ's teachings as they bear on this life and the life to come are in view in this theory; these are made more effective, it is claimed, by a martyr's death.

2. The Moral Influence Theory. This scheme of doctrine was originated by Faustus Socinus (1539–1604) and became a distinguishing

belief of his followers. The theory asserts that the value of Christ's death is not objectively toward God, but fulfills its purpose in human salvation through the influence which that death exerts on the daily life of men. It aims at reformation, with no thought of regeneration in its Biblical sense. To the last degree this scheme should be classified among those that attempt no worthy recognition of the value of Christ's death. All of Christ's life, His teachings, His mighty works, His death, His resurrection, and His ascension serve but one objective purpose, namely, to exert a moral influence over men. The theory lends itself to a great variety of ideas, but its essential principle is unchanged. Modern Unitarians, being the nearest representatives of the Socinian views, more nearly perpetuate the Moral Influence theory than any others of the present day. The advocates of this theory have never been concerned to interpret the teachings of the Bible. It is recognized by all students of the Scriptures that the death of Christ does have its effect on the lives of those who are saved. No text declares this more clearly than 2 Corinthians 5:15, which states: "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

A theory closely related to the Moral Influence theory and to be classed with it contends that the death of Christ was an expression of the sympathy of God for the sinner. An illustration used by those who preach this idea is of a mother leaning over the cradle of her sick child, and there is more pain manifest on her face through sympathy than is manifest on the face of the suffering child; but Christ did not die merely to become a companion of men who die. He died that men might not have to die. He does not merely hold their hand while they suffer the judgments of their sins; rather, He bore that penalty that they might never have it to bear.

3. The Identification Theory. This estimation of the value of the death of Christ may be stated in few words: It is declared by those who defend this idea that Christ so identified Himself with men that He was able to represent them before God, and thus to confess their sins and to repent in their behalf. It is obvious that the essential element of expiation is not included and that God, again, is supposed to be justified in forgiving sovereignly those who repent, whether it be their own act or the act of another identified with them.

4. The Rectoral or Governmental Theory. In entering upon an analysis of the Rectoral or Governmental theory, it is acknowledged that it is different, indeed, from those theories already mentioned, it being the one and only theory which recognizes the need of an objective work of Christ with respect to God. Other theories seek no more than the remission of human sin, without regard for the deeper moral issues which arise when it is asserted that a holy God forgives sin apart from any penalty for the sin. There are but two theories—that of Satisfaction and the Rectoral or Governmental—which can claim the attention of sincere men who respect the holy character of God and the revelation He has given. Thus, and for this reason, these two interpretations are placed over against each other in every worthy treatment of this great theme. It will likewise be necessary to hold these two systems in close comparison throughout this discussion.

The history of the Rectoral or Governmental theory has been traced above. There it was pointed out that, as a natural interpretation of the Scriptures, many believers from its beginning held the doctrine of divine satisfaction through the death of Christ, and, though the doctrine of satisfaction was systematized by Anselm in the eleventh century, the doctrine was held in general, as much as any truth obtained, throughout the Christian era. In the sixteenth century attacks were made upon the doctrine of satisfaction by the Socinians which were rationalistic and against the very Scriptures upon which the doctrine rests. These Scriptures were misinterpreted and rejected in the interest of human reason. It was then that Hugo Grotius, a jurist of Holland and a man of colossal intellect, undertook to devise a scheme of interpretation which would preserve some semblance of an objective value in Christ's death and yet avoid much of the rational criticism then being launched against the doctrine of satisfaction. Though men have departed to some extent from the Grotian philosophy, the essential features of his theory remain as he propounded them. This theory has been the refuge of Arminians, it is largely the belief of the theologians of continental Europe, and has been the accepted doctrine held by the independents of Great Britain and New England. In the latter region, this theory has been defended by such men as Joseph Bellamy, Samuel Hopkins, John Smalley, Stephen West, Jonathan Edwards, Jr., Horace Bushnell, and Edwards A. Park. The last-named stated that this theory was "the traditional orthodox doctrine of the American Congregationalists." Nevertheless, the

doctrine of satisfaction has been, and is, held by all Calvinists and is that which appears in all the worthy creeds of the church.

These two systems of interpretation agree that the death of Christ and the shedding of His blood play a large part in the salvation of men. The doctrine of satisfaction embodies the conception of Christ's death, that it was a penal substitution which had the objective purpose of providing a just and righteous ground for God to remit the sins of those for whom Christ died. The equity, it is declared, is perfect, since the Substitute bore the penalty. This is expressed in the words, "that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26). The Rectoral or Governmental theory contends that in His death Christ provided a vicarious suffering, but that it was in no way a bearing of punishment. The advocates of this theory object to the doctrine of imputation in all its forms, especially that human sin was ever imputed to Christ or that the righteousness of God is ever imputed to those who believe. They declare that a true substitution must be *absolute* and thus, of necessity, it must automatically remit the penalty of these for whom Christ died. Therefore, it is asserted that, since Christ died for all men and yet not all men are saved, the Satisfaction theory fails. That there was a substitution of the most absolute character both as respects merit and demerit, which does not become effective apart from a vital union with Christ—the result of saving faith—but does accrue to all who are in Christ, is rejected.

It is conceded that there are great difficulties which arise when finite minds attempt to reduce the divine mode of operation respecting the salvation of lost men—the greatest divine undertaking—to the limitations of a human theory. Believing that the death of Christ did provide an absolute satisfaction and was a complete substitution and to avoid the problem which is engendered by the fact that multitudes are not saved, a certain school of Calvinists have averred that Christ died only for the elect, or those who are saved. Some of the more extreme of this school contend that, in the case of the elect, saving faith is of minor importance since the death of Christ is automatically effective. The majority of Calvinists, however, recognize the obvious fact, that even the elect are no more saved than the nonelect until they believe on Christ.

Judging from their voluminous writings, it is not easy for the advocates of the Rectoral or Governmental theory to state precisely what they believe

Christ accomplished by His death, and it is equally difficult to understand the exposition of the theory which they offer. To say, as they do, that Christ's sufferings were sacrificial but not punitive, is equal to saying that Christ answered by His death some divine necessity other than the penalty which sin incurs from divine holiness and divine government. It is asserted that the sin of man caused God to suffer and that that suffering fell on Christ, though the Father was in complete rapport with the Son in the hour of suffering. The sufferings are said to manifest thus divine compassion rather than penal judgment. When so estimated, it is declared, the sufferings are not lessened nor is their efficacy reduced. By these sufferings of Christ, God reveals His holy hatred for sin, and, by an actual demonstration in the cross, He displays the distress which sin causes Him. This is allowed to pass as an objective value of Christ's death Godward, and is as near to propitiation as the system is able to approach.

The plea of those who hold the Governmental theory is that, since God is love and ever has been, there is no occasion for Him to be propitiated Yet the Scripture declares that the unsaved are "children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3), and that by His death Christ has rendered God propitious (1 John 2:2). In its objective value manward, or as it affects the sinner for whom He died, it can mean no more than a moral influence such as would arise in the mind of one who is impressed by the spectacle of divine sorrow for sin and compassion for the sinner. By so much, the death of Christ accomplishes no change in the estate of the sinner. This is as near to reconciliation as the theory may come; yet the Bible declares that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and, by that death, so changed the estate of men that He is not now imputing their trespasses unto them (2 Cor. 5:19). Similarly, considering the value of Christ's death sinward, according to this theory God is safe, in a governmental sense, in forgiving the one who is rendered penitent by the recognition of the fact of Christ's death; and that is as near as the system may approach to a redemption. Yet this Christ, according to His own declaration, gave His life "a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28; cf. Mark 10:45; 1 Tim. 2:6). The theory is exhausted by its one claim that, on the rectoral or governmental side of the divine requirements, having by Christ's death demonstrated the divine estimation of evil and by His sacrificial suffering displayed the divine compassion, God may with safety to His government pardon in a sovereign manner the sinner who, being

influenced by the fact of Christ's death, is penitent. Divine government is thought to be protected sufficiently in the maintenance of its holy standards if forgiveness as a divine generosity is extended to the penitent. Labored arguments have been presented to demonstrate that a forgiveness based on an expression of divine displeasure concerning sin—which expression is accepted as a form of atonement for sin—is not a sovereign forgiveness, but is based on a worthy ground. Such arguments fail to carry any weight of conviction with those who oppose the theory.

From the above it may be concluded that Grotius, as those who follow him, distinguished between that which was *governmental* and that which is *personal* in God with respect to His judgment of sin. The theory proposes that God could not judge sin on a personal basis or as that which outrages His holiness, since He is love, but He must judge sin on the ground of His rectoral or governmental relation to men. No penalty falls on a substitute and the penitent sinner is forgiven as an act of divine compassion. Baur published an estimation of the work of Grotius in *Bibliotheca Sacra* (IX, 259), and a brief quotation bearing on this phase of the theory is given here: "The fundamental error of the Socinian view was found by Grotius to be this: that Socinus regarded God, in the work of redemption, as holding the place merely of a creditor, or master, whose simple will was a sufficient discharge from the existing obligation. But, as we have in the subject before us to deal with punishment and the remission of punishment, God cannot be looked upon as a creditor, or an injured party, since the act of inflicting punishment does not belong to an injured party as such. The right to punish is not one of the rights of an absolute master or of a creditor, these being merely personal in their character; it is the right of a ruler only. Hence God must be considered as a ruler, and the right to punish belongs to the ruler as such, since it exists, not for the punisher's sake, but for the sake of the commonwealth, to maintain its order and to promote the public good" (cited by Miley, *Theology*, II, 161).

From this brief analysis it will be seen that two major ideas are paramount in this theory as presented by its advocates, namely, *penitence* and *forgiveness*, and no other aspects of the value of Christ's death are acknowledged and no other feature of the great work of God in the salvation of a soul is comprehended in this system. Should any question be raised about the need of an amercement or penalty that would uphold the

sanctity of the law, the fact that Christ suffered sacrificially is deemed sufficient to meet the requirement. Grotius was Arminian in his theology and his theory is well suited to a system of interpretation of the Scriptures which is satisfied with modified and partial truths.

As for the methods employed by these two systems, it may be observed that the doctrine of satisfaction follows the obvious teachings of the Bible. It is the result of an unprejudiced induction of the Word of God as it bears on the death of Christ. On the other hand, the defenders of the Grotian theory build a philosophy which is not drawn from Scripture, and, having declared their speculations and reasonings, undertake to demonstrate that, by various methods of interpretation, the Scriptures may be made to harmonize with the theory. It is significant that Christians, being, in the main, subject to the Bible, have held the doctrine of satisfaction throughout all generations.

Of those who have expounded and defended the Rectoral or Governmental theory, none in the United States has given it more scholarly consideration than Dr. John Miley, the Arminian theologian. When stating his disagreement with the time-honored doctrine of satisfaction, Dr. Miley objects (1) to the doctrine of substitution as generally held. It is his contention that neither the sin of man is imputable to Christ, nor the righteousness of God imputable to man; and (2) if man's sin is imputable to Christ, man does not need the personal faith which appropriates forgiveness, since nothing could remain to be forgiven. These are the major arguments which Socinus advanced and these, in turn, have been presented by many of the Arminian school. The fallacy involved will be given due consideration in the next division of this chapter. It is due Dr. Miley that a part, at least, of his own defense of the Rectoral or Governmental theory should be quoted here. Under the general division, "THEORY AND NECESSITY FOR ATONEMENT, " he declares:

> (1). *An Answer to the Real Necessity.*—The redemptive mediation of Christ implies a necessity for it. There should be, and in scientific consistency must be, an accordance between a doctrine of atonement and the ground of its necessity. The moral theory finds in the ignorance and evil tendencies of man a need for higher moral truth and motive than reason affords; a need for all the higher truths and motives of the Gospel. There is such a need—very real and very urgent. And Christ has graciously supplied the help so needed. But we yet have no part of the necessity for an objective ground of forgiveness. Hence this scheme does not answer to the real necessity for an atonement. Did the necessity arise out of

an absolute justice which must punish sin, the theory of satisfaction would be in accord with it, but without power to answer to its requirement, because such a necessity precludes substitutional atonement. We do find the real necessity in the interests of moral government —interests which concern the divine glory and authority, and the welfare of moral beings. Whatever will conserve these ends while opening the way of forgiveness answers to the real necessity in the case. Precisely this is done by the atonement which we maintain. In the requirement of the sacrifice of Christ as the only ground of forgiveness the standard of the divine estimate of sin is exalted, and merited penalty is rendered more certain respecting all who fail of forgiveness through redemptive grace. And these are the special moral forces whereby the divine law may restrain sin, protect rights, guard innocence, and secure the common welfare. Further, the doctrine we maintain not only gives to these salutary forces the highest moral potency, but also combines with them the yet higher force of the divine love as revealed in the marvelous means of our redemption. Thus, while the highest good of moral beings is secured, the divine glory receives its highest revelation. The doctrine has, therefore, not only the support derived from an answer to the real necessity for an atonement, but also the commendation of a vast increase in the moral forces of the divine government.

(2). *Grounded in the Deepest Necessity.*—We are here in direct issue with the doctrine of satisfaction: for here its advocates make special claim in its favor, and urge special objections against ours. We already have the principles and facts which must decide the question. In their scheme, the necessity lies in an absolute obligation of justice to punish sin, simply as such, and ultimately in a divine punitive disposition. But we have previously shown that there is no such necessity. We have maintained a punitive disposition in God; but we also find in him a compassion for the very sinners whom his justice so condemns. And we may as reasonably conclude that his disposition of clemency will find its satisfaction in a gratuitous forgiveness of all as that he will not forgive any, except on the equivalent punishment of a substitute. Who can show that the punitive disposition is the stronger? We challenge the presentation of a fact in its expression that shall parallel the cross in expression of the disposition of mercy. And with no absolute necessity for the punishment of sin, it seems clear that but for the requirements of rectoral justice compassion would triumph over the disposition of a purely retributive justice. Hence this alleged absolute necessity for an atonement is really no necessity at all. What is the necessity in the governmental theory? It is such as arises in the rightful honor and authority of the divine Ruler, and in the rights and interests of moral beings under him. The free remission of sins without an atonement would be their surrender. Hence divine justice itself, still having all its punitive disposition, but infinitely more concerned for these rights and interests than in the mere retribution of sin, must interpose all its authority in bar of a mere administrative forgiveness. The divine holiness and goodness, infinitely concerned for these great ends, must equally bar a forgiveness in their surrender. The divine justice, holiness, and love must, therefore, combine in the imperative requirement of an atonement in Christ as the necessary ground of forgiveness. These facts ground it in the deepest necessity. The rectoral ends of moral government are a profounder imperative with justice itself than the retribution of sin, simply as such. One stands before the law in the demerit of crime. His demerit renders his punishment just, though not a necessity. But the protection of others, who would suffer wrong through his impunity, makes his punishment an obligation of judicial rectitude. The same principles are valid in the divine government. The demerit of sin imposes no obligation of punishment upon the divine Ruler; but the protection of rights and interests by means of merited penalty is a requirement of his judicial rectitude, except as that protection can be

secured through some other means. It is true, therefore, that the rectoral atonement is grounded in the deepest necessity.

(3). *Rectoral Value of Penalty.*—We have sufficiently distinguished between the purely retributive and the rectoral offices of penalty. The former respects simply the demerit of sin; the latter, the great ends to be attained through the ministry of justice and law. As the demerit of sin is the only thing justly punishable, the retributive element always conditions the rectoral office of justice; but the former is conceivable without the latter. Penal retribution may, therefore, be viewed as a distinct fact, and entirely in itself. As such, it is simply the punishment of sin because of its demerit, and without respect to any other reason or end. But as we rise to the contemplation of divine justice in its infinitely larger sphere, and yet not as an isolated attribute, but in its inseparable association with infinite holiness, and wisdom, and love, as attributes of the one divine Ruler over innumerable moral beings, we must think that his retribution of sin always has ulterior ends in the interests of his moral government. We therefore hold all divine punishment to have a strictly rectoral function. Punishment is the ultimate resource of all righteous government. Every good ruler will seek to secure obedience, and all other true ends of a wise and beneficent administration, through the highest and best means. Of no other is this so true as of the divine Ruler. On the failure of such means there is still the resource of punishment which shall put in subjection the harmful agency of the incorrigible. Thus rights and interests are protected. This protection is a proper rectoral value of penalty, but a value realized only in its execution. There is a rectoral value of penalty simply as an element of law. It has such value in a potency of influence upon human conduct. A little analysis will reveal its salutary forces. Penalty, in its own nature, and also through the moral ideas with which it is associated, makes its appeal to certain motivities in man. As it finds a response therein, so has it a governing influence, and a more salutary influence as the response is to the higher associated ideas. First of all, penalty, as an element of law, appeals to an instinctive fear. The intrinsic force of the appeal is determined by its severity and the certainty of its execution; but the actual influence is largely determined by the state of our subjective motivity. Some are seemingly quite insensible to the greatest severity and certainty of threatened penalty, while others are deeply moved thereby. Human conduct is, in fact, thus greatly influenced. This, however, is the lowest power of penalty as a motive; yet it is not without value. Far better is it that evil tendencies should be restrained, and outward conformity to law secured, through such fear than not at all. The chief rectoral value of penalty, simply as an element of law, is through the moral ideas which it conveys, and the response which it thus finds in the moral reason. As the soul answers to these ideas in the healthful activities of conscience and the profounder sense of obligation, so the governing force of penalty takes the higher form of moral excellence. As it becomes the clear utterance of justice itself in the declaration of rights in all their sacredness, and in the reprobation of crime in all its forms of injury or wrong, and depth of punitive desert, so it conveys the imperative lessons of duty, and rules through the profounder principles of moral obligation. Now rights are felt to be sacred, and duties are fulfilled because they are such, and not from fear of the penal consequences of their violation or neglect. The same facts have the fullest application to penalty as an element of the divine law. Here its higher rectoral value will be, and can only be, through the higher revelation of God in his moral attributes as ever active in all moral administration.

(4). *Rectoral Value of Atonement.*—The sufferings of Christ, as a proper substitute for the punishment, must fulfill the office of penalty in the obligatory ends of moral government. The manner of fulfillment is determined by the nature of the service. As the salutary rectoral force of penalty, as an element of law, is specially through the moral ideas which it reveals,

so the vicarious sufferings of Christ must reveal like moral ideas, and rule through them. Not else can they so take the place of penalty as, on its remission, to fulfill its high rectoral office. Hence the vicarious sufferings of Christ are an atonement for sin as they reveal God in his justice, holiness, and love; in his regard for his own honor and law; in his concern for the rights and interests of moral beings; in his reprobation of sin as intrinsically evil, and utterly hostile to his own rights and to the welfare of his subjects. Does the atonement in Christ reveal such truths? We answer, Yes. Nor do we need the impossible penal element of the theory of satisfaction for any part of this revelation. God reveals his profound regard for the sacredness of his law, and for the interests which it conserves, by what he does for their support and protection. In direct legislative and administrative forms he ordains his law, with declarations of its sacredness and authority; embodies in it the weightiest sanctions of reward and penalty; reprobates in severest terms all disregard of its requirements, and all violation of the rights and interests which it would protect; visits upon transgression the fearful penalties of his retributive justice, though always at the sacrifice of his compassion. The absence of such facts would evince an indifference to the great interests concerned; while their presence evinces, in the strongest manner possible to such facts, the divine regard for these interests. The facts, with the moral ideas which they embody, give weight and salutary governing power to the divine law. The omission of the penal element would, without a proper rectoral substitution, leave the law in utter weakness. Now let the sacrifice of Christ be substituted for the primary necessity of punishment, and as the sole ground of forgiveness. But we should distinctly note what it replaces in the divine law and wherein it may modify the divine administration. The law remains, with all its precepts and sanctions. Penalty is not annulled. There is no surrender of the divine honor and authority. Rights and interests are no less sacred, nor guarded in feebler terms. Sin has the same reprobation; penalty the same imminence and severity respecting all persistent impenitence and unbelief. The whole change in the divine economy is this—that on the sole ground of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ all who repent and believe may be forgiven and saved. This is the divine substitution for the primary necessity of punishment. While, therefore, all the other facts in the divine legislation and administration remain the same, and in unabated expression of truths of the highest rectoral force and value, this divine sacrifice in atonement for sin replaces the lesson of a primary necessity for punishment with its own higher revelation of the same salutary truths; rather, it adds its own higher lesson to that of penalty. As penalty remains in its place, remissible, indeed, on proper conditions, yet certain of execution in all cases of unrepented sin, and, therefore, often executed in fact, the penal sanction of law still proclaims all the rectoral truth which it may utter. Hence the sacrifice of Christ in atonement for sin, and in the declaration of the divine righteousness in forgiveness, is an additional and infinitely higher utterance of the most salutary moral truths. The cross is the highest revelation of all the truths which embody the best moral forces of the divine government. The atonement in Christ is so original and singular in many of its facts that it is the more difficult to find in human facts the analogies for its proper illustration. Yet there are facts not without service here. An eminent lecturer, in a recent discussion of the atonement, has given notoriety to a measure of Bronson Alcott in the government of his school. He substituted his own chastisement for the infliction of penalty upon his offending pupil, receiving the infliction at the hand of the offender. No one can rationally think such a substitution penal, or that the sin of the pupil was expiated by the stripes which the master suffered instead. The substitution answered simply for the disciplinary ends of penalty. Without reference either to the theory of Bronson Alcott or to the interpretation of Joseph Cook, we so state the case as most obvious in the philosophy of its own facts. Such office it might well fulfill. And we accept the report of the very salutary

result, not only as certified by the most reliable authority, but also as intrinsically most credible. No one in the school, and to be ruled by its discipline, could henceforth think less gravely of any offense against its laws. No one could think either that the master regarded with lighter reprobation the evil of such offense, or that he was less resolved upon a rigid enforcement of obedience. All these ideas must have been intensified, and in a manner to give them the most healthful influence. The vicarious sacrifice of the master became a potent and most salutary moral element in the government maintained. Even the actual punishment of the offender could not have so secured obedience for the sake of its own obligation and excellence. We may also instance the case of Zaleucus, very familiar in discussions of atonement, though usually accompanied with such denials of analogy as would render it useless for illustration. It is useless on the theory of satisfaction, but valuable on a true theory. Zaleucus was lawgiver and ruler of the Locrians, a Grecian colony early founded in southern Italy. His laws were severe, and his administration rigid; yet both were well suited to the manners of the people. His own son was convicted of violating a law, the penalty of which was blindness. The case came to Zaleucus both as ruler and father. Hence there was a conflict in his soul. He would have been an unnatural father, and of such a character as to be unfit for a ruler, had he suffered no conflict of feeling. His people entreated his clemency for his son. But, as a statesman, he knew that the sympathy which prompted such entreaty could be but transient; that in the reaction he would suffer their accusation of partiality and injustice; that his laws would be dishonored and his authority broken. Still there was the conflict of soul. What should he do for the reconciliation of the ruler and the father? In this exigency he devised an atonement by the substitution of one of his own eyes for one of his son's. This was a provision above law and retributive justice. Neither had any penalty for the ruler and father on account of the sin of the son. The substitution, therefore, was not penal. The vicarious suffering was not in any sense retributive. It could not be so. All the conditions of penal retribution were wanting. No one can rationally think that the sin of the son, or any part of it, was expiated by the suffering of the father in his stead. The transference of sin as a whole is unreasonable enough; but the idea of a division of it, a part being left with the actual sinner and punished in him, and the other part transferred to a substitute and punished in him, transcends all the capabilities of rational thought. The substitution, without being penal, did answer for the rectoral office of penalty. The ruler fully protected his own honor and authority. Law still voiced its behests and sanctions with unabated force. And the vicarious sacrifice of the ruler upon the altar of his parental compassion, and as well upon the altar of his administration, could but intensify all the ideas which might command for him honor and authority as a ruler, or give to his laws a salutary power over his people. This, therefore, is a true case of atonement through vicarious suffering, and in close analogy to the divine atonement. In neither case is the substitution for the retribution of sin, but in each for the sake of the rectoral ends of penalty, and thus constitutes the objective ground of its remissibility. We have, therefore, in this instance a clear and forceful illustration of the rectoral value of the atonement. But so far we have presented this value in its nature rather than in its measure. This will find its proper place in treating the sufficiency of the atonement.

(5). *Only Sufficient Atonement.*—Nothing could be more fallacious than the objection that the governmental theory is in any sense acceptilational, or implicitly indifferent to the character of the substitute in atonement. In the inevitable logic of its deepest and most determining principles it excludes all inferior substitution and requires a divine sacrifice as the only sufficient atonement. Only such a substitution can give adequate expression to the great truths which may fulfill the rectoral office of penalty. The case of Zaleucus may illustrate this. Many other devices were also at his command. He, no doubt, had money, and

might have essayed the purchase of impunity for his son by the distribution of large sums. In his absolute power he might have substituted the blindness of some inferior person. But what would have been the signification or rectoral value of any such measure? It could give no answer to the real necessity in the case, and must have been utterly silent respecting the great truths imperatively requiring affirmation in any adequate substitution. The sacrifice of one of his own eyes for one of his son's did give the requisite affirmation, while nothing below it could. So in the substitution of Christ for us. No inferior being and no inferior sacrifice could answer, through the expression and affirmation of great rectoral truths, for the necessary ends of penalty. And, as we shall see in the proper place, no other theory can so fully interpret and appropriate all the facts in the sacrifice of Christ. It has a place and a need for every element of atoning value in his substitution.—*Ibid.*, II, 176–84

R.W. Dale is the outstanding English exponent of the Rectoral or Governmental theory, though he draws much nearer the doctrine of satisfaction than Dr. Miley. Only the most careful study of Dale's language will disclose the view which he evidently held. A brief portion of his writing is quoted here:

The Death of Christ may be described as an Expiation for sin, for it was a Divine act which renders the punishment of sin unnecessary. It was a Vicarious Death. He died "for us," "for our sins," "in our stead." For the principle that we deserved to suffer was asserted in His sufferings, that it might not have to be asserted in ours. He was forsaken of God, that we might not have to be forsaken. He did not suffer that He might merely share with us the penalties of our sin, but that the penalties of our sin might be remitted. It was a Representative Death, the Death of One whom the elder theologians were accustomed to describe as the new Federal Head of the human race, or of the Church. The technical language of theologians obscured and even concealed the truth which it was intended to express. The Lord Jesus Christ is in very truth, by the original law of the universe, the Representative of mankind. It may be described as a Ransom—an act of God by which we are delivered or redeemed from the calamities which threatened us so long as we were exposed to the punishment of sin, and by which we are also delivered or redeemed from those moral and spiritual evils from which there was no escape except through the restoration to us of the life of God. It was a Satisfaction to the righteousness of God, in whatever sense the punishment of the guilty can be spoken of as a Satisfaction to the righteousness of God. It was a Sacrifice for sin—an acknowledgment, such as we could never have made for ourselves, of the greatness of our guilt; an actual submission on our behalf to the penalty of guilt, and a confession that our very life had been justly forfeited by our sins. It was a Propitiation for sin—a Propitiation originated and effected by God himself, through which we are brought into such relations to God, that all moral reasons for withholding from us the remission of sins disappear. As an act of submission to the righteousness of the Law by which we were condemned, an act done in our name, and ultimately carrying our submission with it, it "has the property"—to quote the formal definition of a Propitiation given by one of our own theologians—"of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to *admit* the expiation; that is, to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender" (Dr. Pye Smith). Or, to state what seems to me to be the complete truth, the Death of Christ was a Propitiation for the sins of men because it was a revelation of the righteousness of God on the ground of

> which He can remit the penalties of sin; because it was an act of submission to the justice of those penalties on behalf of mankind, an act in which our own submission was really and vitally included; and because it secured the destruction of sin in all who through faith are restored to union with Christ. It is, therefore, the Supreme and irresistible argument by which we can now sustain our appeal to God's infinite mercy to grant us forgiveness of sin and deliverance from the wrath to come.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 432–34

As a summarization of this discussion of the Rectoral or Governmental theory, three indictments may be lodged against this system.

(a) It is a hypothesis which is based on human reason, which makes no avowed induction of the Scriptures on the theme which it essays to expound, but contends that the Scriptures, by special interpretation, can be made to harmonize with it.

(b) It attempts an impossible distinction between the sufferings of Christ as *sacrificial* in contrast to the sufferings of Christ as *penal.* The weakness of this distinction is well published in Dr. Miley's two illustrations, quoted above—the teacher punished in place of the pupil and Zaleucus who sacrificed his eye for the crime of his son. Of these, Dr. Miley asserts that they could not be penal. If he means that they rendered no satisfaction to God for sin as God saw it, none will contend with him; but within their own sphere as related to human laws and regulations, each became a definite penal substitute which not only upheld the law that was involved, but gave, so far as human standards may require, a righteous discharge of the offender. One fallacy which dominates this theory lies hidden in the unrecognized distinction which exists between divine and human governments.

(c) It restricts the scope of the value of Christ's death to the one issue of the forgiveness of the sins of the unsaved, the assumption being that fallen man—if, indeed, man be fallen at all—needs no more than the forgiveness of sin. The death of Christ unto the sin nature and the death of Christ as a ground for imputed righteousness are either neglected or rejected.

5. The Doctrine of Satisfaction. As has been observed, the belief that Christ met the righteous demands of God against sin has been the view of true believers in all their history, and because of the fact that it is the plain testimony of the Word of God and the natural conclusion whenever an unprejudiced induction of the Bible teaching bearing on this theme is made.

It remains, as it has been, the unquestioned belief of expositors, conservative preachers, and evangelists.

The doctrine of satisfaction falls into two general classifications or schools of interpretation—the absolute and the moderate. By the term *absolute* reference is made to a school of theologians who teach, with an emphasis upon the apparent reasonableness of the case, that if Christ rendered satisfaction to God for the sins of a person, that person is thereby constituted one of the elect and must, of necessity, be saved since the penalty no longer exists, having been perfectly borne by the substitute. The *moderate* interpretation of Christ's death contends that, on the authority of the Scriptures, Christ died for the whole *cosmos* world and that none are saved or immediately benefited by Christ's death until they believe. Since this phase of the discussion respecting the value of Christ's death occupies an entire division of this volume, next to be considered, it need not be pursued further in this connection. Under that division the various points of difference between the schools of thought of those who hold the doctrine of satisfaction will be examined.

As in contrast to all other theories regarding the value of the death of Christ—including the Rectoral or Governmental—which entire group restricts the work of Christ to the one undertaking of providing a way by which the sinner may be forgiven, the doctrine of satisfaction, because of its full accounting for *all* that the Bible affirms, recognizes and includes the typical foreshadowings of the Old Testament, and is as much concerned to be in accord with these as with the New Testament antitypical teachings; it sustains from the Word of God the actual substitution by Christ both in the field of disobedience which He bore (ἀντί) in the room and stead of the sinner, and in the field of obedience which He offered to God in behalf of those who are void of obedience; it incorporates the truth that Christ by His death ended the entire merit-system for all who believe; it respects the peculiar and far-reaching doctrines of redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation; it gives unreserved consideration to the death of Christ in its relation to the sin nature and the personal sins which flow out of it; it accounts for those specific personal sins committed by Christians; it also advances into angelic realms and into heaven itself. Compared to all of this, a theory which cannot, by its limitations, expand beyond a gratuitous or sovereign forgiveness of the personal sins of those who are unsaved is less

than a human gesture where naught but the mighty arm of the infinite One can avail. Nor should it be overlooked that so-called theories are not only hopelessly inadequate but they dishonor God by assuming that He can disregard, if not insult, His own holiness by an attitude of leniency toward sin; and, as has been stated, if divine leniency for sin is once admitted, a principle is introduced which denies the Word of God and besides, if extended to all sin, would account the death of Christ foolishness.

In view of the fact that this entire volume with its exposition of Soteriology is an elucidation of the doctrine of satisfaction and that this entire work on theology is grounded in that sublime reality, its more extended analysis is uncalled for here.

Conclusion

In an address—"Modern Theories of the Atonement"—delivered before the Religious Conference held in Princeton Seminary, October 13, 1902, and published in the Princeton Review of 1903, Dr. B. B. Warfield gave what, it is believed, is the most clarifying analysis of this subject ever published. This address is deemed of sufficient importance to every theological student to justify its reproduction here:

> We may as well confess at the outset that there is no such thing as a modern theory of the Atonement, in the sense in which there is a modern theory, say, of the Incarnation—the *kenosis* theory to wit, which is a brand-new conception, never dreamed of until the nineteenth century was well on its course, and likely, we may hope, to pass out of notice with that century. All the theories of the Atonement now current readily arrange themselves under the old categories, and have their prototypes running back more or less remotely into the depths of Church history.
>
> The fact is, the views men take of the atonement are largely determined by their fundamental feelings of need—by what men most long to be saved from. And from the beginning three well-marked types of thought on this subject have been traceable, corresponding to three fundamental needs of human nature as it unfolds itself in this world of limitation. Men are oppressed by the ignorance, or by the misery, or by the sin in which they feel themselves sunk; and, looking to Christ to deliver them from the evil under which they particularly labor, they are apt to conceive His work as consisting predominantly in revelation of divine knowledge, or in the inauguration of a reign of happiness, or in deliverance from the curse of sin.
>
> In the early Church, the intellectualistic tendency allied itself with the class of phenomena which we call Gnosticism. The longing for peace and happiness that was the natural result of the crying social evils of the time, found its most remarkable expression in what we know as Chiliasm. That no such party-name suggests itself to describe the manifestation given to the longing to be delivered from the curse of sin, does not mean that this longing was less prominent or less poignant: but precisely the contrary. The other views were sloughed off as heresies, and each received its appropriate designation as such: this was the fundamental point of sight of the Church itself, and as such found expression in numberless ways, some of which, no doubt, were sufficiently bizarre—as, for example, the somewhat widespread representation of the atonement as centering in the surrender of Jesus as a ransom to Satan.
>
> Our modern Church, you will not need me to tell you, is very much like the early Church in all this. All three of these tendencies find as full representation in present-day thought as in any age of the Church's life. Perhaps at no other period was Christ so frequently or so passionately set forth as merely a social Saviour. Certainly at no other period has His work been so prevalently summed up in mere revelation. While now, as ever, the hope of Christians at large continues to be set upon Him specifically as the Redeemer from sin.
>
> The forms in which these fundamental types of thinking are clothed in our modern days, differ, as a matter of course, greatly from those they assumed in the first age. This difference

is largely the result of the history of thought through the intervening centuries. The assimilation of the doctrines of revelation by the Church was a gradual process; and it was also an orderly process —the several doctrines emerging in the Christian consciousness for formal discussion and scientific statement in a natural sequence. In this process the doctrine of the atonement did not come up for formulation until the eleventh century, when Anselm gave it its first really fruitful treatment, and laid down for all time the general lines on which the atonement must be conceived, if it is thought of as a work of deliverance from the penalty of sin. The influence of Anselm's discussion is not only traceable, but has been determining in all subsequent thought down to to-day. The doctrine of satisfaction set forth by him has not been permitted, however, to make its way unopposed. Its extreme opposite—the general conception that the atoning work of Christ finds its essence in revelation and had its prime effect, therefore, in deliverance from error—was advocated in Anselm's own day by perhaps the acutest reasoner of all the schoolmen, Peter Abelard. The intermediate view which was apparently invented five centuries later by the great Dutch jurist, Hugo Grotius, loves to think of itself as running back, in germ at least, to nearly as early a date. In the thousand years of conflict which has raged among these generic conceptions each has taken on protean shapes, and a multitude of mixed or mediating hypotheses have been constructed. But, broadly speaking, the theories that have divided the suffrages of men easily take places under one or other of these three types.

There is a fourth general conception, to be sure, which would need to be brought into view were we studying exhaustive enumeration. This is the mystical idea which looks upon the work of Christ as summed up in the incarnation; and upon the saving process as consisting in an unobserved leavening of mankind by the inworking of a vital germ then planted in the mass. But though there never was an age in which this idea failed entirely of representation, it bears a certain aristocratic character which has commended it ordinarily only to the few, however fit: and it probably never was very widely held except during the brief period when the immense genius of Schleiermacher so over-shadowed the Church that it could hardly think at all save in the formulas taught by him. Broadly speaking, the field has been held practically by the three theories which are commonly designated by the names of Anselm, Grotius, and Abelard; and age has differed from age only in the changing expression given these theories and the relative dominance of one or another of them.

The Reformers, it goes without saying, were enthusiastic preachers of the Anselmic conception—of course as corrected, developed, and enriched by their own deeper thought and truer insight. Their successors adjusted, expounded, and defended its details, until it stood forth in the seventeenth century dogmatics in practical completeness. During this whole period this conception held the field; the numerous controversies that arose about it were rather joined with the Socinian or the mystic than internal to the circle of recognized Church teachers. It was not until the rise of Rationalism that a widely spread defection became observable. Under this blight men could no longer believe in the substitutive expiation which is the heart of the Anselmic doctrine, and a blood-bought redemption went much out of fashion. The dainty Supranaturalists attained the height only of the Grotian view, and allowed only a "demonstrative" as distinguished from an "ontological" necessity for an atonement, and an "executive" as distinguished from a "judicial" effect to it. The great evangelical revivals of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, however, swept away all that. It is probable that a half-century ago the doctrine of penal satisfaction had so strong a hold on the churches that not more than an academic interest attached to rival theories.

About that time a great change began to set in. I need only to mention such names as those of Horace Bushnell, McLeod Campbell, Frederick Dennison Maurice, Albrecht Ritschl,

to suggest the strength of the assault that was suddenly delivered against the central ideas of an expiatory atonement. The immediate effect was to call out an equally powerful defense. Our best treatises on the atonement come from this period; and Presbyterians in particular may well be proud of the part played by them in the crisis. But this defense only stemmed the tide; it did not succeed in rolling it back. The ultimate result has been that the revolt from the conceptions of satisfaction, propitiation, expiation, sacrifice, reinforced continually by tendencies adverse to evangelical doctrine peculiar to our times, has grown steadily more and more widespread, and in some quarters more and more extreme, until it has issued in an immense confusion on this central doctrine of the gospel. Voices are raised all about us proclaiming a "theory" of the atonement impossible, while many of those that essay a "theory" seem to be feeling their tortuous way very much in the dark. That, if I mistake not, is the real state of affairs in the Modern Church.

I am not meaning to imply that the doctrine of substitutive atonement—which is, after all, the very heart of the gospel—has been lost from the consciousness of the Church. It has not been lost from the hearts of the Christian community. It is in its terms that the humble Christian everywhere still expresses the grounds of his hope of salvation. It is in its terms that the earnest evangelist everywhere still presses the claims of Christ upon the awakened hearer. It has not even been lost from the forum of theological discussion. It still commands powerful advocates wherever a vital Christianity enters academical circles: and, as a rule, the more profound the thinker, the more clear is the note he strikes in its proclamation and defense. But if we were to judge only by the popular literature of the day—a procedure happily not possible—the doctrine of a substitutive atonement has retired well into the background. Probably the majority of those who hold the public ear, whether as academical or as popular religious guides, have definitely broken with it, and are commending to their audiences something other and, as they no doubt believe, something very much better. A tone of speech has even grown up regarding it which is not only scornful but positively abusive. There are no epithets too harsh to be applied to it, no invectives too intense to be poured out on it. An honored bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church tells us that "the whole theory of substitutional punishment as a ground either of conditional or unconditional pardon is unethical, contradictory, and self-subversive" (Bishop Foster, in his "Philosophy of Christian Experience": 1891, p. 113). He may rightly claim to be speaking in this sweeping sentence with marked discretion and unwonted charity. To do justice to the hateful theme requires, it seems, the tumid turmoil and rushing rant of Dr. Farrar's rhetoric. Surely if hard words broke bones, the doctrine of the substitutional sacrifice of the Son of God for the sin of man would long ago have been ground to powder.

What, then, are we offered instead of it? We have already intimated that it is confusion which reigns here: and in any event we cannot go into details. We may try, however, to set down in few words the general impression that the most recent literature of the subject makes.

To obtain a just view of the situation, I think we ought to note, first of all, the wide prevalence among the sounder thinkers of the Grotian or Rectoral theory of the atonement—the theory, that is, that conceives the work of Christ not as supplying the ground on which God forgives sin, but only as supplying the ground on which He may safely forgive sins on the sole ground of His compassion. The theory of hypothetical universalism, according to which Christ died as the proper substitute for all men on the condition, namely, that they should believe—whether in its Remonstrant or in its Amyraldian form—has in the conflict of theories long since been crushed out of existence—as, indeed, it well deserved to be. This having been shoved out of the way, the Grotian theory has come to be the orthodox Arminian

view and is taught as such by the leading exponents of modern Arminian thought whether in Britain or America; and he who will read the powerful argumentation to that effect by the late Dr. John Miley, say, for example, will be compelled to agree that it is, indeed, the highest form of atonement-doctrine conformable to the Arminian system. But not only is it thus practically universal among the Wesleyan Arminians. It has become also, under the influence of such teachers as Drs. Wardlaw and Dale and Dr. Park, the mark also of orthodox Nonconformity in Great Britain and of orthodox Congregationalism in America. Nor has it failed to take a strong hold also of Scottish Presbyterianism: it is specifically advocated by such men of mark and leading as, for example, Dr. Marcus Dods. On the Continent of Europe it is equally widespread among the saner teachers: one notes without surprise, for example, that it was taught by the late Dr. Frederic Godet, though one notes with satisfaction that it was considerably modified upward by Dr. Godet, and that his colleague, Dr. Gretillat, was careful to correct it. In a word, wherever men have been unwilling to drop all semblance of an "objective" atonement, as the word now goes, they have taken refuge in this half-way house which Grotius has builded for them. I do not myself look upon this as a particularly healthful sign of the times. I do not myself think that, at bottom, there is in principle much to choose between the Grotian and the so-called "subjective" theories. It seems to me only an illusion to suppose that it preserves an "objective" atonement at all. But meanwhile it is adopted by many because they deem it "objective," and it so far bears witness to a remanent desire to preserve an "objective" atonement.

We are getting more closely down to the real characteristic of modern theories of the atonement when we note that there is a strong tendency observable all around us to rest the forgiveness of sins solely on repentance as its ground. In its last analysis, the Grotian theory itself reduces to this. The demonstration of God's righteousness, which is held by it to be the heart of Christ's work and particularly of His death, is supposed to have no other effect on God than to render it safe for Him to forgive sin. And this it does not as affecting Him, but as affecting men—namely, by awaking in them such a poignant sense of the evil of sin as to cause them to hate it soundly and to turn decisively away from it. This is just Repentance. We could desire no better illustration of this feature of the theory than is afforded by the statement of it by one of its most distinguished living advocates, Dr. Marcus Dods. The necessity of atonement, he tells us, lies in the "need of some such demonstration of God's righteousness as will make it possible and safe for Him to forgive the unrighteous." Whatever begets in the sinner true penitence and impels him toward the practice of righteousness will render it safe to forgive him. Hence Dr. Dods asserts that it is inconceivable that God should not forgive the penitent sinner, and that Christ's work is summed up in such an exhibition of God's righteousness and love as produces, on its apprehension, adequate repentance. "By being the source, then, of true and fruitful penitence, the death of Christ removes the radical subjective obstacle in the way of forgiveness." "The death of Christ, then, has made forgiveness possible, because it enables man to repent with an adequate penitence, and because it manifests righteousness and binds men to God." There is no hint here that man needs anything more to enable him to repent than the presentation of motives calculated powerfully to induce him to repent. That is to say, there is no hint here of an adequate appreciation of the subjective effects of sin on the human heart, deadening it to the appeal of motives to right action however powerful, and requiring therefore an internal action of the Spirit of God upon it before it can repent: or of the purchase of such a gift of the Spirit by the sacrifice of Christ. As little is there any hint here of the existence of any sense of justice in God, forbidding Him to account the guilty righteous without satisfaction of guilt. All God requires for forgiveness is repentance: all the sinner needs for repentance is a moving

inducement. It is all very simple; but we are afraid it does not go to the root of matters as presented either in Scripture or in the throes of our awakened heart.

The widespread tendency to represent repentance as the atoning fact might seem, then, to be accountable from the extensive acceptance which has been given to the Rectoral theory of the atonement. Nevertheless much of it has had a very different origin and may be traced back rather to some such teaching as that, say, of Dr. McLeod Campbell. Dr. Campbell did not himself find the atoning fact in man's own repentance, but rather in our Lord's sympathetic repentance for men. He replaced the evangelical doctrine of substitution by a theory of sympathetic identification, and the evangelical doctrine of expiatory penalty-paying by a theory of sympathetic repentance. Christ so fully enters sympathetically into our case, was his idea, that He is able to offer to God an adequate repentance for our sins, and the Father says, It is enough! Man here is still Held to need a Saviour, and Christ is presented as that Saviour, and is looked upon as performing for man what man cannot do for himself. But the gravitation of this theory is distinctly downward, and it has ever tended to find its lower level. There are, therefore, numerous transition theories prevalent —some of them very complicated, some of them very subtle—which connect it by a series of insensible stages with the proclamation of human repentance as the sole atonement required. As typical of these we may take the elaborate theory (which, like man himself, may be said to be fearfully and wonderfully made) set forth by the modern Andover divines. This finds the atoning fact in a combination of Christ's sympathetic repentance for man and man's own repentance under the impression made upon him by Christ's work on his behalf—not in the one without the other, but in the two in unison. A similar combination of the revolutionary repentance of man induced by Christ and the sympathetic repentance of Christ for man meets us also in recent German theorizing, as, for example, in the teaching of Häring. It is sometimes clothed in "sacrificial" language and made to bear an appearance even of "substitution." It is just the repentance of Christ, however, which is misleadingly called His "sacrifice;" and our sympathetic repentance with Him that is called our participation in His "sacrifice", and it is carefully explained that though there was "a substitution on Calvary," it was not the substitution of a sinless Christ for a sinful race, but the substitution of humanity *plus* Christ for humanity *minus* Christ. All of which seems but a confusing way of saying that the atoning fact consists in the revolutionary repentance of man induced by the spectacle of Christ's sympathetic repentance for man.

The essential emphasis in all these transition theories falls obviously on man's own repentance rather than on Christ's. Accordingly the latter falls away easily and leaves us with human repentance only as the sole atoning fact—the entire reparation which God asks or can ask for sin. Nor do men hesitate to-day to proclaim this openly and boldly. Scores of voices are raised about us declaring it not only with clearness but with passion. Even those who still feel bound to attribute the reconciling of God somehow to the work of Christ are often careful to explain that they mean this ultimately only, and only because they attribute in one way or other to the work of Christ the arousing of the repentance in man which is the immediate ground of forgiveness. Thus Dean Fremantle tells us that it is "repentance and faith" that "change for us the face of God." And then he adds, doubtless as a concession to ingrained, though outgrown, habits of thought: "If, then, the death of Christ, viewed as the culminating point of His life of love, is the destined means of repentance for the whole world, we may say, also, that it is the means of securing the mercy and favour of God, of procuring the forgiveness of sins." And Dr. (now Principal) Forsyth, whose fervid address on the atonement at a great Congregationalist gathering a few years ago quite took captive the hearts of the whole land, seems really to teach little more than this. Christ sympathetically

enters into our condition, he tells us, and gives expression to an adequate sense of sin. We, perceiving the effect of this, His entrance into our sinful atmosphere, are smitten with horror of the judgment our sin has thus brought on Him. This horror begets in us an adequate repentance of sin: God accepts this repentance as enough; and forgives our sin. Thus forgiveness rests proximately only on our repentance as its ground: but our repentance is produced only by Christ's sufferings: and hence, Dr. Forsyth tells us, Christ's sufferings may be called the ultimate ground of forgiveness.

It is sufficiently plain that the function served by the sufferings and death of Christ in this construction is somewhat remote. Accordingly they quite readily fall away altogether. It seems quite natural that they should do so with those whose doctrinal inheritance comes from Horace Bushnell, say, or from the Socinian theorizing of the school of Ritschl. We feel no surprise to learn, for example, that with Harnack the sufferings and death of Christ play no appreciable part. With him the whole atoning act seems to consist in the removal of a false conception of God from the minds of men. Men, because sinners, are prone to look upon God as a wrathful judge. He is, on the contrary, just Love. How can the sinner's misjudgment be corrected? By the impression made upon him by the life of Jesus, keyed to the conception of the Divine Fatherhood. With all this we are familiar enough. But we are hardly prepared for the extremities of language which some permit themselves in giving expression to it. "The whole difficulty," a recent writer of this class declares, "is not in inducing or enabling God to pardon, but in moving men to abhor sin and to want pardon." Even this difficulty, however, we are assured is removable: and what is needed for its removal is only proper instruction. "Christianity," cries our writer, "was a revelation, not a creation." Even this false antithesis does not, however, satisfy him. He rises beyond it to the acme of his passion. "Would there have been no Gospel," he rhetorically demands—as if none could venture to say him nay—"would there have been no Gospel had not Christ died?" Thus "the blood of Christ" on which the Scriptures hang the whole atoning fact is thought no longer to be needed: the gospel of Paul, which consisted not in Christ *simpliciter* but specifically in "Christ as crucified," is scouted. We are able to get along now without these things.

To such a pass have we been brought by the prevailing gospel of the indiscriminate love of God. For it is here that we place our finger on the root of the whole modern assault upon the doctrine of an expiatory atonement. In the attempt to give effect to the conception of indiscriminate and undiscriminating love as the basal fact of religion, the entire Biblical teaching as to atonement has been ruthlessly torn up. If God is love and nothing but love, what possible need can there be of an atonement? Certainly such a God cannot need propitiating. Is not He the All-Father? Is He not yearning for His children with an unconditioned and unconditioning eagerness which excludes all thought of "obstacles to forgiveness"? What does He want but—just His children? Our modern theorizers are never weary of ringing the changes on this single fundamental idea. God does not require to be moved to forgiveness; or to be enabled to pardon; or even to be enabled to pardon safely. He raises no question of whether He can pardon, or whether it would be safe for Him to pardon. Such is not the way of love. Love is bold enough to sweep all such chilling questions impatiently out of its path. The whole difficulty is to induce men to permit themselves to be pardoned. God is continually reaching longing arms out of heaven toward men: oh, if men would only let themselves be gathered unto the Father's eager heart! It is absurd, we are told—nay, wicked—blasphemous with awful blasphemy—to speak of propitiating such a God as this, of reconciling Him, of making satisfaction to Him. Love needs no satisfying, reconciling, propitiating; nay, will have nothing to do with such things. Of its very nature it

flows out unbought, unpropitiated, instinctively and unconditionally, to its object. And God is Love!

Well, certainly, God *is* Love. And we praise Him that we have better authority for telling our souls this glorious truth than the passionate assertion of these somewhat crass theorizers. God *is* Love! But it does not in the least follow that He is nothing but love. God *is* Love: but Love is not God and the formula "Love" must therefore ever be inadequate to express God. It may well be—to us sinners, lost in our sin and misery but for it, it must be—the crowning revelation of Christianity that God is love. But it is not from the Christian revelation that we have learned to think of God as nothing but love. That God is the Father of all men in a true and important sense, we should not doubt. But this term "All-Father"—it is not from the lips of Hebrew prophet or Christian apostle that we have caught it. And the indiscriminate benevolencism which has taken captive so much of the religious thinking of our time is a conception not native to Christianity, but of distinctly heathen quality. As one reads the pages of popular religious literature, teeming as it is with ill-considered assertions of the general Fatherhood of God, he has an odd feeling of transportation back into the atmosphere of, say, the decadent heathenism of the fourth and fifth centuries, when the gods were dying, and there was left to those who would fain cling to the old ways little beyond a somewhat saddened sense of the *benignitas numinis.* The *benignitas numinis!* How studded the pages of those genial old heathen are with the expression; how suffused their repressed life is with the conviction that the kind Deity that dwells above will surely not be hard on men toiling here below! How shocked they are at the stern righteousness of the Christian's God, who loomed before their startled eyes as He looms before those of the modern poet in no other light than as "the hard God that dwelt in Jerusalem"! Surely the Great Divinity is too broadly good to mark the peccadillos of poor puny man; surely they are the objects of His compassionate amusement rather than of His fierce reprobation. Like Omar Khayyam's pot, they were convinced, before all things, of their Maker that "He's a good fellow and 'twill all be well."

The query cannot help rising to the surface of our minds whether our modern indiscriminate benevolencism goes much deeper than this. Does all this one-sided proclamation of the universal Fatherhood of God import much more than the heathen *benignitas numinis?* When we take those blessed words, "God is Love," upon our lips, are we sure we mean to express much more than that we do not wish to believe that God will hold man to any real account for his sin? Are we, in a word, in these modern days, so much soaring upward toward a more adequate apprehension of the transcendent truth that God is love, as passionately protesting against being ourselves branded and dealt with as wrath-deserving sinners? Assuredly it is impossible to put anything like their real content into these great words, "God is Love," save as they are thrown out against the background of those other conceptions of equal loftiness, "God is Light," "God is Righteousness," "God is Holiness," "God is a consuming fire." The love of God cannot be apprehended in its length and breadth and height and depth—all of which pass knowledge—save as it is apprehended as the love of a God who turns from the sight of sin with inexpressible abhorrence, and burns against it with unquenchable indignation. The infinitude of His love would be illustrated not by His lavishing of His favor on sinners without requiring an expiation of sin, but by His-through such holiness and through such righteousness as cannot but cry out with infinite abhorrence and indignation —still loving sinners so greatly that He provides a satisfaction for their sin adequate to these tremendous demands. It is the distinguishing characteristic of Christianity, after all, not that it preaches a God of love, but that it preaches a God of conscience.

A somewhat flippant critic, contemplating the religion of Israel, has told us, as expressive of his admiration for what he found there, that “an honest God is the noblest work of man.” There is a profound truth lurking in the remark. Only it appears that the work were too noble for man; and probably man has never compassed it. A benevolent God, yes: men have framed a benevolent God for themselves. But a thoroughly honest God, perhaps never. That has been left for the revelation of God Himself to give us. And this is the really distinguishing characteristic of the God of revelation: He is a thoroughly honest, a thoroughly conscientious God—a God who deals honestly with Himself and us, who deals conscientiously with Himself and us. And a thoroughly conscientious God, we may be sure, is not a God who can deal with sinners as if they were not sinners. In this fact lies, perhaps, the deepest ground of the necessity of an expiatory atonement.

And it is in this fact also that there lies the deepest ground of the increasing failure of the modern world to appreciate the necessity of an expiatory atonement. Conscientiousness commends itself only to awakened conscience; and in much of recent theologizing conscience does not seem especially active. Nothing, indeed, is more startling in the structure of recent theories of atonement, than the apparently vanishing sense of sin that underlies them. Surely, it is only where the sense of guilt of sin has grown grievously faint, that men can suppose repentance to be all that is needed to purge it. Surely it is only where the sense of the power of sin has profoundly decayed, that men can fancy that they can at will cast it off from them in a “revolutionary repentance.” Surely it is only where the sense of the heinousness of sin has practically passed away, that man can imagine that the holy and just God can deal with it lightly. If we have not much to be saved from, why, certainly, a very little atonement will suffice for our needs. It is, after all, only the sinner that requires a Saviour. But if we are sinners, and appreciate what it means to be sinners, we will cry out for that Saviour who only after He was perfected by suffering could become the Author of eternal salvation.—*Studies in Theology*, pp. 283–97

Divine Election

Chapter VIII

The Fact of Divine Election

In this pursuance of the theme, divine election, a limited treatment is proposed in view of the extended consideration already given in Chapter XV of Volume I. Only the subdivision of the doctrine of decrees, namely, divine election, is directly germane to the more restricted field of Soteriology.

Though the doctrine of divine election presents difficulties which are insolvable by the finite mind, the fact of divine selection is not limited to God's choice of some out of the many for eternal glory; it is observable anywhere in the universe. There is a variety in all God's creation. There are classifications among the angels. One star is said to differ from another star in glory. Men are not born of the same race with the same advantages, nor with the same native abilities. These variations in the estates of men cannot be accounted for on the basis of the efficacy of the free will of man. Men do not choose their race, their life conditions, whether it be in civilization or in heathendom, nor do they choose their natural gifts. On the other hand, it is as clearly disclosed to those who will receive the revelation, that God's attitude toward the entire human family is one of infinite compassion and boundless sacrificial love. Though the two revealed facts—divine election and the universality of divine love—cannot be reconciled within the sphere of human understanding, here, as elsewhere, God may be honored by *believing* and by *resting* in Him. Therefore, to God be all the glory! And to Him be given the first consideration! Those systems of religious thought which require that the doctrine of God shall conform to the notion of the supremacy of man, which begin with man, defend man, and glorify man, are fundamentally wrong and therefore are productive of God-dishonoring error. The order of truth is established forever by the first phrase of the Bible—"In the beginning God." He it is who planned, He executes, and He it is who will realize to an infinite degree *all* that He has purposed. He will never be defeated nor disappointed. The true system of religious thought begins with God, defends God, and glorifies God; and the creature is

conformed to the plan and purpose of the Creator. The fall of man alone can account for the wickedness of heart which resists the divine supremacy.

Having declared the believer to be blessed "with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" (Eph. 1:3), the Apostle proceeds to enumerate some of those measureless possessions and positions in Christ; and what could be more orderly than that the contemplation of the divine dealing with man should begin with a declaration of God's sovereignty in election? Whatever God bestows upon His creatures must, of necessity, be absolute in its nature. He discovers nothing in fallen man other than an object of His superabounding grace. The first man, Adam, stood before God on the ground of a natural perfection, being the true representation of God's creative purpose; but Adam fell from the estate of natural perfection and from that time, both for Adam and his posterity, only regenerative grace could commend any human being to God. No obligation rests upon God in the exercise of His grace. He may, and does, choose whom He will. He neither sees, nor foresees, any good in man which might form a basis of His blessings. Whatever good is found in redeemed man is wrought in him by divine grace. God does design for those whom He chooses that they shall be "holy and without blame before him"; but this is the result which is wrought by God in grace, and is never wrought by man. Certainly man has not chosen God. Christ emphasized this when He said, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." Even the first man when unfallen and wholly free to choose, did not choose God; how much more is it certain that fallen man will not of himself choose God! Therefore the provision of the ground of redemption is not enough in itself; the perverted will of man must be divinely moved. The unregenerate heart must be rendered willing as well as transformed in its essential character. All of this God undertakes and accomplishes in sovereign grace. He elects, He calls, He inclines the heart, He redeems, He regenerates, He preserves, and He presents faultless before His glory those who are the objects of His sovereign grace. On the other hand, He employs means to the accomplishment of His purpose. On the divine side, the awful demands of sin must be met by the sacrifice of His only begotten Son. It is not enough that sin shall be *declared* to be sinful; it is required that its curse shall be *borne* by the Lamb of God, the will of man must be moved, regeneration must be wrought by the Spirit, and every spiritual and heavenly blessing must be secured by the setting up of an

actual union with Christ. On the human side, when man's opposition to God is divinely broken down, he then believes to the saving of his soul. So demanding and real are all the divine means employed for the saving of the lost, that it is as much required of man that he believe and thus elect to be saved by the divine grace, as that actual redemption shall be wrought for him on Calvary's cross. In the realm of human experience man is conscious only of his power to choose, or reject, the salvation that is in Christ; and, because of the reality of this human choice, he is saved or lost according to his belief, or disbelief, in Christ as his Savior.

While there is very much in the doctrine of divine election which transcends the limitations of the finite understanding, it is true that man originates nothing—not even sin, since sin began with the angels of God. It is God who hath chosen His elect; and while this selection is both sovereign and final, nevertheless not one human being who desires to be saved and who complies with the necessary terms of the gospel, will ever be lost.

The wickedness of fallen man is disclosed in his natural disposition to withhold from his Creator the honor and obedience which is due from the creature. Man's inability to recognize the measurements of the estate into which he has been placed by creation, or to be satisfied therewith, is a primary evidence of the fall. Nothing, indeed, will arise in the natural man that might be a basis of divine favor. Such a basis must originate in the sovereign grace of God, and that which does thus arise is perfect and worthy of God.

The treatment of the doctrine of election falls into two major parts, namely, (a) the fact of divine election and (b) the order of elective decrees.

This study of the fact of divine election may be subdivided into four features, which are, (a) the terms used, (b) a clear revelation, (c) essential truths embraced, and (d) objections to the doctrine of election.

I. The Terms Used

1. Biblical Usage. In Biblical usage, the word *election* designates a sovereign divine purpose so formulated as to be independent of human merit, descent, or cooperation. The entire doctrine is in harmony with the truth, previously observed, that, in God's creation, both variety and selection are everywhere present. The term is used of Israel (Isa. 65:9, 22),

of the Church (Rom. 8:33; Col. 3:12; 2 Tim. 2:10; 1 Thess. 1:4; 1 Pet. 5:13), and of Christ (Isa. 42:1; 1 Pet. 2:6).

2. Chosen.

This word is but a synonym of the word *election.* Those elected of God are chosen by Him from all eternity. Like *election*, the term is applied to Israel (Isa. 44:1), and to the Church (Eph. 1:4; 2 Thess. 2:13; 1 Pet. 2:9), and is also used of the apostles (John 6:70; 13:18; Acts 1:2).

3. Drawing. There is a general drawing as mentioned in John 12:32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me"; and an irresistible drawing which Christ mentioned, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:44).

4. Calling. This feature of divine activity is similar to drawing. No Scripture defines the divine call, with all that it means in its effectiveness, better than Romans 8:30: "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

5. Divine Purpose. Again, that which is closely akin to election is suggested by the word *purpose*. It is written, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself" (Eph. 1:9); "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph. 3:11).

6. Foreknowledge. This specific term means merely that God knows beforehand. It is used of Israel (Rom. 11:2) and of the Church (Rom. 8:29).

7. Foreordination and Predestination. These words, almost complete synonyms, are used in the New Testament to declare the truth that God determines what shall be before it comes to pass. These words are more concerned with that to which men are divinely appointed than with the men themselves. God's foreordination and predestination precede all history. As foreknowledge recognizes the certainty of future events, foreordination and predestination make thse events sure. The two divine activities of foreseeing and foreordaining could not function separately. They do not occur in

succession, but are dependent on each other and either one is impossible wihtout the other.

II. A Clear Revelation

Whatever reaction to the fact of divine election may be recorded by the mind of man, the doctrine stands as an unequivocal revelation. This is not to say that it is free from complexity, or that problems are involved in the doctrine which are insuperable; and, as before noted under like circumstances, where human apprehension reaches its utmost boundary, faith is still a guiding factor. A few moments of unprejudiced reflection will serve much, to the end that a very simple proposition may be accepted, which is, that this is God's universe; all created intelligences are the work of His hands and therefore are to be disposed of as He shall choose. It only remains to discover, what is equally true, that what He determines is directed by infinite understanding, executed by infinite power, and is the manifestation of infinite love. How terrible might be the estate of the creature were he in the hands of an insane, fiendish despot! How universal, too, is the confidence in the mind of man that God is good! Why should it not be so? But why, when His goodness is even dimly recognized, is it not a ground of rest and trust? Is it not clear to all that to question the divine elective plan is to question the very wisdom and worthiness of God? Angels, who know vastly more of God's Being, cease not to adore Him throughout all ages. To do less than that would be, for them, to descend to the level of satanic infamy. In view of the truth that God has designed, created, and executed all that is, and that it goes on to the consummation He has foreordained, it should not be thought strange or unreasonable that He determines the course and destiny of human history. Men choose their course by what seems to them a free will and they glory in the fact that they are wise enough to adjust themselves to circumstances, but God is the Author of circumstances. Man blindly responds to the emotions of his heart, but God searches the heart of man and is able to create and control every sentiment which sways the mind of men. No equal game of competition for supremacy is on between God and man. When all the vain conceit of man is at its superlative manifestation, he is still the creature functioning as God created him to do. It is common sanity to give God His rightful place and to

acknowledge His sovereign elective purpose in all that He has made to exist. The Bible is adjusted to the truth that God is supreme, with the authority and sovereign right in creation that belongs normally to the Creator. He may give latitude to men, but their sphere of freedom is never outside the larger sphere of His eternal purpose. Certain Scriptures may well be cited which mark off the uncompromised authority of God.

No more striking example of election could be found than that asserted by Jehovah when He utters His seven "I will's" which form the unconditional covenant with Abraham. "I will bless thee, I will make of thee a great nation, in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." These purposes, centered in one man apart from any human conditions to be fulfilled, reach out to the whole earth and imply the divine ascendancy and jurisdiction over not one human destiny alone, but over governments and nations to the end of time. In this light it will not be difficult to observe that the election of one person is a small issue compared to the outreach of such a covenant, and that Abraham is the elect of God for this distinction. Attention should be given to the prediction, which has never failed to be executed, in which Jehovah declared to Abraham, "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee." When the nations who are thus to be judged stand before the throne of Christ's glory (Matt. 25:31–46), the King will say to those on the right hand "Come, ye blessed," and to those on the left hand, "Depart … ye cursed." However, it is to be observed that in predestination a kingdom is prepared from the foundation of the world for those on the right hand; but no specific preparation is indicated for those on the left hand. They go to the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Men have no rightful part in that destiny, but only as they have cast in their lot with the enemies of God and have, like Satan, repudiated the Creator's authority. Multitudes of men lived in Abraham's generation, but God prepared and spoke to Abraham alone. It would be rationalistic to contend with Jehovah because of the fact that He did not do for every person precisely what He did for Abraham and because of the fact that what He did was wrought in sovereign grace apart from any consideration of merit or demerit on Abraham's part.

In His early ministry, Christ asserted the unwelcome truth of divine election when He said, "But I tell you of a truth, many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six

months, when great famine was throughout all the land; but unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian" (Luke 4:25–27).

Why, indeed, should an obscure maiden be chosen to be the mother of the Redeemer? Were there not a multitude to resent this on the ground of seeming partiality? Yet the angel said unto Mary, "Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women" (Luke 1:28).

Were certain men chosen to be apostles at random? Did Christ pick the first men that He met after He determined to associate men with Himself, or were these men chosen in the divine counsels of eternity? Was it a mere coincidence that Saul of Tarsus was prepared by education and called to the greatest of all human tasks—the formation of Christian doctrine? God could say, as well, to Pharaoh, "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth" (Rom. 9:17). Thus it is disclosed that a mighty purpose is served through Pharaoh; yet Pharaoh did not understand it. Doubtless he considered himself to be worthy of all the credit for what he was, being as self-centered as any other "self-made" man.

The case of Cyrus is equally instructive. God called him by name when Cyrus had not known Him. This mighty king was called that he might know that Jehovah is the God of Israel, and that Cyrus might know Jehovah. The prophet declares: "Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the LORD, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me" (Isa. 45:1–4). Why, indeed, of two of earth's greatest kings —Pharaoh and Cyrus—to be elected thus, should one be to a hardened heart and the other to know Jehovah? The Scriptures do not leave room for an

implication that these destinies were due to human designs or traits; the testimony in each instance is that Jehovah did precisely what occurred in each case. God is not asking to be relieved of such responsibility. Why should God elect Jacob and reject Esau? Why should the seed be called in Isaac and not in Ishmael? Only because God willed it so; and shall it be said that there was no worthy reason for these divine selections? Should it be said that there is no reason for any of God's actions in election and only because of the fact that men, perchance, do not understand them? Is any life ever lived—whether it be on the plane of Pharaoh or on the plane of an apostle—that does not serve the purpose of its Creator? Is it not true that no two human beings are alike as seen by God and that no one could serve as a substitute for another; or could the divine purpose for one be extended, as men would require, to others?

It is rational, to say the least, for each person to enter gladly into the will of God for himself and especially since, within His eternal purpose, He extends the gracious invitation "Whosoever will may come." It is not to be expected that the unsaved will accept truth respecting divine sovereignty in election. The mind energized by Satan (Eph. 2:2) will not yield any point to the authority of God. The entire theme concerns those only who are regenerated and should never be presented to, or even discussed in the presence of, the unsaved.

III. Essential Truths Embraced

1. God Has by Election Chosen Some to Salvation, But Not All. This truth, too often resisted for want of an understanding of the nature of God, or of the position He occupies in relation to His creatures, is reasonable; but it is distinctly a revelation. This, as before stated, cannot be doubted by those who are amenable to the Word of God. It is disclosed concerning individuals that they were chosen in the Lord (Rom. 16:13), chosen to salvation (2 Thess. 2:13), chosen in Him before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4), predestined to the adoption of sons (Eph. 1:5), elect according to the foreknowledge of God (1 Pet. 1:2), vessels of mercy which He hath before prepared unto glory (Rom. 9:23). There can be no question raised but that these passages contemplate an act of God by which some are chosen, but not all. The idea of election, or selection, cannot be applied to

an entire class as unrelated to any others. Hidden in the word *election* is the implied truth, which is unavoidably a part of it, that others are not chosen, or are passed by. This suggests again the distinction, already particularized when discussing the divine decrees, that predestination points either to election or retribution, and that election cannot be understood in any other light than that others—the nonelect—are passed by. The thought expressed by the word *election* cannot be modified. It asserts an express intention on the part of God to confer salvation on certain persons, but not all. It is not a mere purpose to give salvation to those who may believe; it rather determines who will believe.

2. Divine Election Was Accomplished in Eternity Past. All things which related to human history were determined in the eternal counsels of God before man was created. Three passages serve to state this truth: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love" (Eph. 1:4); "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began" (2 Tim. 1:9); "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18). Some have held that election takes place in time and that it was the sending of the gospel to men which God purposed in past ages. Men are elect, it is claimed, only as they exercise their own wills in accepting the offers of divine grace. To such, one passage of Scripture provides a correction: "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 2:13–14). Thus it is said that election to salvation is "from the beginning," which corresponds to that beginning cited in John 1:1. The gospel, it is said, served as the call which fulfilled the eternal election to salvation.

3. Election Does Not Rest Merely on Foreknowledge. The obvious distinction between foreknowledge and foreordination, or predestination, has been the occasion for much discussion, there being those who assert that God, by His foreknowledge, discriminated between those who by their

own choice would accept salvation and those who would not, and, being thus informed, God was able to predestinate those He knew would believe. The superficial character of this notion is seen (1) in the fact that foreknowledge and foreordination, or predestination, could not be placed in a sequence. Nothing could be foreknown as certain that had not been made certain by foreordination, nor could anything be foreordained that was not foreknown. Of three passages bearing on the relationship between these two divine activities, two mention foreknowledge first in order, while the other reverses this arrangement. In Romans 8:29 it is written, “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate”; and in 1 Peter 1:2 believers are addressed as “elect according to the foreknowledge of God.” But in Acts 2:23, where the divine purpose in Christ’s death is in view, it is said: “him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.” (2) The Scriptures declare that that which cometh to pass is foreordained of God and not merely foreknown. Salvation is by grace apart from works. Men are not saved because of good works whether anticipated or realized. Election is according to grace and not according to works. If salvation be by grace, it is no more of works, and if it be by works, it is no more of grace (Rom. 11:5–6). In the light of this revelation, it is impossible to build a foreseen structure of works as the ground of any person’s salvation. Similarly, there is divine authority for denying that faith and personal holiness, even foreseen, determine divine election. The Bible reverses this order by declaring that election is unto faith and holiness. It is no slight error to confuse these issues and make faith and holiness the cause and election the effect. Faith can serve no greater purpose than to be the means by which that which God has determined may be realized. Referring again to passages already cited, it will be seen that God chose from the beginning those to be saved, and predestinated them to “belief of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:13); and He chose some before the foundation of the world that they should be holy and without blame before Him in love (Eph. 1:4). Thus it is revealed that men are not first holy and then elect; but they are first elect and that election is unto holiness. As an illustration of this order in the truth, the Apostle refers to the divine choice of Jacob over Esau before they were born and before they had done either good or evil. All this, it is said, is to the end that the divine election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth (Rom. 9:10–13). It may be added that acceptable works and qualities

are not resident in any fallen human being, except these characteristics are wrought in the human heart by divine energy. It would therefore be folly to expect that God would foresee in men what could never exist. Doubtless, multitudes of people cling to a conditional election lest they be forced to recognize the depravity of man.

4. Divine Election is Immutable. Not only will that which was determined in past ages be brought to fruition, but it is immutable. It is claimed by those who give an undue emphasis to the ability of the human will, that God's purposes in salvation may be frustrated, that the elect of today may, because of human determination, become the nonelect of tomorrow. It is implied that God can do no more than to adjust Himself to the will of man, and His determination concerning His creatures may change. In reply to this idea, it may be remarked that God has never created a human will as an instrument to defeat His own purpose. He creates them that they may serve His immutable will. Since God is the Creator of all things, it is absurd to suppose that He who creates cannot determine the choice and destiny of that which He has wrought. Referring to those who had erred and by their unbelief had "overthrown the faith of some," the Apostle declares in assuring terms, "Nevertheless the foundation of God [His eternal purpose] standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" (2 Tim. 2:18-19). Human language cannot express a more positive assertion than that which appears in Romans 8:30: "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." The text, in harmony with all the Bible, states that *all* who are predestinated are called, that *all* who are called are justified, and that *all* who are justified are glorified. There could not be one more or one less, else God has failed in the realization of His good pleasure.

5. Election in Relation to Christ's Mediation. In theological investigation, a problem arises which sustains no close relation to the believer's daily life and service but which relates to the order of elective decrees—to be considered in Chapter IX—whether Christ died for men because of their election to salvation, or whether they are elect because Christ died for them. The question introduces nothing chronological. It has

to do with that which is logical, or the matter of cause and effect in the mind of God. In other words, since it is so evident that God was not influenced in His elective choice by foreseen faith and obedience of the elect, was He influenced by the foreseen relation of the elect to the Savior? This much may be known: There was that in God which impelled Him to give His Son for the world (John 3:16). From this and other Scriptures it may be concluded that, though the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8), the election of some to salvation through the Lamb's death established the necessity for that death. By this interpretation, election stands first in the order uninfluenced by other issues, and is thus distinctly an election according to grace. The whole theme is exceedingly abstruse and it may be well to be reminded here of Romans 11:34: "Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" If the best of men were to devise a program for the Almighty, it is probable they would not include election at all, and it is more than certain that their scheme would not start with election in sovereign grace apart from all values of human merit.

The doctrine of election is not without its difficulties—precisely such, indeed, as are normal when the finite mind assays to trace the paths of infinity. Within his own consciousness, man recognizes little outside his own power of determination; however, in the end and regardless of the means by which man has reached his destiny, it will be that destiny which was not only foreseen, but was divinely purposed. Such must be the conviction of every devout soul that contemplates the obvious truth, that the Creator is as resourceful in executing His purposes as He is in originating them.

IV. Objections to the Doctrine of Election

In his *Systematic Theology*, Dr. Augustus H. Strong has presented the usual objections to election and refuted them in a manner so brief and yet so conclusive that it seems well to restate his material here. A part only of his argument in each instance is here quoted:

> (*a*) It is unjust to those who are not included in this purpose of salvation. —Answer: Election deals, not simply with creatures, but with sinful, guilty, and condemned creatures. That any should be saved, is matter of pure grace, and those who are not included in this

purpose of salvation suffer only the due reward of their deeds. There is, therefore, no injustice in God's election. We may better praise God that he saves any, than charge him with injustice because he saves so few. …

(*b*) It represents God as partial in his dealings and a respecter of persons. —Answer: Since there is nothing in men that determines God's choice of one rather than another, the objection is invalid. It would equally apply to God's selection of certain nations, as Israel, and certain individuals, as Cyrus, to be recipients of special temporal gifts. If God is not to be regarded as partial in not providing a salvation for fallen angels, he cannot be regarded as partial in not providing regenerating influences of his Spirit for the whole race of fallen men. …

(*c*) It represents God as arbitrary.—Answer: It represents God, not as arbitrary, but as exercising the free choice of a wise and sovereign will, in ways and for reasons which are inscrutable to us. To deny the possibility of such choice is to deny God's personality. To deny that God has reasons for his choice is to deny his wisdom. The doctrine of election finds these reasons, not in men, but in God. …

(*d*) It tends to immorality, by representing men's salvation as independent of their own obedience.—Answer: The objection ignores the fact that the salvation of believers is ordained only in connection with their regeneration and sanctification, as means; and that the certainty of final triumph is the strongest incentive to strenuous conflict with sin. …

(*e*) It inspires pride in those who think themselves elect.—Answer: This is possible only in the case of those who pervert the doctrine. On the contrary, its proper influence is to humble men. Those who exalt themselves above others, upon the ground that they are special favorites of God, have reason to question their election. …

(*f*) It discourages effort for the salvation of the impenitent, whether on their own part or on the part of others.—Answer: Since it is a secret decree, it cannot hinder or discourage such effort. On the other hand, it is a ground of encouragement, and so a stimulus to effort; for, without election, it is certain that all would be lost (*cf.* Acts 18:10). While it humbles the sinner, so that he is willing to cry for mercy, it encourages him also by showing him that some will be saved, and (since election and faith are inseparably connected) that he will be saved, if he will only believe. …

(*g*) The decree of election implies a decree of reprobation.—Answer: The decree of reprobation is not a positive decree, like that of election, but a permissive decree to leave the sinner to his self-chosen rebellion and its natural consequences of punishment.—Pp. 431–34

Chapter IX

The Order of Elective Decrees

Of all the decrees of God, reaching out as they do to infinity, five are related directly to the purpose of God in election as it pertains to those who comprise the Church, the Body of Christ. The problem which presents itself to the mind of thoughtful and devout men is with respect to the order which these five decrees maintain in the mind of God. The arrangement, being logical rather than chronological, is somewhat speculative and yet great issues are involved. By the term *logical* is meant that, though the entire program is as one thought in the mind of God, the principle of cause and effect is evidently involved. That is, one issue may prepare the way for and thus become the cause of another. These specific decrees are here named, but without regard at this time for the right order which they sustain.

(1) The decree to elect some to salvation and leave others to their just condemnation.
(2) The decree to create all men.
(3) The decree to permit the fall.
(4) The decree to provide salvation for men.
(5) The decree to apply salvation to men.

Four schools of interpretation are recognized, each contending for a specific order in the arrangement of these elective decrees. These schools are: the *supralapsarian,* the *infralapsarian,* the *sublapsarian,* and the *Arminian,* the first three being classed as Calvinistic. Though the defense of these varying orders concerns primarily the one subject—the election of some to be saved and the leaving of others to a just condemnation —the titles by which three of these schools are identified relates them to the fall of man. The word *lapsarian* refers to one who believes in the doctrine that man is a fallen being. Of this particular line of investigation, Dr. Charles Hodge writes this qualifying word: “It is to be borne in mind that the object of these speculations is not to pry into the operation of the divine mind, but simply to ascertain and exhibit the relation which the several truths revealed in Scripture concerning the plan of redemption bear to each other”

(*Systematic Theology*, II, 321). A more detailed consideration of each of the claims advanced by each of these schools is here presented:

I. The Order Set Forth by the Supralapsarians

This group is sometimes styled the *High Calvinists* or the *Ultra Calvinists.* The primary issue in the order proposed by this school of interpreters is that the decree to elect some and to reprobate all others stands first in the order of decrees, and by this disposal God is declared to have elected men to their destiny before they were created and before the fall. In reality, by this system men are consigned to perdition before they sin and without a cause, except it be by the sovereign will of God. It is true that God, as First Cause, effected man's existence knowing who would be reprobate, but this responsibility, like that of the presence of sin in the world, is never reckoned from the creature back upon God. Earlier in this immediate discussion, it was concluded that divine election precedes the determination to provide a Savior. The present issue is with respect to the order which obtains between the decree to elect and the decree to permit the fall.

The order as defended by the supralapsarians is:

(1) Decree to elect some to be saved and to reprobate all others.
(2) Decree to create men both elect and nonelect.
(3) Decree to permit the fall.
(4) Decree to provide salvation for the elect.
(5) Decree to apply salvation to the elect.

On this view as held by the supralapsarians, Dr. Wm. G. T. Shedd remarks:

> The supralapsarian theory places, in the order of decrees, the decree of election and preterition before the fall, instead of after it. It supposes that God begins by decreeing that a certain number of men shall be elected, and reprobated. This decree is prior even to that of creation, in the logical order. … The objections to this view are the following: (*a*) The decree of election and preterition has reference to a non-entity. Man is contemplated as creatable, not as created. Consequently, the decree of election and preterition has no real object. … Man is only ideally existent, an abstract conception; and therefore any divine determination concerning him, is a determination concerning nonentity. But God's decrees of election and reprobation suppose some actually created beings, from which to select and reject. "On *whom* he will, he hath mercy; and *whom* he will, he hardeneth," Rom. 9:18. The first decree,

in the order of nature, must therefore be a decree to create. God must bring man into being, before he can decide what man shall do or experience. It is no reply to say, that man is created in the Divine idea, though not in reality, when the decree of predestination is made. It is equally true that he is fallen in the Divine idea, when this decree is made. And the question is, What is the logical order, *in the divine idea*, of the creation and the fall? (*b*) The Scriptures represent the elect and non-elect, respectively, as taken out of an existing aggregate of beings. John 15:19, "I have chosen you out of the world." (*c*) The elect are chosen to justification and sanctification. Eph. 1:4–6; 1 Pet. 1:2. They must therefore have been already fallen, and consequently created. God justifies "the ungodly," Rom. 4:5; and sanctifies the unholy. (*d*) The supralapsarian reprobation is a Divine act that cannot presuppose sin, because it does not presuppose existence. But the Scriptures represent the non-elect as sinful creatures. In Jude 4, the men who were "of old ordained to this condemnation" are "ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness." Accordingly, the Westminster Confession (III.7) affirms that God passes by the non-elect, and "ordains them to dishonor and wrath for their *sin*, to the praise of his glorious justice." The supralapsarian quotes Rom. 9:11, in proof of his assertion that election and preterition are prior to the creation of man. "The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil," Jacob was chosen and Esau was left. This is an erroneous interpretation. Birth is not synonymous with creation. Parents are not the creators of their children. Man exists before he is born into the world. He exists in the womb; and he existed in Adam.—*Dogmatic Theology*, I, 442–43

II. The Order Set Forth by the Infralapsarians

According to this school—properly called *moderate* Calvinists—the distinctive issue is that the decree to elect some and to leave others in retribution follows the fall, the order they defend being:

(1) Decree to create all men.
(2) Decree to permit the fall.
(3) Decree to provide salvation for men.
(4) Decree to elect those who do believe and to leave in just condemnation all who do not believe.
(5) Decree to apply salvation to those who believe.

Dr. Charles Hodge is one, among several, who makes no distinction between the infralapsarian and sublapsarian views by not mentioning the latter. What he writes, therefore, combines these to some extent. Of the infralapsarians he says:

> That this view is self-consistent and harmonious. As all the decrees of God are one comprehensive purpose, no view of the relation of the details embraced in that purpose which does not admit of their being reduced to unity can be admitted. In every great mechanism, whatever the number or complexity of its parts, there must be unity of design. Every part bears a given relation to every other part, and the perception of that relation is necessary to a

proper understanding of the whole. Again, as the decrees of God are eternal and immutable, no view of his plan of operation which supposes Him to purpose first one thing and then another can be consistent with their nature. And as God is absolutely sovereign and independent, all his purposes must be determined from within or according to the counsel of his own will. They cannot be supposed to be contingent or suspended on the action of his creatures, or upon anything out of Himself. The infralapsarian scheme, as held by most Augustinians, fulfils all these conditions. All the particulars form one comprehensive whole. All follow in an order which supposes no change of purpose; and all depend on the infinitely wise, holy, and righteous will of God. The final end is the glory of God. For that end He creates the world, allows the fall; from among fallen men He elects some to everlasting life, and leaves the rest to the just recompense of their sins. Whom He elects He calls, justifies, and glorifies. This is the golden chain the links of which cannot be separated or transposed. This is the form in which the scheme of redemption lay in the Apostle's mind as he teaches us in Rom. 8:29, 30.—*Op. cit.*, p. 320

III. The Order Set Forth by the Sublapsarians

This arrangement sustained by a group who are also styled *moderate* Calvinists, differs but slightly from the order proposed by the infralapsarians. Technically, the infralapsarians place election after the decree to provide salvation, though Dr. Hodge, quoted above, does not recognize this feature when listing the order of decrees as proposed by the infralapsarians. The sublapsarians are identified by the placing of the decree to elect to follow the decree to permit the fall. In general, the sublapsarian order is a refutation of the supralapsarian order. Dr. Hodge's theological position classes him more reasonably with this school. The distinction between the infralapsarian and the sublapsarian is that the infralapsarian school places the decree to provide salvation before the decree to elect, while the sublapsarian places the decree to elect before the decree to provide salvation. The infralapsarian order, which places the decree to provide salvation before the decree to elect, allows possibly for the contention that Christ wrought an unlimited redemption, whereas the sublapsarian order, which places the decree to elect before the decree to provide salvation, favors the theory of a limited redemption. The order prescribed by the sublapsarians is:

(1) Decree to create all men.
(2) Decree to permit the fall.
(3) Decree to elect those who do believe and to leave in just condemnation those who do not believe.

(4) Decree to provide salvation for men.
(5) Decree to apply salvation to those who believe.

IV. The Order Set Forth by the Arminians

Here the order is identical with that of the infralapsarian view, with one exception: The Arminian view of election, which they make to follow the decree to provide salvation, is by the Arminians made to depend on foreseen human virtue, faith, and obedience, whereas the infralapsarian view of election invests it with sovereign choice apart from any foreseen human merit whatsoever.

Refuting the Arminian idea of election, Dr. Shedd exposes the position of Richard Watson—the chief of Arminian theologians—as follows:

> Respecting election, Watson (Institutes, II. 338) remarks as follows: "To be elected is, to be separated from the world ('I have chosen you out of the world'), and to be sanctified by the Spirit ('elect unto obedience'). It follows, then, that election is not only an act of God in *time*, but also that it is *subsequent* to the administration of the means of salvation. Actual election cannot be eternal, for from eternity the elect were not actually chosen out of the world, and could not be actually sanctified unto obedience." This explanation makes election to be sanctification itself, instead of its cause. "To be elected, is to be separated from the world, and to be sanctified." The term "separate" is used here by Watson not as St. Paul uses it to denote election, when he says that God "separated him from his mother's womb" (Gal. 1:15); but in the sense of sanctification, as St. Paul employs it in 2 Cor. 6:17, "Be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing." By this interpretation, election is made to be the same thing as sanctification, instead of being an act of God that produces it; as is taught in Eph. 1:4, "He hath chosen us that we should be holy," and in 1 Pet. 1:2, "Elect unto obedience."—*Op. cit.*, p. 449

Conclusion

It will be observed from the foregoing that the differences represented in these various orders of decrees, though they seem highly speculative to some, do represent vital doctrine at its very foundation. The three schools of Calvinists contend alike that divine election is the sovereign choice of God which expresses His grace apart from every form of human works foreseen or actual; and that the Arminian school, by making election to be no more than foreknowledge of human merit, asserts that, in the end, man elects himself by his faith and obedience. The Calvinistic schools are the result of

a faithful induction of the Word of God bearing on the elective decrees, whereas the Arminian school is an intrusion of human reason.

Chapter X

For Whom Did Christ Die?

This chapter undertakes the discussion of a question which for many centuries has divided and yet divides some of the most orthodox and scholarly theologians. On the one hand, those who according to theological usage are known as *limited redemptionists* contend that Christ died only for that elect company who in all dispensations were predetermined of God to be saved; and, on the other hand, those who according to the same theological usage are known as *unlimited redemptionists* contend that Christ died for all men who live in the present age, which age is bounded by the two advents of Christ, and that His death has other and specific values in its relation to the ages past as well as the ages to come. The issue is well defined, and men of sincere loyalty to the Word of God and who possess true scholarship are found on both sides of the controversy. It is true that the doctrine of a limited redemption is one of the five points of Calvinism, but not all who are rightfully classified as Calvinists accept this one feature of that system. It is equally true that all Arminians are unlimited redemptionists, but to hold the doctrine of unlimited redemption does not necessarily constitute one an Arminian. There is nothing incongruous in the fact that many unlimited redemptionists believe, in harmony with all Calvinists, in the unalterable and eternal decree of God whereby all things were determined after His own will; and in the sovereign election of some to be saved, but not all; and in the divine predestination of those who are saved to the heavenly glory prepared for them. Without the slightest inconsistency the unlimited redemptionists may believe in an election according to sovereign grace, that *none* but the elect will be saved, that *all* of the elect will be saved, and that the elect are by divine enablement alone called out of the estate of spiritual death from which they are too impotent to take even one step in the direction of their own salvation. The text, “No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him” (John 6:44), is as much a part of the one system of doctrine as it is of the other.

It is not easy to disagree with good and great men. However, as they appear on each side of this question, it is impossible to entertain a conviction and not oppose those who are of a contrary mind. The disagreement now under discussion is not between orthodox and heterodox men; it is within the fellowship of those who have most in common and who need the support and encouragement of each other's confidence. Few themes have drawn out more sincere and scholarly investigation.

I. Classification of Views

When recognizing more specifically the divisions of theological thought concerning the extent of the value of the death of Christ, it will be found that the limited redemptionists are divided into two general groups, and that the unlimited redemptionists are likewise divided into two general groups, making in all four divisions or parties in relation to this question. The position held by these may be defined briefly as follows:

1. The Extreme Limited Redemptionists. This group is sometimes styled the High, or Ultra, Calvinist. It includes the supralapsarians who, as has been seen, assert that the decree of divine election stands first in the order of elective decrees—before the decree to create men, before the decree to permit the fall, and before the decree to provide salvation. Such a view could make no place for an unlimited redemption, nor could it encourage the preaching of the gospel to those who, they contend, were reprobated from the beginning.

2. The Moderate Calvinists Who are Limited Redemptionists. The appellation *Moderate Calvinist*, in this instance, is based on their belief that the decree to elect is preceded by the decree to create and the decree to permit the fall. Though they contend for a limited redemption, they make a place for world-wide preaching of the gospel and grant certain concessions not possible to the extreme Calvinists.

3. The Moderate Calvinists Who are Unlimited Redemptionists. The men who belong to this school of interpretation defend all of the five points of Calvinism excepting one, namely, "Limited Atonement," or what has been termed "the weakest point in the Calvinistic system of doctrine."

This form of moderate Calvinism is more the belief of Bible expositors than of the theologians, which fact is doubtless due to the truth that the Bible, taken in its natural terminology and apart from those strained interpretations which are required to defend a theory, seems to teach an unlimited redemption. Men of this group believe that Christ died actually and fully for all men of this age alike, that God has ordained that the gospel shall be preached to all for whom Christ died, and that through the proclamation of the gospel He will exercise His sovereign power in saving His elect. This group believe in the absolute depravity of man and his total inability to believe apart from the enabling power of the Spirit, and that the death of Christ, being forensic, is a sufficient ground for any and every man to be saved, should the Spirit of God choose to draw him. They contend that the death of Christ of itself saves no man, either actually or potentially, but that it does render all men *savable;* that salvation is wrought of God alone, and at the time the individual believes.

4. The Arminians. An exhaustive study of the Arminian view is not called for here, this being a consideration of those variations which obtain among Calvinists. Enough will be presented if it be remarked that the Arminians hold that Christ's death was for all men alike, and that it secures for everyone a measure of common grace whereby all are able to believe if they will. Men are, according to this view, subject to divine judgment only on the ground of their wilful rejection of Christ's salvation.

Besides, mention may be made of a theory advanced by F. W. Grant which maintains that Christ's death is a *propitiation* for the whole world and a *substitution* for the elect; but Grant has failed to disclose how God could be propitious toward the world apart from the substitutionary aspect of Christ's death. Grant is doubtless seeking to distinguish between that which is *potential* for all mankind and that which has been *consummated* in, and *applied* to, the elect who are saved.

II. Points of Agreement and Disagreement Between the two Schools of Moderate Calvinists

First, it is a common belief that all men are not to be saved. Both schools will unite in a rejection of any form of universalism or restitutionism. An

innumerable company are to be saved and an innumerable company are to be lost. *Second*, it is a common belief that the death of Christ is suitable in the sense that it would answer the need of every fallen man. *Third*, it is a common belief that men could be saved by no other means than the death and resurrection of Christ. *Fourth*, the gospel is to be preached to all, but the underlying freedom to preach is different within one group than it is within the other. *Fifth*, faith must be wrought in the unsaved by the Holy Spirit. *Sixth*, only the elect will be saved. *Seventh*, whatever Christ did, whether for the elect or non-elect, is suspended awaiting compliance on the part of the unsaved with the divinely imposed conditions. No person is born forgiven or justified. *Eighth*, the belief of one group is that God provides salvation for the elect to the end that the elect might be saved. The belief of the other group is that God provided salvation for all men to the end that the elect might be saved. Both schools appeal to the Scriptures, though the one is forced, because of its restricted nature, to make strained interpretations of the so-called universal passages. Reference will be made to these strained interpretations as this chapter advances.

No concessions are required on the part of the unlimited redemptionists. Their system is not complicated or involved. The limited redemptionist concedes that what Christ did would be sufficient to save the non-elect were any such to believe; but the ultra Calvinist could not concede that the elect would be lost if such a one were not to believe, since under that system the death of Christ for a soul becomes the surety for that soul to such a degree that it could not be lost.

In this connection it is well to observe that salvation is vastly more than the forgiveness of sins. It is not difficult to demonstrate that sins are accounted for by the fact that Christ bore them on the cross, but to assert that the bearing of sin is equivalent to the salvation of the one for whom Christ suffered is quite another thing. Certain features of man’s salvation through Christ are directly secured through the cross of Christ—forgiveness, eternal life, justification, all his positions in Christ, and some aspects of sanctification. However, other features of salvation—a place in the family and household of God, adoption, heavenly citizenship, access to God, freedom under grace from the merit system—are wrought by God as the expression of divine benevolence and are related to the death of Christ only as God is rendered free through Christ’s death to act in behalf of those

who believe. It is therefore both unscriptural and misleading to imply that there is no distinction to be drawn between that particular aspect of the saving work of God in providing a Savior, and the saving work of God in which the mighty transformations which constitute a Christian what he is, are accomplished. No responsibility of faith is laid on the sinner to provide the values of Christ's death, but salvation itself is only realized in answer to saving faith. There is nothing inconsistent, if God so wills, in a circumstance which leaves even the elect in a lost estate until they believe; nor is there any inconsistency if one, for whom Christ died, shall be left in a lost estate forever. The limited redemptionist considers the death of Christ as actual for the elect and of no saving benefit for the nonelect, while the unlimited redemptionist considers the death of Christ as actual for the elect and potential and provisional for the nonelect. The notion is without foundation which assumes that a thing is less real because its acceptance may be uncertain or conditional.

The human estimation of the immeasurable value of Christ's death in behalf of lost men is in no way lessened or discredited by the belief that its value is received at the time that saving faith is exercised, rather than at the time the Savior died. The unlimited redemptionist is in no way forced, because of his belief, to take a second place in magnifying the glorious saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The highway of divine election is quite apart from the highway of redemption. With respect to election it is declared that "whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Rom. 8:30), and in this great certainty every believer may rejoice. In respect to redemption it is written that Christ died for fallen men and that salvation, based on that death, is proffered to all who believe; and that condemnation rests on those who do not believe, and on the ground that they refuse that which has been provided for them. It would seem unnecessary to point out that men cannot reject what does not even exist, and if Christ did not die for the nonelect, they cannot be condemned for unbelief (cf. John 3:18). Both salvation and condemnation are conditioned on the individual's reaction to one and the same thing, namely, the saving grace of God made possible through the death of Christ.

In the former connection, the extent of the outreach of Christ's death has been considered. In all, fourteen measureless divine achievements have been enumerated. Only a restricted portion of these achievements is involved in this discussion. In the light of the great and complex work of Christ reaching out to past ages and to ages to come, to an entire elect nation, to the disannulling of the entire merit system, to angelic spheres, to heaven itself, to the judgment of the sin nature, to the propitiation for the Christian's sins, and to the delay of righteous judgments against all sin, the question of whether He died for the elect or the whole world is reduced, comparatively, to a small issue. The limited redemptionist concedes, with his opponent, that divine judgments are delayed on the ground of a universal thing which Christ accomplished in His death; but, by so much, the principle of a universal value in His death is acknowledged and the step is indeed insignificant from that position to the position occupied by the universal redemptionist.

Within the range of human reason, a problem arises which has been the point of attack against Calvinists by Socinians and by Arminians —that if Christ bears the sin of any person, that person should benefit by this divine sacrifice and be free from the judgment which the Savior bore. To avoid this problem, the limited redemptionist contends that Christ died for the elect only. The unlimited redemptionist believes that, while Christ died provisionally for all men, the benefit is applied only when the condition of personal saving faith is met. The limited redemptionist of the moderate school believes with his opponent that none are forgiven until they believe, and by so much he fails to solve the problem which his system was originated to disentangle. To the unlimited redemptionist, the seeming inequity of a judgment falling upon a person after Christ has borne that judgment is but one more mystery which the finite mind cannot understand. The unlimited redemptionist recognizes two revelations which are equally clear—that Christ died for the *cosmos* world, and that His death is the ground of salvation for those who believe and the ground of condemnation for those who do not believe. That men are saved on the one condition of personal faith and that men are condemned for want of that faith are plain teachings of the New Testament. It is equally as great a mystery and one which is closely related to the present problem that, though faith is divinely wrought in the human heart, men are treated as though faith originated in

them. They are blessed eternally who have that faith, and are condemned eternally who have it not. The devout soul must recognize his own limitations and here, as elsewhere, be satisfied to receive as true what God has spoken.

Much of the truth incorporated into these introductory remarks will be treated more fully in the following pages. This proposed discussion of this issue which divides the two schools of moderate Calvinists will pursue the following order: (a) dispensational aspects of the problem; (b) three doctrinal words; (c) the cross is not the only saving instrumentality; (d) universal gospel preaching; (e) is God defeated if men are lost for whom Christ died? (f) the nature of substitution; (g) the testimony of the Scriptures.

III. Dispensational Aspects of the Problem

Judging from their writings, the limited redemptionists frequently ignore dispensational distinctions, recognizing, as they usually do, but one elective purpose of God, in which they include all within the human family from Adam to the present generation who have experienced any divine favor. By this method of interpretation the pre-Israelite patriarchs, the Israelites, and the New Testament Church are assumed to be but one unbroken succession. Without hesitation they draw material for argument from the Old Testament relationships, and assume that whatever may have been true in previous dispensations is comparable and applicable in the present age, whereas the informed, unlimited redemptionist recognizes the dispensational features of God’s dealings with men, and contends that the universal aspect of the value of Christ’s death could apply only to the present age of the outcalling of that elect company which comprises the Church, which is the Body of Christ—an age differing, as it does, from all other ages in many respects, notably, that in it a universal gospel is to be preached, all distinctions between Jews and Gentiles are broken down (Rom. 3:9; 10:12; Eph. 3:6), and tremendous changes are wrought by the death and resurrection of Christ which place the people of this age in a position of responsibility toward God heretofore unknown.

It should be recognized that Israel is an elect *nation* into which each of her succeeding generations entered by physical birth, and that there is no

basis in the fact of Israel's *national* election for comparison with the Church which is composed of elect *individuals*, both Jews and Gentiles, each one predestined, called, justified, and glorified (Rom. 8:30), and commissioned to proclaim a world-wide gospel, which responsibility was wholly unknown in previous ages. It is true that a door was open for proselytes to enter Jewry; but whatever may have been the facts, nothing is said of their being foreordained to do so, or that they exercised saving faith, or that they were regenerated as men are now regenerated, or that a gospel was ever preached unto them. The striking inability to see divine distinctions and purposes concerning humanity is disclosed in the pamphlet, *The Redeemed, Who Are They?*, by Rev. James Mortimer Sanger, B.A. Contending for the opinion that in all ages there are but two classes of people in the world—the good and the bad—this author further claims that Genesis 3:15 anticipates two lines of seed, and that Christ died for the seed of the woman, but not for the seed of Satan. Unfortunately for this theory the seed of the woman is Christ Himself, and none can doubt from Ephesians 2:1–2 that salvation has since come to some, at least, who were originally vitally related to Satan as fully as any unregenerate ever could be.

National election, too often confused with individual election (note the Apostle's warning to the nation Israel on this point as recorded in Rom. 9:4–13), anticipates no more than the ultimate blessing of Israel as a nation and their national preservation unto that end. Ahab and Jezebel along with Abraham and Sarah, were partakers alike in Israel's national election. However, a judgment day for Israel is predicted when multitudes will be rejected (Ezek. 20:33–44; Dan. 12:1–3). There is, nonetheless, a recognition in the Bible of a spiritual remnant in all Israel's generations; but that spiritual group shared no additional covenants, their distinction being due to their willingness to be more faithful to those relations to Jehovah which were the privileges extended to all in Israel. The remnant out of Israel in this age is "a remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. 11:5), and is composed of those who are saved by faith in Christ, and therefore partake of the heavenly calling which pertains to the Church. It is not until a Deliverer comes out of Zion that all Israel will be saved (Rom. 11:27), and that salvation will not only be unto the realization of all their national, earthly covenants, but also unto the taking away of their sins (cf. Jer. 31:34). In the present time, as above stated, only a remnant out of Israel are

being saved as *individuals*, which is according to the divine election in grace and unto the heavenly glory of the Church. Nor is there assurance that all Gentiles will be saved in this dispensation. God is rather visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name (Acts 15:14). Eventually world-wide blessings for Gentiles will be experienced (Acts 15:18), but not until the promised One returns and rebuilds the tabernacle of David which is fallen down (Acts 15:16–17). Therefore, the issues relative to limited or unlimited redemption must be confined to the present age with its divine purpose in the outcalling of the Church, or hopeless confusion must result—such, indeed, as does prevail to a large extent at the present time. Problems relative to God's ways with people of other ages are important in their place, but are not germane to this discussion.

IV. Three Doctrinal Words

Though common to theological usage, the terms *limited redemption* and *unlimited redemption* are inadequate to express the whole of the problem which is under consideration. There are three major aspects of truth set forth in New Testament doctrine relative to the unmeasured benefits which are provided for the unsaved through the death of Christ, and redemption is but one of the three. Each of these aspects of truth is in turn expressed by one word, surrounded as each word is by a group of derivatives or synonyms of that word. These three words are: ἀπολύτρωσις, translated *redemption*, καταλλαγή, translated *reconciliation*, and ἱλασμός, translated *propitiation.* The riches of divine grace which these three words represent transcend all human thought or language; but these truths must be declared in human terms if declared at all. As it is necessary to have four Gospels, since it is impossible for one, two, or even three, to present the full truth concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, so the Scriptures approach the great benefit of Christ's death for the unsaved from three angles, to the end that what may be lacking in the one may be supplied in the others. There are at least four other great words—*forgiveness, regeneration, justification*, and *sanctification* —which represent spiritual blessings secured by the death of Christ; but these are to be distinguished from the three already mentioned in one important particular, namely, that these four words refer to aspects of truth which belong only to those who are saved. Over against these, the

three words—*redemption*, *reconciliation*, and *propitiation* —though incorporating in the scope of their meaning vital truths belonging to the state of the saved, refer in particular to that which Christ wrought for the unsaved in His death on the cross. What is termed *the finished work of Christ* may be defined as the sum total of all that these three words connote when restricted to those aspects of their meaning which apply alone to the unsaved. *Redemption* is within the sphere of relationship which exists between the sinner and his sins, and this word, with those grouped with it, contemplates sin as a slavery, with the sinner as the slave, and freedom to be secured only through the redemption, or ransom, which is in Christ Jesus (John 8:32–36; Rom. 6:17–20; 8:21; 2 Pet. 2:19; Gal. 5:1). *Reconciliation* is within the sphere of relationship which exists between the sinner and God, and contemplates the sinner as at enmity with God, and Christ as the maker of peace between God and man (Rom. 5:10; 8:7; 2 Cor. 5:19; James 4:4). *Propitiation* is also within the sphere of relationship which exists between God and the sinner, but *propitiation* contemplates the larger necessity of God being just when He justifies the sinner, and Christ as an Offering, a Sacrifice, a Lamb slain, who, by meeting every demand of God's holiness against the offender, renders God righteously *propitious* toward that offender (Rom. 3:25; 1 John 2:2; 4:10). Thus it may be seen that redemption is the *sinward* aspect of the cross, reconciliation is the *manward* aspect of the cross, and propitiation is the *Godward* aspect of the cross, and that these three great doctrines combine to declare, as best any human terms are able, one divine undertaking.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the question at issue between the limited redemptionists and the unlimited redemptionists is as much a question of limited or unlimited reconciliation, and limited or unlimited propitiation, as it is one of limited or unlimited redemption. Having made a careful study of these three words and the group of words which must be included with each, one would hardly deny but that there is a twofold application of the truth represented by each.

There is the aspect of redemption which is represented by the word ἀγοράζω, translated *redeem*, which word means *to purchase in the market*; and, while it is used to express the general theme of redemption, its technical meaning implies only the *purchase* of the slave, but does not necessarily convey the thought of his *release* from slavery. The word

ἐξαγοράζω, also translated *redeem*, implies much more, in that ἐξ, meaning *out of*, or *out from*, is combined with ἀγοράζω and thus indicates that the slave is *purchased out of the market* (note here, also, the even stronger terms λυτρόω and ἀπολύτρωσις with their meanings *to loose* and *deliverance*). There is, then, a redemption which *pays the price*, but does not of necessity *release* the slave, as well as redemption which is unto *abiding freedom.* It is probable that the reference to redemption in VIII, 6, and VIII, 8 of the Westminster Confession has the efficacious redemption in view which is completed in those who are saved.

According to 2 Corinthians 5:19 there is a reconciliation declared to be world-wide and wrought wholly of God; yet, in the verse which follows in the context, it is indicated that the individual sinner has the responsibility, in addition to the universal reconciliation wrought of God, to be reconciled himself to God. What God has accomplished has so changed the world in its relation to Himself that He, agreeable to the demands of infinite righteousness, is satisfied with Christ's death as a solution of the sin question for each one. The *desideratum* is not reached, however, until the individual, already included in the world's reconciliation, is himself satisfied with that same work of Christ which has satisfied God as the solution of his own sin question. Thus there is a reconciliation which of itself saves no one, but which is a basis for the reconciliation of any and all who will believe. When they believe, they are reconciled experimentally and eternally, and become the children of God through the riches of His grace.

In one brief verse, 1 John 2:2, God declares that there is a propitiation for our (Christians') sins, and not only for our sins, but also for the sins of the whole world. While due recognition will be given later on to the interpretation of this and similar passages offered by the limited redemptionists, it is obvious that the same twofold aspect of truth—that applicable to the unsaved and that applicable to the saved —is indicated regarding propitiation as is indicated in the case of both redemption and reconciliation.

From this brief consideration of these three great doctrinal words it may be seen that the unlimited redemptionist believes as much in unlimited reconciliation and unlimited propitiation as he does in unlimited redemption. On the other hand, the limited redemptionist seldom includes

the doctrines of reconciliation and propitiation specifically in his discussion of this issue.

V. The Cross is Not the Only Saving Instrumentality

It is one of the points most depended upon by the limited redemptionists to claim that redemption, if wrought at all, *necessitates* the salvation of those thus favored. According to this view, if the redemption price is paid by Christ it must be ἐξαγοράζω or ἀπολύτρωσις, rather than ἀγοράζω, in every instance. It is confidently held by all Calvinists that the elect will, in God's time and way, every one, be saved, and that the unregenerate believe only as they are enabled by the Spirit of God; but the question here is whether the sacrifice of Christ is the only divine instrumentality whereby God *actually* saves the elect, or whether that sacrifice is a divine work, finished, indeed, with regard to its scope and purpose, which renders all men *savable*, but one applied in sovereign grace by the Word of God and the Holy Spirit only when the individual believes. Certainly Christ's death of itself forgives no sinner, nor does it render unnecessary the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. Any one of the elect whose salvation is predetermined, and for whom Christ died, may live the major portion of his life in open rebellion against God and, during that time, manifest every feature of depravity and spiritual death. This alone should prove that men are not severally saved by the act of Christ in dying, but rather that they are saved by the divine *application* of that value when they believe. The blood of the passover lamb became efficacious only when applied to the door post. The fact that an elect person does live some portion of his life in enmity toward God and in a state in which he is as much lost as any unregenerate person, indicates conclusively that Christ must not only die to provide a righteous basis for the salvation of that soul, but that that value must be *applied* to him at such a time in his life as God has decreed, which time, in the present generation, is almost two thousand years subsequent to the death of Christ. By so much it is proved that the priceless value in Christ's death does not save the elect, nor hinder them from rejecting the mercies of God in that period of their life which precedes their salvation.

The unlimited redemptionist claims that the value of Christ's death is extended to all men, but the elect alone come, by divine grace wrought by

an effectual call, into its fruition, while the nonelect are not called, but are those passed by. They hold that God indicates who are the elect, not at the cross, but by the effectual call and at the time of regeneration. It is also believed by the unlimited redemptionists that it pleased God to place the whole world in a position of infinite obligation to Himself through the sacrifice of Christ, and though the mystery of personal condemnation for the sin of unbelief when one has not been moved to faith by the Spirit cannot be solved in this world, the unregenerate, both elect and nonelect, are definitely condemned for their unbelief so long as they abide in that estate (John 3:18). There is nothing more clarifying in connection with this agelong discussion than the recognition of the fact that while they are in their unregenerate state, no vital distinction between the elect and the nonelect is recognized in the Scriptures (1 Cor. 1:24 and Heb. 1:14 might suggest this distinction along lines comparatively unimportant to this discussion). Certainly, that form of doctrine which would make redemption equivalent to salvation is not traceable when men are contemplated in their unregenerate state, and that salvation which is delayed for many years in the case of an elect person might be delayed forever in the case of a nonelect person whose heart God never moves. Was the objective in Christ's death one of making the salvation of all men *possible*, or was it the making of the salvation of the elect *certain?* Some light is gained on this question when it is thus remembered that the consummating divine acts in the salvation of an individual are wrought when he believes on Christ, and not before he believes.

VI. Universal Gospel Preaching

A very difficult situation arises for the limited redemptionist when he confronts the great commissions which enjoin the preaching of the gospel to *every* creature. How, it may be urged, can a universal gospel be preached if there is no universal provision? To say, at one time, that Christ did not die for the nonelect and, at another time, that His death is the ground on which salvation is offered to all men, is perilously near contradiction. It would be mentally and spiritually impossible for a limited redemptionist, if true to his convictions, to urge with sincerity those who are known to be nonelect to accept Christ. Fortunately, God has disclosed nothing whereby the elect can

be distinguished from the nonelect while both classes are in the unregenerate state. However, the gospel preacher, if he entertains a doubt respecting the basis for his message in the case of even one to whom he is appealing, if sincere, does face a real problem in the discharge of his commission to preach the gospel to every creature. To believe that some are elect and some nonelect creates no problem for the soul-winner provided he is free in his convictions to declare that Christ died for everyone to whom he speaks. He knows that the nonelect will not accept the message. He knows, also, that even an elect person may resist it to near the day of his death. But if the preacher believes that any portion of his auditors are destitute of any basis of salvation, having no share in the values of Christ's death, it is no longer a question in his mind of whether they will accept or reject; it becomes rather a question of *truthfulness* in the declaration of the message. As Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander points out: "On this supposition [that of a limited atonement] the general invitations and promises of the gospel are without an adequate basis, and seem like a mere mockery, an offer, in short, of what has not been provided. It will not do to say, in reply to this, that as these invitations are actually given we are entitled on the authority of God's word to urge them and justified in accepting them; for this is mere evasion" (*A System of Biblical Theology*, II, 111). Representing the other side of the question, another Britisher, writing as late as 1919, declares: "Alas for the consumate folly of would-be theologians possessing Bibles, yet forever harping upon such mere pickings as 'whosoever believeth' and 'whosever will!'" Almost every theologian has discussed in his writings the question of a limited or unlimited redemption, and clarifying quotations might be multiplied indefinitely could space be given to them. On the question of the beliefs of sincere gospel preachers, it would repay the reader to investigate how, universally, all great evangelists and missionaries have embraced the doctrine of unlimited redemption, and made it the very underlying structure of their convincing appeal.

VII. Is God Defeated If Men are Lost for Whom Christ Died?

Back of this phase of this subject is the conviction oft expressed by limited redemptionists, that for Christ to die for those who are never saved

is to experience defeat on His part. Of course, it must be conceded that if the finished work is a *guarantee* of salvation to those for whom Christ died, there is a very noticeable defeat if one fails to be saved. But it is merely *assumed* that redemption is a guarantee of salvation. Christ becomes the surety of salvation when one believes. Christ's death is a finished transaction, the value of which God has not ever applied to any soul until that soul passes from death unto life. It is *actual* in its availability, but *potential* in its application. To state that the value of Christ's death is suspended until the hour of regeneration, is not to intimate that its value is any less than it would be were it applied at any other time. There are reasons which are based on the Scriptures why God might provide a redemption for *all* when He merely proposed to save *some*. He is justified in placing the whole world in a particular relation to Himself that the gospel might be preached with all sincerity to all men, and that, on the human side, men might be without excuse, being judged, as they are, for their rejection of that which is offered unto them. Men of this dispensation are condemned for their unbelief. This is expressly declared in John 3:18 and implied in John 16:7–11, in which latter context the Spirit is seen in His work of convincing the world of but one sin, namely, that "they believe not on me." But to reject Christ and His redemption, as every unbeliever does, is equivalent to the demand on his part that the great transaction of Calvary shall be reversed and that his sin, which was laid upon Christ, shall be retained by himself with all its condemning power. It is not asserted here that sin is thus ever retained by the sinner. It is stated, however, that since God does not apply the value of Christ's death to the sinner until that sinner is saved, God would be morally free to hold the sinner who rejects Christ, as being accountable for his sins, and to this unmeasured burden would be added all the condemnation which justly follows the sin of unbelief. In this connection, reference is made by the limited redemptionists to three passages which it is argued indicate that impenitent men die with their sins upon them and, therefore, it is asserted, Christ could not have borne their sins. These passages are:

John 8:24. "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." This is a clear statement that calls for little exposition. It is a case of believing on Christ or dying in the condemnation of sin. It is not alone the one sin of unbelief, but "your sins" to which Christ refers. There is occasion for some

recognition of the fact that Christ spoke these words *before* His death and, also, that He here requires them to believe that He is the "I AM"—Jehovah. These facts are of importance in any specific consideration of this text; but enough may be said, if it be pointed out that the issue is as much a problem for one side of this discussion as for the other. If it be claimed by the limited redemptionists that these people to whom Christ spoke would die in their sins because they were nonelect and, therefore, their sins were not borne by Christ, it may be replied (1) that the condition indicated by Christ on which they may avoid dying in their sins is not based on His not dying for them, but rather their *believing* on Him, and (2) were it true that they die in their sins because of their position as nonelect for whom Christ did not die, it would be equally true that those among them who were of the elect (cf. verse 30) and whose sins were laid on Christ, would have no need to be saved from a lost estate. In other words, this important passage teaches that the value of Christ's death, as marvelous and complete as it is, is not applied to the unregenerate until they *believe.* It is the effectual calling of the Spirit which indicates God's elect and not some partial, unidentified, and supposed discrimination wrought out in the death of Christ.

Ephesians 5:6. "Because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." The designation *children of disobedience* does not refer to the personal disobedience of any individual in this class, but rather to the fact that all unregenerate people are disobedient in the natural headship of Adam. This includes the elect and nonelect in their unsaved state; but it should be noted that those elect saved people to whom the Apostle is writing were, until saved, not only children of disobedience, but under the energizing power of Satan, being in a state of spiritual death (Eph. 2:1–2). Thus, again, it is proved that the value of Christ's death is applied to the elect, not at the cross, but when they believe.

Revelation 20:12. "And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." This scene is related to the great white throne judgment of all the unregenerate of all the ages, and it should be noted that, in other ages, men were placed more upon a covenant of works than they are now. The sum total of sin in the present age is *unbelief* (John 16:9), as the sum total of human responsibility toward God in securing a right relation to God is *belief* (John 6:29). It is very possible that those of this vast company who were of this dispensation may be

judged for the one inclusive sin of unbelief, while those of other ages may be judged for many and specific sins; but from the foregoing proofs it is evident that it is in no way unscriptural to recognize that the impenitent of this age are judged according to their own specific sins, since the value of Christ's death is not applied to or accepted for them until they believe, and all these it is evident have never believed.

At this point, and in this connection, it is appropriate to consider the challenge which the limited redemptionists universally advance—that if Christ bore the sins of the nonelect, they could not be lost; for it is claimed even the condemning sin of unbelief would thus be borne and, therefore, have lost its condemning power. By this challenge the important question is raised of whether Christ bore all the individual's sins except *unbelief*. On this aspect of this theme, John Owen wrote nearly three centuries ago: "God imposed His wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men, or some sins of all men. If the last, some sins of all men, then have all men some sins to answer for, and so no man shall be saved. … If the second, that is what we affirm, viz. that Christ in their stead and room suffered for all the sins of all the elect in the world. If the first [viz. that Christ died for all the sins of all men], then why are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins? You will say, Because of their unbelief; they will not believe. But this unbelief, is it a sin or is it not? If not, why should they be punished for it? If it be, then Christ underwent the punishment due to it or not. If He did, why must that hinder, more than their other sins for which He died, from partaking of the fruit of His death? If He did not, then He did not die for all their sins" (cited by W. L. Alexander, *ibid.*, II, 109–10).

To this it may be replied that the sin of unbelief assumes a specific quality, in that it is man's answer to that which Christ wrought and finished for him when bearing his sins on the cross. There is, doubtless, divine freedom secured by Christ's death whereby God may pardon the sin of unbelief since he freely forgives *all* trespasses (Col. 2:13), and there is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1). The sin of unbelief, being particular in character, is evidently treated as such in the Scriptures. Again, if Christ bore the sin of unbelief along with the other sins of the elect, then no elect sinner in his unregenerate estate is

subject to any condemnation, nor does he require to be forgiven or justified in the sight of God.

If it be inquired at this point, as it frequently is, whether the general call of God (John 12:32) could be sincere in every instance since He does not design the salvation of the nonelect, it may be asserted that, since the inability of the nonelect to receive the gospel is due to human sin, from His own standpoint, God is justified in extending the invitation to them. In this connection there is an important distinction to be observed between the sovereign *purpose* of God and His *desires*. For specific and worthy reasons, God, as any other being, may purpose to do more or less than He desires. His desire is evidently toward the whole world (John 3:16), but His purpose is as clearly revealed to be toward the elect. In the important passage, "who would have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. 2:4, R.V.), this distinction is seen in that the passive rather than the active form of the verb *save* is used.

VIII. The Nature of Substitution

The limited redemptionists sincerely believe that Christ's substitution for a lost soul *necessitates* the salvation of that soul. The following is another argument from John Owen: "For whom Christ died, He died as their sponsor, in their room and stead, that He might free them from guilt and desert of death (Isa. 53:5, 6; Rom. 5:6–8; Gal. 3:13; 2 Cor. 5:21). Evidently He changeth turns with us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. … Christ dying for men made satisfaction for their sins, that they should not die. Now, for what sins He made satisfaction, for them the justice of God is satisfied; which surely is not done for the sins of the reprobates, because He justly punisheth them to eternity upon themselves (Matt. 5:26)" (as summarized by Alexander, *ibid.*, p. 108). This is a fair issue and there is some light available through the careful consideration of the precise nature of substitution itself.

Man did not first discover the necessity of a substitute to die in his room and stead; this necessity was in the heart of God from all eternity. Who can declare what sin actually is in the sight of infinite rectitude? Who will assume to measure the ransom price God must require for the sinner? Who can state what the just judgments of outraged holiness were, which were

required by the Father and rendered by the Son? Or who can declare the cost to God of the disposition of sin itself from His presence forever?

Two Greek prepositions are involved in the doctrine of substitution: (1)'Υπέρ (translated *for*), which word is broad in its scope and may mean no more than that a thing accomplished becomes a benefit to others. In this respect it would be declared by this word that Christ's death became a benefit to a greater or less degree to those for whom He died. This word is, however, at times invested with the most absolute substitutionary meaning (cf. Heb. 2:9; Titus 2:14; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18; 4:1). (2) 'Αντί (also translated *for*), which word conveys the thought of complete substitution of one thing or person in the place of another. Orthodox men, whether of one school or the other, will contend alike that Christ's death was *for* men in the most definite sense. However, substitution may be either *absolute* or *conditional*, and in the case of Christ's death for the sinner it was both absolute and conditional. Marshall Randles in his book on *Substitution*, page 10, states this twofold aspect of truth thus: "Substitution may be absolute in some respects, and conditional in others, *e.g.*, a philanthropist may pay the ransom price of an enslaved family, so that the children shall be unconditionally freed, and the parents only on condition of their suitably acknowledging the kindness. Similarly the substitution of Christ was partly absolute, and partly conditional, in proportion to man's capacity of choice and responsibility. His death availed for the rescue of infants from the race-guilt; their justification, like their condemnation, being independent of their knowledge and will, and irrespective of any condition which might render the benefit contingent. But for the further benefit of saving men who have personally and voluntarily sinned, the death of Christ avails potentially, taking effect in their complete salvation if they accept Him with true faith."

It is not a question of the perfect character of Christ's substitution; His substitution is as complete whether applied at one time or another, or if it never be applied. It is not a question of the ability or the inability of the sinner to believe apart from divine enablement. It is rather a question of whether the full value of Christ's death might be *potentially* provided for the nonelect, even though they never benefit by it, but are only judged because of it. The limited redemptionists, it may be restated, believe that the elect are saved because it is *necessary* for them to be saved in view of the fact that Christ died for them. The unlimited redemptionists believe that the

substitutionary death of Christ accomplished to infinite perfection all that divine holiness could ever require for every lost soul of this age; that the elect are saved on the ground of Christ's death for them through the effective call and divine enablement of the Spirit; that the value of Christ's death is rejected even by the elect until the hour that they believe; and that that value is rejected by the nonelect forever, and for this rejection they are judged.

It has been objected at this point that the belief of the unlimited redemptionist results in the end in man being his own savior; that is, he is saved or lost according to his works. The question of whether believing on Christ is a saving work has been considered earlier in this thesis. One passage of Scripture will suffice to clear this matter. In Romans 4:5 it is written: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Here the thought is not that the candidate for salvation performs no works *except* belief, but rather that by believing he turns from all works of his own, on which he might depend, and confides in Another to do that which no human works could ever do. By so much the determination rests with man, though it is recognized that no man possesses saving faith apart from a divine enablement to that end. Recognition must be given by all to the fact—to be expanded later on—that the peculiar manner in which God enlightens the mind and moves the heart of the unsaved to the end that they gladly accept Christ as Savior, is in no way a coercion of the will; rather the human volition is strengthened and its determination is the more emphatic. It is futile to attempt to dismiss the element of human responsibility from the great gospel texts of the New Testament.

It is both reasonable and Scriptural to conclude that a perfect substitution avails for those who are saved: that, in the case of the elect, it is delayed in its application until they believe and in the case of the non-elect, it is never applied at all.

IX. The Testimony of the Scriptures

In the progress of the discussion between the limited redemptionists and the unlimited redemptionists, much Scripture is noted on each side and, naturally, some effort is made by each group to harmonize that which might

seem to be conflicting between these lines of proof. Some of the passages cited by the limited redemptionists are:

John 10:15. "I lay down my life for the sheep." This statement is clear. Christ gave His life for His elect people; however, it is to be observed that both Israel's election and that of the Church are referred to in this text (vs. 16).

John 15:13. Christ laid down His life for His friends.

John 17:2, 6, 9, 20, 24. In this most important Scripture Christ declares that He gives eternal life to as many as are given to Him, that an elect company has been given to Him, that He prays now only for this elect company, and that He desires that this elect company may be with Him in glory.

Romans 4:25. Christ is here said to have been delivered for *our* (the elect) sins and raised again for *our* (the elect) justification. This, too, is specific.

Ephesians 1:3–7. In this extended text the fact that Christ is the Redeemer of His elect people is declared with absolute certainty.

Ephesians 5:25–27. In which passage Christ is revealed as both loving the Church and giving Himself for it, that He might bring it with infinite purity and glory into His own possession and habitation.

In contemplating the Scriptures cited above, and many others of the same specific character, the unlimited redemptionists assert that it is the primary purpose of Christ to bring many sons into glory and that He never lost sight of this purpose; that it actuated Him in all His sufferings and death is beyond question, and that His heart is centered on those who are thus given to Him of the Father. However, not once do these passages exclude the truth, equally emphasized in the Scripture, that He died for the whole world. There is a difference to be noted between the *fact* of His death and the *motive* of His death. He may easily have died for all men with a view to securing His elect. In such a case, Christ would have been actuated by two great purposes: one, to pay the forensic ransom price for the world; the other, to secure His elect Body and Bride. The former of these purposes seems to be implied in such texts as Luke 19:10, "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," and John 3:17, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved," while the latter seems to be implied in such

passages as John 10:15, “As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep.” The Scriptures do not always include all the truth involved in the theme presented, at a given place. Similarly, if the fact that any reference to the nonelect world is omitted from these passages (which refer only to the elect) is a sufficient ground for the contention that Christ died only for the elect, then it could be argued with inexorable logic that Christ died only for Israel (cf. John 11:51; Isa. 53:8); and that He died only for the Apostle Paul, for Paul declares “who loved me, and gave himself for me” (Gal. 2:20). As well might one contend that Christ restricted His prayers to Peter because of the fact that He said to Peter: “But I have prayed for thee” (Luke 22:32). To the unlimited redemptionist these Scriptures present not the slightest difficulty. He interprets these great passages precisely as does his opponent. He believes in the sovereign election of God and the one and only heavenly purpose to gather out a redeemed people for heaven’s glory. However, the limited redemptionist is not able to deal with the unlimited redemption passages as easily. Important passages may be grouped together thus:

1. Passages Which Declare Christ’s Death to Be for the Whole World (John 3:16; 2 Cor. 5:19; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2). The limited redemptionist states that the use of the word *world* in these and similar passages is restricted to mean the world of the elect, basing the argument on the fact that the word *world* may at times be restricted in the extent of its scope and meaning. They claim that these universal passages, to be in harmony with the revelation that Christ died for an elect company, must be restricted to the elect. According to this interpretation, John 3:16 would read: “God so loved the elect, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever [of the elect] believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” 2 Corinthians 5:19 would read: “God was in Christ, reconciling the elect unto Himself.” Hebrews 2:9 would read: “He tasted death for every man of those who comprise the company of the elect.” 1 John 2:2 would read: “He is the propitiation for our [the elect] sins: and not for our’s only, but also for the sins of those who comprise the world of elect people.” John 1:29 would read: “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the elect.”

A study of the word *cosmos* has been presented in Volume II. There it was seen that usually this word refers to a satanic system which is antigod in character, though in a few instances it refers to the unregenerate people who are in the *cosmos.* Three passages serve to emphasize the antipathy which obtains between the saved, who are "chosen out of the world," and the world itself: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John 15:18–19); "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John 17:16); "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 John 5:19). Yet, in support of a theory, it is claimed that the elect, which the world hates and from which it has been saved, is the "world." Dr. Shedd points to certain specific passages. To quote: "Sometimes it is the world of believers, the church. Examples of this use are: John 6:33, 51, 'The bread of God is he which giveth life to the world' [of believers]. Rom. 4:13, Abraham is 'the heir of the world' [the redeemed]. Rom 11:12, 'If the fall of them be the riches of the world.' Rom. 11:15, 'If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world.' In these texts, 'church' could be substituted for 'world'" (*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 479). It is an assumption, quite foreign to Dr. Shedd, to declare that the word *ecclesia*—called-out ones—should be substituted for the word *cosmos* in these passages. Not one of them requires consideration in any other light than that usually accorded to the satanic system.

2. Passages Which are All-Inclusive in Their Scope (2 Cor. 5:14; 1 Tim. 2:6; 4:10; Titus 2:11; Rom. 5:6). Again, the limited redemptionist points out that in various passages the word *all* is restricted to the elect. Indeed, such passages must be restricted if the cause of the limited redemptionist is to stand—but are these properly so restricted? By the limited redemptionist's interpretation, 2 Corinthians 5:14 would read: "If one died for the elect, then were the elect dead." 1 Timothy 2:6 would read: "who gave Himself a ransom for the elect, to be testified in due time." 1 Timothy 4:10 would read: "who is the Saviour of the elect, especially of those who believe." Titus 2:11 would read: "The grace of God that bringeth

salvation hath appeared unto the elect." Romans 5:6 would read: "In due time Christ died for the elect, in their ungodly estate."

3. Passages Which Offer a Universal Gospel to Men (John 3:16; Acts 10:43; Rev. 22:17, etc.). The word *whosoever* is used at least 110 times in the New Testament, and always with the unrestricted meaning.

4. A Special Passage, 2 Peter 2:1, wherein the ungodly false teachers of the last days who bring swift destruction upon themselves are said to "deny the Lord that bought them." Men are thus said themselves to be ransomed who deny the very ground of salvation and who are destined to destruction.

Two statements may be in order in concluding this division of this discussion:

(a) The interpretation of John 3:16 which the limited redemptionist offers tends to restrict the love of God to those among the unregenerate who are the elect. In support of this, passages are quoted which declare God's peculiar love for His saved people. There is no question that there is a "much more" expression of the love of God for men after they are saved than before (Rom. 5:8–10), though His love for unsaved men is beyond measure; but to assert that God loves the elect in their unregenerate estate more than the nonelect, is an assumption without Scriptural proof. Some limited redemptionists have been bold enough to say that God does not love the nonelect at all.

(b) What if God did give His Son to die for all men of this dispensation in an equal sense, to the end that all might be legitimately invited to gospel privileges, could He, if actuated by such a purpose, use any more explicit language than He has used to express such an intent?

Conclusion

Again let it be said that to disagree with good and worthy teachers is undesirable, to say the least; but when these teachers appear on both sides of a question, as in the present discussion, there seems to be no alternative. By an inner bent of mind some men tend naturally to accentuate the measureless values of Christ's death, while others tend to accentuate the glorious results of the application of those values in the immediate salvation of the lost. The gospel must be understood by those to whom it is preached; and it is wholly impossible for the limited redemptionist, when presenting the gospel, to hide with any completeness his conviction that the death of Christ is only for the elect. And nothing could be more confusing to an unsaved person than to be drawn away from the consideration of the saving grace of God in Christ, to the contemplation of the question whether he is elect or not. Who can prove that he is of the election? If the preacher believes that some to whom he addresses his message could not be saved under any circumstances, those addressed have a right to know what the preacher believes and in time will know. Likewise, it is not wholly sincere to avoid the issue by saying the preacher does not know whether any nonelect are present. Are they absent from every service? Is it not reasonable to suppose that they are usually present when such a vast majority of humanity will probably never be saved at all? In this discussion of this and other problems respecting the value of Christ's death, no greater wrong could be imposed than that, by a philosophical contemplation of truths that are throbbing with glory, light, and blessing, the evangelistic fervor of even one who is called to preach salvation through Christ to lost men should be dampened. May the God who loved a lost world to the extent that He gave His own Son to die for that world, ever impart that passion of soul to those who undertake to convey the message of that measureless love to men!

The Saving Work of the Triune God

Chapter XI

THE FINISHED WORK OF CHRIST

RESPECTING THE THEME now under consideration, no words of Scripture more accurately or completely describe the destiny-determining truth that God is the Author, Executor, and Consummator of man's salvation than Jonah 2:9 and Psalm 3:8. These texts assert: "Salvation is of Jehovah" and "Salvation belongeth unto Jehovah." Though the references, like all in the Old Testament, contemplate those aspects of salvation which are peculiar to the old order—often extending no further than to imply that God's covenant people were delivered from their enemies—these uncomplicated and conclusive declarations serve as well to set forth the truth regarding the broader field of divine undertaking in man's salvation as recorded in the New Testament. The gospel preacher should ever be on his guard lest by so much as an inference or intimation he violate or contradict the transcendent revelation that salvation is of Jehovah. Not the slightest insinuation should ever be advanced which implies that man might share in, or contribute to, that final consummation in eternal glory. Again, reason as well as revelation may serve to guide the mind; for, it will be seen, every step of the way from the divine election from before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4) to the presentation in faultless perfection in glory is superhuman and therefore must be wrought, if wrought at all, by Another who is mighty to save. At no point has Arminianism—and with it all other forms of rationalism—missed the way more completely than it has respecting the truth that salvation is of Jehovah, being misled—often in real sincerity—by the wholly irrelevant fact that God does instruct the one who is saved about his manner of life. Confusion and contradiction arise when these later life-responsibilities are allowed to enter as a part of the human requirements in salvation. By such teachers it is claimed that man is saved by the power of God through faith, provided he continues by good works to adorn the doctrine which he professes. No less subversive of the truth of divine grace is that disposition to require of the unsaved some form of meritorious works as a part of the human step in the initial stage of salvation. That salvation from its beginning to its end is all a work of God in response to saving faith

uncomplicated by any form of human merit, virtue, or works, is the cornerstone in the whole structure of Soteriology. It is true, a saved person may do things for God; but the reality of his salvation is due alone to the truth that God has done things for him. Too often this essential feature of salvation is acknowledged as a theory and then, for want of due consideration or consistency, such human requirements are imposed on the unsaved as the condition of their salvation as deny the fundamental truth that salvation is by faith alone. In this introductory word only a passing reference to these issues may be made, which issues, later on (Chapter XX), must be considered with utmost attention.

To the same end that clarity may prevail, it is essential to recognize that the "salvation [which] is of Jehovah" includes the three Persons of the Godhead as actively engaged in the realization of this stupendous undertaking. It has been demonstrated in previous pages that the central truth of Soteriology is the fact that the Second Person became incarnate and died a sacrificial death; however, when salvation is viewed in its broader aspects, it is seen to be wrought as fully by the First Person and the Third Person. In every aspect of saving grace the three Persons are concurring. Even when hanging on the cross, the Son was not alone in His vast achievement. It was God who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; the Father was offering His Lamb; and that sacrifice was offered through the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14).

The entire scope of the divine undertaking by which a person may be saved and presented faultless before the presence of His glory is here to be contemplated—and without reference to that divine election which was before all time—under seven general divisions, namely, (1) the finished work of Christ, (2) the convicting work of the Spirit (Chap. XII), (3) the riches of divine grace (Chap. XIII), (4) the doctrine of security (Chaps. XIV–XVII), (5) deliverance from the reigning power of sin, (6) deliverance from human limitations (Chap. XVIII), and (7) the believer presented faultless (Chap. XIX).

No apology is to be made for the renewal of the discussion of the finished work of Christ. It inheres as an essential factor of the present theme. The consideration of it again is safe for the student since it is fundamental to a right understanding of the gospel of divine grace, and must undergird every worthy presentation of it.

Attention has been called before to the truth that what is termed *the finished work of Christ* includes a threefold contemplation of the value of Christ's death as related to the unsaved. That death is a redemption toward sin, a reconciliation toward man, and a propitiation toward God. No one, or even two, of these aspects of Christ's death for the unsaved will represent a full exhibition of that specific phase of His death. All three are required; but the three together form a perfect whole which is properly termed *the finished work of Christ.* No aspect of the sin problem can be conceived which does not find its solution in this threefold achievement. With sufficient consideration of these aspects of doctrine, the student will early arrive at the point where the theological usage by which all that Christ wrought in His death is referred to as *redemption* will be judged as misleading, and the mind will require as clear a recognition of the facts of *reconciliation* and *propitiation* as of *redemption.* He will as certainly depart from the theological tradition that these are synonymous terms which relate to one and the same thing. Since these three aspects of Christ's accomplishment in His death are so foundational to all features of Soteriology, reference must be made to them in subsequent discussion, as they have been considered in that which has gone before.

Argument could not arise against the truth that the finished work of Christ is altogether and only a work of God for man to which man could make no contribution whatever. Men, indeed, had their part in the crucifixion of Christ (Acts 4:27–28), but only as the perpetrators of the greatest crime in the universe. These effective factors in Christ's death for the unsaved are not even remotely within the range of human cooperation. In relation to this threefold work of Christ, man can sustain no part in it other than to *believe* that it avails for him. To those who believe, the whole value of Christ's finished work is reckoned and, because of that reckoning, they stand at once redeemed from condemnation because of sin, reconciled with respect to their own relation to God, and sheltered perfectly under that satisfaction which Christ offered to outraged holiness. By so much, the one who believes is forevermore upon a peace footing with God (Rom. 5:1). These immeasurable benefits to fallen man are incomprehensible; but though the sum total of all the divine blessings which are gained through the death of Christ be added into one vast whole, that mighty sum is small

indeed as compared with the value to God Himself of that which Christ wrought by His death upon the cross.

As a designed purpose, the salvation of men had its origin in God and accomplishes an objective which answers the divine intent with that infinity of perfection which characterizes every work of God. As for relative importance, the realization of His aim is not only the major goal in view, but is the whole of that aim. That men are rescued from eternal misery is but an integral aspect of the entire objective; for it will not be overlooked that neither the creation of the universe, including all moral beings, nor the fall of man was imposed upon God as a necessity. It is not difficult to deduce from that supreme divine pronouncement—Colossians 1:15–19: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell"—that creation, including angels and men, is wrought by the Second Person, the Savior of the world, and for Him, and that every adhesion by which the universe holds together and every progression in the march of time is due to His immediate presence, support, and power. Supreme above all is His headship in relation to the Church, and by the Church all fulness of satisfaction is secured to God; for there is that in the Church which corresponds to "the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints." Upon the divine side, the salvation of men is not merely a rescuer's expedition or heroism. It is of surpassing import to fallen men that they may be saved; but back of that is a divine project the realization of which is in itself important enough to justify the creation of a universe, the incarnation of the Second Person, and His sacrificial death. It follows that the bringing of many sons unto glory (Heb. 2:10) achieves more for the One by whom it is designed and wrought than for the sons who are glorified. Every step God is taking in this great achievement makes its permanent contribution to that which will glorify Him henceforth and forever.

It may be concluded that, by the death of Christ as a redemption toward sin, a reconciliation toward man, and a propitiation toward God, a higher morality is developed by which the Holy One, who cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance, is able to remain just while He justifies the ungodly who do no more than to believe in Jesus (Rom. 3:26; 4:5).

Chapter XII

The Convicting Work of the Spirit

What is presented in this general division is based on the truth that there are two necessities underlying the salvation of a soul, namely, (1) a righteous dealing with the problem of human sin—and this God has consummated in the gift of His Son as the Lamb who took away the sin of the world—and (2) a free choice of salvation on the part of man and in view of the fact that God recognizes the free will of man for what He created it to be. It is reasonable to conclude that as man by an act of his will renounced God at the beginning, in like manner he, by the act of his own will, must return to God. It matters nothing at this point that man cannot of himself turn to God and that he must be enabled to do so. In the end, though enabled, he acts by his own will and this truth is emphasized in every passage wherein the salvation of man is addressed to his will. "Whosoever will may come."

The present chapter aims to point out that aspect of the saving work of God by which He, by the Spirit, exerts an influence upon the unsaved by which they may make an intelligent acceptance of Christ as Savior and by which they are caused to desire the salvation which Christ provides. It is as definitely contended that, apart from this divine influence, no unregenerate person will ever turn to God. From this it will be seen that, next to the accurate and faithful presentation of the gospel of saving grace, no truth is more determining respecting all forms of evangelism than this. It is in connection with this specific enabling work of the Spirit that the sovereign election of God is manifested. Only those are included whom God *calls, draws,* and *enlightens.* The gospel is to be preached to all, but not all will respond to it. Because of the fact that not all do respond to the gospel, earnest evangelists and preachers have often been distressed, supposing that stronger appeals, mightier arguments, and greater personal influence would bring those who are indifferent to Christ as Savior, thus ignoring this all-determining preliminary work of the Spirit by which alone unregenerate people may believe. Outward actions have been stressed in soul-winning—actions which may be performed apart from any heart-acceptance of Christ as Savior. These outward professions have too often been counted as

salvation. Because of the fact that such superficial avowals prove spurious, doctrines have been encouraged which allow for the possibility of surrendering saving faith. Since it is clearly indicated that one hundred percent of those predestinated are called, and one hundred percent of those called are justified, and one hundred percent of those justified are glorified (Rom. 8:30), the evangelist does well to consider the importance of the divine call by which the heart is inclined and sufficiently enlightened to act intelligently on its own account and by its own volition in the glad acceptance of Christ as Savior. Only confusion and spiritual darkness can result when, apart from this illuminating divine call, the unsaved are forced by human pressure into professions which have no origin in the heart itself. No ground is found in the Bible for the Arminian notion of a general bestowment of grace whereby all men are able to respond to the gospel appeal; yet such a belief, along with the added error that those once saved can be lost again, has encouraged soul-winners to press the unsaved into outward assumptions and expressions which have no depth of conviction behind them. Such profession must end in failure; but little consideration has been given to the damage which is done to the soul that attempts such man-impelled professions and finds them to fail. Any method or appeal which encourages men to do aught other than to *believe* on Christ is fraught with dangers which are infinite and eternal. It is true that only the elect will believe; but what misrepresentation of, and insult to, God's faithfulness is engendered when, because of wrong doctrine and misleading appeals, a theory must be propounded and defended which contradicts God's unconditional covenant that those predestinated will be called, justified, and glorified.

The extended truth related to that work of the Spirit in the human heart which precedes salvation and which makes salvation possible will be considered under three divisions, namely, (1) the need of the Spirit's work, (2) the fact of the Spirit's work, and (3) the result of the Spirit's work.

I. The Need of the Spirit's Work

Dr. A. A. Hodge distinguishes three meanings in the word *inability* as it applies to men—it is *absolute, natural,* and *moral.* He writes:

It is *absolute* in the proper sense of that term. No unregenerate man has power either directly or indirectly to do what is required of him in this respect; nor to change his own nature so as to increase his power; nor to *prepare* himself for grace, nor in *the first instance* to co-operate with grace, until in the act of regeneration God changes his nature and gives him through grace gracious ability to act graciously in constant dependence upon grace. It is *natural* in the sense that it is not accidental or adventitious but innate, and that it belongs to our fallen nature as propagated by natural law from parent to child since the fall. It is *not* natural in *one* sense, because it does not belong to the nature of man as created. Man was created with plenary ability to do all that was in any way required of him, and the possession of such ability is always requisite to the moral perfection of his nature. He may be a real man without it, but can be a perfect man only with it. The ability graciously bestowed upon man in regeneration is not an endowment extra-natural, but consists in the restoration of his nature, in part, to its condition of primitive integrity. *It* is *not* natural in another sense, because it does not result in the least from any constitutional deficiency in human nature as it now exists as to its rational and moral faculties of soul. This inability is purely *moral*, because while every responsible man possesses all moral as well as intellectual faculties requisite for right action, the moral *state* of his faculties is such that right action is impossible. Its *essence* is in the inability of the soul to know, love, or choose spiritual good, and its *ground* exists in that moral corruption of soul whereby it is blind, insensible, and totally averse to all that is spiritually good.—*Outlines of Theology*, pp. 340–41

And Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander also states:

The inability of man to deliver himself from guilt and condemnation arises from want of power to do what is requisite for the attaining of the object; the inability of man to be good and holy arises from a want of will or inclination to do what he has the power physically to do. Strictly speaking, the inability in this latter case is simply confirmed indisposition to do what is right, arising from spiritual blindness and depravity. Man has not lost the capacity to be holy; he has not ceased to be a free agent, choosing what he prefers, and determining his own acts; he is under no external force preventing him from being holy. The spiritual inability under which he lies is that of a mind set against God, destitute of the principle of spiritual vitality and activity, through carnality and worldliness and sinful indulgence incapable of discerning the beauty of holiness, and so environed and permeated by selfishness that all true love to God is excluded from it. This is a real inability, inasmuch as it hinders and prevents man from being holy, though it does not destroy his capacity for being holy.—*System of Biblical Theology*, I, 324

However, the objective in the immediate discussion is not to demonstrate the general inability of fallen man—to which fact the Scriptures bear abundant proof—but to make evident the more specific truth that unregenerate men are not able to take one step, apart from the enabling power of the Spirit, in the direction of their salvation. The Arminian error which avers that a general and universal grace is given to all men by which they, if they will, may turn to God is exposed and reproved by a large body

of Scripture, and no Scripture is found which sustains this error. Several of these vital passages may well be considered at this point:

Romans 3:10–18. "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes."

Following the disclosure set forth in Romans 3:9 of the age-characterizing truth that Jews and Gentiles are now alike divinely reckoned to be "under sin," which means that they are without merit in respect to their salvation, an unqualified condemnation, asserted in verses 10–18, is said to rest upon all men. Of the various affirmations in this context, one directly precludes the idea that unregenerate people of this age have ability in themselves to turn to God. This Scripture declares: "There is none that seeketh after God." In spite of this far-reaching statement, men have too often been urged to "seek the LORD while he may be found" (Isa. 55:6), not discovering the wide difference between the restoration of a covenant people and the present estate of the human race—Jew and Gentile alike—"under sin." In the present age there is but One that is seeking. Luke 19:10 records Christ's own words, "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Thus it is seen to be by divine initiative alone that any from among the lost are, in this age, brought to the place where they embrace the salvation which is in Christ Jesus. A portion of this Romans passage, it will be seen, is quoted from Psalm 14:1–3; yet it is clear that, while the Psalm exhibits the natural wickedness of man as common to all ages and a distinct Old Testament revelation, it omits the *specific* declaration that none are seeking after God, thus perhaps implying that the inability to seek is not only true, but has a particular manifestation in the present age of grace.

1 Corinthians 2:14. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

The “things of the Spirit of God” which the unregenerate man is here said to be unable to receive include a vast field of revelation, but none more in evidence than the Scriptures which invite men to God and which extend to them the many wonderful promises. To the unsaved, these Scriptures are “foolishness,” and, owing to their inability, they are disqualified from knowing or receiving these things of God. Romans 8:7 bears on this same incapacity: “Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Likewise, Romans 1:21 asserts that, having rejected God in the beginning of the human race, men “became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.” Here, as before, much more than depravity is published. It is the inability of man to turn to God apart from divine enablement, which is disclosed.

2 Corinthians 4:3–4.“But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”

This will be concluded at once to be the most direct and decisive passage bearing on the question whether the unsaved have any power, apart from immediate divine enlightenment, to turn to God in saving faith. It is the gospel—by which alone men are saved—which has been veiled by Satan to the end that its truth should not reach them. Men are not blinded with regard to morals, education, and those things which make for refinement. Upon those and similar themes all may attend without difficulty and within the range of their native ability. On the other hand, as all experienced soul-winners must recognize, the unsaved remain unimpressed with the way of salvation until they are awakened by the Spirit, and when awakened, their response and enthusiasm is a marvel to behold. This blinding is said to be wrought by Satan, and it is implied that it is one of his strategies in the execution of his purpose to defeat God in His grace toward lost men. This satanic effort to defeat God is to be expected from all that has transpired between God and Satan in past ages, and in the light of the fact that a soul when saved is translated “from the power of darkness” (Col. 1:13) and becomes a witness against Satan in this sphere of his activity. The same truth that the mind of the unsaved is blinded is declared in Ephesians 4:18: “having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their

heart.” In the light of this Scripture, little ground remains on which the notion may rest which avers that man is able, apart from immediate divine enablement, to turn to God in saving faith.

Ephesians 2:1–3. “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.”

An estate in spiritual death is by the Apostle thus said to characterize all the “children of disobedience”; and since this disobedience refers to the first sin of the federal head of the race, the term *children of disobedience* includes all who are unsaved—those who have not, by being united to the resurrected Christ, come under the blessing made possible through the obedience of Christ (Phil. 2:8). The estate of spiritual death is universal, and no more should be expected of a spiritually dead person than he is able to produce. Being, as this passage declares, under Satan’s control, no revolutionary, independent turning to God will be permitted. Those in Satan’s power will turn to God only as One who is greater in power than Satan moves them so to turn.

Akin to this specific revelation is that written in 1 John 5:19: “And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” It requires more understanding concerning angelic realities than human beings possess to comprehend the meaning of the word κεῖμαι, here translated *lieth*, which implies a vital, if not organic, union between the unsaved and Satan. Out of such a relationship no individual may hope to be released apart from divine deliverance.

John 3:3. “Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.”

According to this passage, the incapacity of the unsaved is to a marked degree emphasized by Christ. The kingdom of God is that spiritual realm into which one may enter only by a birth from above, and which, though infinitely real and rich in its essentials, cannot be seen or comprehended by unregenerate men. There is special force in this unqualified assertion by Christ in view of the fact that it was addressed to one of the most faithful

and religious men of his day. The truth that the most conscientious of Judaism needed a new birth, which evidently he little understood, should not be overlooked. No discredit is implied respecting the great factors and blessings which Judaism secured; but it is clearly demonstrated here, as everywhere that this truth appears, that a new and marvelous reality is introduced by the death and resurrection of Christ and by the advent of the Holy Spirit. It is in the range of these new and measureless blessings that the inability of the unsaved to "see the kingdom of God" is demonstrated.

John 6:44. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day."

The counterpart passage—"No man cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John 14:6)—declares the truth that there is but one way for the lost to be saved (cf. Acts 4:12; Heb. 7:25); but the passage under consideration discloses the truth that none will ever come to the Savior apart from the immediate drawing power of God. The statement is unqualified and final. The message presented is so important that the Savior goes on to say: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (John 6:45).

The present discussion involves the whole doctrine of the divine call. There is a general drawing which is exercised wherever and whenever Christ is preached as Savior (John 12:32), but such should not be confused with the specific and irresistible drawing to which reference is made in John 6:44. Of all who are thus drawn, the Savior could say with an unqualified assurance, "And I will raise him up at the last day." Likewise, there is a general call which may be felt whenever the gospel is preached, and it, too, may be resisted, as it often is; but over against this is the efficacious call of Romans 8:30. In this passage, as before observed, it is assured that everyone whom God predestinates is called, and the precise numerical company, again, of those called are justified, and that same company—no more and no less—are to be glorified. The lost are not said here, or elsewhere, to originate their own steps toward God; rather it is as His sovereignty determines.

Ephesians 2:8–9. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

So conclusive is this passage relative to man's inability in the field of saving faith that much has been attempted in the way of exegesis which proposes to make the salvation the gift of God, rather than the faith which receives it. When thus interpreted, the phrase "through faith" is practically eliminated and serves no purpose. The contrast which the passage sets up between faith and works becomes a contrast between salvation and works, for which there is no ground either in Scripture or reason. If the passage stood alone in the Word of God, declaring a truth not elsewhere propounded, some reason might be assigned to such exegetical attempts which divest the context of its assured meaning; but, when rightly interpreted, it stands out as but one of many of the same general character.

Though much Scripture of an indirect nature might be cited, enough has been presented to establish the doctrine of man's natural inability to exercise saving faith. Were men able to move themselves toward God, there would be no provision from God for this need. The fact that such enablement is provided argues in favor of man's inability. It is too often supposed that the only restraint upon unregenerate persons in the sphere of their ability to turn to God, is their natural disinclination or prejudice. The Arminian error regarding a universal grace is largely responsible for such suppositions. If Christian workers cannot move the unsaved out of the power of Satan by argument and persuasion, a far more effective way is open and that is prayer. It is probable that God has included prayer as one of the divinely ordained means for the calling out and saving of His elect people. Prayer is not a provision by which men may secure something outside the elective will of God; it is rather one of the ordained steps in the realization of that will.

II. The Fact of the Spirit's Work

One passage, which records the words of Christ in the upper room and which anticipates the peculiar features of the present age, declares specifically the fact that the Holy Spirit undertakes a work in the hearts of unregenerate men which is quite evidently not their regeneration, but may be defined as a preparation of the mind to the end that an intelligent choice of Christ as Savior may be made. In the light of the Scriptures just considered, there would be no hope of the salvation of any individual in this

age apart from this particular ministry of the Spirit. The passage which stands quite alone respecting this work of the Spirit, reads as follows: “Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:7–11).

Evidently, this specific work is wrought in behalf of the *cosmos* world, but, of necessity, it is directed, not to the *cosmos* as a whole, but to the individual. All that the Spirit undertakes in this ministry is indicated by the word ἐλέγχω, which has been variously translated *reprove, convince, convict*, etc. The word determines so much at this point that it must not be passed over lightly.

The thought expressed by ἐλέγχω is not at all of the creation of sorrow in the heart, but rather of an illumination or enlightenment respecting certain truths which the Lord was careful to enumerate; that is, the enlightenment will be along three lines—“sin, because they believe not on me”; “righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more”; and “judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.” This ministry is one which is accomplished in the heart itself, by which the whole being responds to realities which had not been recognized before. In contrast with this ministry to the unsaved, an enlightening, or teaching, ministry is undertaken on a much wider scale in the heart of the one who is saved. This wider ministry is described and defined in the verses which follow in the same context (John 16:12–15).

These three features of revelation now under consideration—sin, righteousness, judgment—as defined in their scope by the Lord, constitute the essentials of the gospel of divine grace.

1. “Of Sin.” In view of a finished work by Christ wherein sin is borne and all blessings are secured, the immeasurable failure for the individual for whom Christ has died is that he does not *believe* on Him. It is noticeable, though contrary to general opinion, that the Spirit does not enlighten the mind with respect to all the sins the individual has committed. It is not a matter of creating shame or remorse concerning sin, nor is it so much as a

reminder of sin that has been committed—though there is nothing, on the other hand, to preclude sorrow or consciousness of sin; it is rather that, since sin has been borne by Christ, there remains the one great and only responsibility of one's attitude toward the Savior who bore the sin. This unbelief the Lord declared is the basis of final condemnation, when He said: "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18). To make the unsaved realize this is a task too great for the preacher; it must be accomplished by the Holy Spirit, and He will so reveal this specific truth to the unsaved, within the elective divine purpose, as the gospel is preached to them. The fact indicated in this text, that the one ground of condemnation is the failure to *believe* on Christ as Savior, confirms the truth, restated more than one hundred times in the New Testament, that the one and only condition of salvation is faith in Christ as Savior. Only the elect will believe and even these will do so through the enlightening ministry of the Spirit alone. However, though no complete explanation is given of all that is involved, those who do not believe, as indicated in John 3:18, are held accountable for not believing. Unfallen man would experience no such difficulty in the realms of faith; and since his present incapacity is so largely due to that original separation from God which the first sin wrought, there is, possibly, a partial solution to this problem which these Scriptures set up.

The testimony of this portion of the truth is, then, that it is the work of the Spirit to enlighten the unsaved with respect to the one determining sin, that they believe not on Christ.

2. "Of Righteousness." Since imputed righteousness is the only form of righteousness included in salvation by grace and since this context presents only those most vital truths related to man's salvation which the Holy Spirit reveals, it is clear that the reference here is to imputed righteousness—that perfect righteousness of God which Christ is and which the believer becomes when in Christ. The whole issue is of a perfect standing before God—far more, indeed, than the removal of sin by forgiveness. It is that which God bestows on "him that worketh not" (Rom. 4:5); and of the greatest importance is the truth that the one who would be saved shall come to know that he is not entering into a merit arrangement, which would

demand of him that he produce his own righteousness as a basis of acceptance before God. Gospel preaching has made much of the remission of sin through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and not more than should be; but a deplorable neglect has been accorded the equally requisite truth that a perfect standing is imputed also to the one who believes. The truth of the gospel, as outlined in John 16:7–11, is presented in a full-orbed perfection. Wherein it exceeds man's restricted discernment of the gospel will but serve to demonstrate the inattention of men to the paramount theme. As over against this careless notion that any kind of a statement will serve as a gospel message, attention should again be drawn to the unrevoked anathema of Galatians 1:8–9. So little, indeed, is the fact and value of imputed righteousness comprehended—due to a large extent to the neglect of it—that it is not easy to develop this truth to the same level of realization to which the more accentuated verity of forgiveness of sin has attained. There can be no question that the two ideas—imputed righteousness and remission of sin—are, as a challenge to the human understanding, incomparable, largely due, it would seem, to the obvious fact that remission of sin is a more or less common experience in human relationships, while the imputation of righteousness has no parallel in human experience outside that set forth in the gospel. However, were these to be compared, that which is constructive and positive, as imputed righteousness is, will be held in higher regard by those who understand it than remission of sin, which is only negative in character. What could contribute more to peace of mind and heart than the consciousness that one has become the assured recipient of a perfect and eternal standing before God?

To the extent that the great truth of imputed righteousness is foreign to human experience and to the extent that it is grounded on an invisible Person in heaven rather than on self or any human ability or character, to that degree its presentation to darkened, unregenerate minds must be supernaturally wrought by the Holy Spirit. This is precisely what He does when He convicts of righteousness. It is not affirmed that the unsaved individual must understand the complex doctrine of imputed righteousness before he can be saved; it is rather maintained that the truth that a complete standing and acceptance before God, which renders unnecessary all works of human merit, shall be comprehended and that this perfect standing

proceeds from Christ and is based on a new and vital union set up between Christ and the one who believes. Here is introduced a supernatural feature of the gospel. Divine forgiveness of sin is also a supernatural accomplishment when based on the death of Christ; but far too often forgiveness of sin is computed to be no more than a divine benevolence or generosity.

A marked distinction is to be noted between that form of righteousness which man produces and proposes to offer to God as the basis of his acceptance, and that form of righteousness which God has made available and presents to man. In God's plan of salvation, man ceases from his own works and enters into rest; for there remaineth an unending sabbath rest from all works of merit for those who believe (Heb. 4:9–10). So far as the unsaved are concerned, the requirements are met when by the specific enlightenment of the Spirit they recognize that Christ as Savior answers every need of the human heart for time and eternity. This is a far different overture than the proposition that sin may be forgiven. It extends to the larger constructive fact that a perfect righteousness is imputed to all who believe. The essential fact that the Holy Spirit is appointed so to enlighten the mind of unsaved man respecting imputed righteousness, indicates conclusively that this great truth should be included as a major factor in all gospel preaching to the unsaved. The ambitious student, bent on excelling as an effective and accurate preacher of the gospel, would do well to learn —even by tireless effort—the great doctrine of imputed righteousness.

3. "OF JUDGMENT." No reference is made by this phrase to a judgment to come; the reference is rather to the greatest of all judgments, which is now past and was accomplished by Christ as Substitute when He died the Just for the unjust, when the immeasurable billows of God's hatred of sin swept over the One who had become a sin offering for those for whom He died. This judgment, it is revealed, did concern Satan the prince of this world, but in a sense far deeper than a mere judgment of the person of that great being. The judgment accomplished infinite results for the unsaved and of these results the Holy Spirit would cause them to be enlightened.

The human mind can conceive of nothing more hopeless or helpless than a fallen human being for whom Christ did not die. Such, to an unrevealed degree, was the estate of humanity before the cross—excepting those of one

nation with whom covenants were made and who had the advantage of animal sacrifices that anticipated the values of Christ's death. It is true that the privilege of animal sacrifices was extended to humanity before the nation Israel began its history; but what the precise value of these sacrifices was is not revealed and the people did not long claim their benefits (Rom. 1:21). Apparently the very fact that no sacrifices were offered by these multitudes became the ground on which the people were claimed by Satan as his own subjects. In Isaiah 14:17, among the stupendous undertakings of Satan there enumerated, it is affirmed that Satan "opened not the door of his prisoners." Whether it was in his power to release them is, at this juncture, an unimportant question. It is enough to know that they were helpless in Satan's power. These people, with respect to helplessness, were not unlike the fallen angels for whom no sacrifice, so far as Scripture discloses, has ever been made. In the description of the mighty realities which Christ would accomplish in His first advent and which He Himself asserted were fulfilled when He came the first time, it is said that He came "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" (Isa. 61:1; cf. Luke 4:16–21).

The same truth—that Satan held a vast authority over men and that that authority was broken by Christ in His death—is recorded in Colossians 2:14–15, which reads: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it." Here, as in John 16:11, it is taught that it was by and through the cross that Christ triumphed over Satan and his fallen angels. The passage (John 16:11) hardly declares that men are redeemed by Christ's triumph over Satan and his angels; it is rather that men are redeemed by the same death which served as a judgment of Satan and his angels, and by that death are released from that power which Satan exercised over them—as indicated in Colossians 1:13: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son," and 1 John 5:19: "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness."

It is indicated that the Spirit will enlighten the unsaved with respect to judgment—both that their sins are judged and that the one is judged who, because of his assumed authority over the unsaved, holds them in his

power. A central truth of the gospel is that Christ in His death as Substitute bore the sins of those who are lost, and there is no truth which needs more the illumination of the Spirit if it is to be disclosed to Satan-blinded minds. This enlightenment is of a work that is finished, to which nothing need be added and to which nothing could be added. It is a work finished as a redemption toward sin, a reconciliation toward the sinner, and propitiation toward God. The work is not something the sinner must persuade God to do, but is something perfectly accomplished, to which the unsaved can sustain no other relation than to believe what God has wrought in his behalf.

Thus it may be deduced that John 16:7–11 presents a truth of measureless import—a threefold work of the Spirit in behalf of the unsaved which is not to be confused with His larger ministries when, as a part of the salvation of men, He regenerates, indwells, baptizes, and seals; nor is this specific ministry of the Spirit in enlightening the unsaved to be confused with His service to those who are saved when He bears fruit in them, exercises gifts, teaches the Word of God, and intercedes in them. When the Spirit enlightens the Satan-blinded mind regarding sin, righteousness, and judgment, that otherwise blinded mind is at once more than normally enabled to understand the three great foundational truths that sin has been judged, righteousness is available in and through Christ, and the condemning sin is failure to believe that which God now offers the sinner, namely, a perfect salvation in and through Christ the Savior. No soul can be saved apart from this enlightenment, for no other power is sufficient to break through the blindness which Satan has imposed on the minds of those who are lost. It therefore follows that evangelism which is adjusted to God’s Word will make a large place for this preliminary work of the Spirit and recognize that in answer to prayer alone the souls of lost men may be moved to believe on Christ.

III. The Results of the Spirit’s Work

To a degree which allows of no exception, the Scriptures assert the supernatural inability of fallen men to turn to God in saving faith, apart from the supernatural unveiling of the mind which Satan has darkened. It is equally true that this divine enlightenment results in an ability to understand

the gospel, which ability is augmented beyond that which is the natural competency of the individual thus blessed. Those thus favored enter into the riches of divine grace by a faith which God engenders. That faith, it is declared, is “not of yourselves: it is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8). Such imparted or inwrought faith leads on to a personal transaction with Christ—that specific commitment without which no adult or accountable person will be saved. In this enlightenment the natural faculties of seeing and hearing are also enlarged. The blind receive their sight and can say, “Whereas I was blind, now I see”; and the deaf hear. Such likewise was the spiritual meaning of those miracles in which Christ gave sight to blind eyes and opened deaf ears. To these realities He referred when He said: “And this is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day. … It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me” (John 6:39–40, 45). These passages exhibit the sovereignty of God, and no Scripture is more absolute about divine determination than verse 44 of this same context: “No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.” It is here in the sphere of an effectual call that the divine election is realized. It is not determined on the basis of a theory that there is a selected company for whom alone Christ has died, nor are men saved because of anything good—actual or foreseen—in them. In sovereign grace God predestined and those whom He predestined, He called—no more and no less—and whom He called, He justified—no more and no less—and whom He justified, He glorified—no more and no less. The Arminian practice of intruding into this passage the human element by such phrases as, “if they will to hear the call” and, “if they remain faithful,” etc., deserves the rebuke which belongs to those who distort the Word of God by adding thereto. By these four divine actions—predestinating, calling, justifying, glorifying—the sovereign elective choice of God is disclosed. Not one of these is so related to the death of Christ that it can be claimed that it is by His death God marks off those whom He has chosen for His eternal glory. The elect and no more will be called, justified, and glorified, and evangelism would do well

to conform to this revelation and not pursue Arminian misunderstandings which propose that by methods incorporating human works of merit any person can, if he will, respond to the gospel of divine grace.

It is yet to be observed that the individual, unregenerate person must believe for himself. The reception of Christ as Savior must be by a choice which arises in the center of his own being and be a reflection of his own intelligent preference. Too often methods have been employed requiring mere outward actions which, though sincere, may indicate no heart experience; and those outward actions may be motivated by the earnest appeal of loved ones and friends who, being themselves saved, do appreciate the importance of a decision for Christ. The pressure of these outside influences has been, in many instances, the chief dependence of the evangelist for his apparent success in his work. It is often recognized that the evangelist to be a success must possess a dominating and even overpowering personality. This with other psychological influences which are skilfully employed amount to what is almost an irresistible effect. All this mass of influence may be focused upon the unsaved individual to compel him to do something which perchance is no choice of his own, nor has it a vestige of virtue in the realm of that which constitutes a decision for Christ. A few “converts” have held out and these have justified the methods used without due regard to the disastrous effect upon a soul of the one who, under such irrelevant influences, has made professions and taken positions which were unrelated to a true acceptance of Christ as Savior. The lost are saved when they hear the gospel under divine illumination, that is, when they hear and believe. “So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Rom. 10:17). As certainly as this is true, it is the preacher’s part to expect that souls will be saved *while* he is preaching, rather than after he has concluded his message and has given the unsaved something to do that they may be saved. There is a public testimony on the part of those who are saved; but this should not be confused with the simple requirement that the lost may be saved by personal faith in Christ as Savior. The appeal of the soul-winner is of value, for it has pleased God to commit the proclamation of the gospel to those who are appointed to preach the glad tidings.

Chapter XIII

The Riches of Divine Grace

This Aspect of the saving work of the triune God, though restricted to those transformations which are divinely wrought for the individual at the moment he believes, is not only supremely important since it defines the character of salvation, but is almost limitless in extent. The restrictions imposed demand that a clear distinction be made between that which has been divinely undertaken by way of preparation for the salvation of a soul, and the salvation itself. Included in the sphere of preparation are such achievements as the finished work of Christ, the enlightening work of the Spirit, and all other influences which provide the righteous ground upon which a lost soul may be saved. It is no small undertaking so to deal with the sin question that there is infinite freedom accorded God in saving the lost; nor is it a small endeavor so to move the Satan-blinded individual that he will act by his own choice in the receiving of Christ as his Savior. These two problems, it will be remembered from previous statements, form the total of that which hinders the salvation of fallen men. To satisfy the divine demands, a perfect redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation are required, while the problem on the human side is that of man's free, moral agency and the need of such influences as shall insure the right choice of the human will. A clear distinction is also required between the divine work in the immediate salvation of the soul and those responsibilities and activities which belong to the Christian life and service. Many new realities are created by regeneration and all aspects of human experience are affected by the mighty transformation which salvation secures. With respect to the distinction between salvation itself and the life responsibilities which follow, Arminianism has again wrought confusion by its misunderstandings, assuming, as that system does, that the immediate salvation—whatever it is conceived to be—is probationary and therefore made to depend, with reference to its permanence, upon holy living and faithfulness. None would deny that a holy life becomes the Christian in view of the fact that he is a child of God and also of the truth that he is a member of Christ's Body; but to make sonship, which by its nature is interminable and is a position before God which rests wholly on the merit of Christ, to be conditioned by and

dependent upon human worthiness is to contradict the whole order of divine grace and to make impotent man to be, in the end, his own savior.

The significant phrase, the “things that accompany salvation” (Heb. 6:9), may be interpreted as referring to those mighty positions and possessions which are wrought instantaneously and simultaneously by God at the instant an individual exercises saving faith in Christ. When recorded in detail—as they will yet be—it will be seen that there are at least thirty-three of these stupendous, supernatural divine undertakings and that the sum total of these achievements is the measure of the difference between one who is saved and one who is lost. The essential and all-determining fact that these divine accomplishments are wrought instantaneously and simultaneously and are never a progressive order or sequence, establishes the truth that all human beings may be, at a given time, classified as either perfectly lost—God having wrought none of these features of salvation for them—or perfectly saved—God having wrought completely and finally all that enters into the immediate salvation of a soul. There are no intermediate estates. Of no human being could it be said that he is partly saved and partly lost. In conformity with the New Testament, it must be maintained that all cultured, refined, educated, moral, and religious people—regardless of outward professions—who have not been saved by a personal faith in Christ are lost, and as perfectly lost as they would be had they none of these characteristics which, in their place, are of great value. It may be a problem whether an individual has entered into saving grace through Christ—and here there is need of a clear apprehension of the Biblical evidence of so great a change (cf. 2 Cor. 13:5; 1 John 5:13)—but there could be no problem involved with respect to the essential truth that, until perfectly saved by the infinite work of God, the soul is perfectly lost.

Similarly, the messages to be preached to these two classes—those perfectly lost and those perfectly saved—are, of necessity, different in every particular. It is to be doubted whether any text of Scripture will be found to be applicable to both classes alike. To the unsaved, God makes no appeal with regard to their manner of life; no improvement or reformation is required of them. Society and civil governments may press their claims upon unregenerate people as also upon regenerate people to the end that prescribed ideals may be realized, but this fact—in so far as it obtains—must not be confused with the uncompromised attitude of God in His

relation to these classes. He requires of the unsaved that they hear and heed the gospel only. Over against this, every divine injunction concerning a God-honoring faithfulness is addressed to the Christian and from the moment he is saved. There are no elementary, curtailed, or diminished requirements which are tempered to those who are beginners in the great responsibility of Christian living. The Scriptures recognize "babes in Christ," but they are not such because of immaturity; they are babes because of carnality (1 Cor. 3:1–2), and that form of carnality may be exhibited by those who have been Christians for fifty years.

Next to the delinquency of misstating the gospel with its immeasurable penalty (Gal. 1:8–9), is the so prevalent practice on the part of preachers of presenting Christian-life truth to the unsaved without warning them that such truth is not addressed to them. By this performance, every suggestion which might arise in the mind of the unsaved that a vital difference might exist between themselves and Christians is obliterated, and the unsaved are encouraged to believe that a Christian is one who merely acts in a certain way and such actions are all that God requires of any person. No matter how unimportant it may seem to the preacher, he cannot afford ever to address Christians about their specific duties and not remind the unsaved, if such be present, that the word being spoken can have no application to them. Such faithful discrimination will have the effect, at least, of creating a consciousness in the minds of unregenerate people that they are lost.

The thirty-three divine undertakings in the salvation of a soul, which are here designated as *the riches of grace*, represent all that God can do to satisfy His own infinite love for the sinner. If at first consideration this statement seems to be extreme, it, in due time, will be demonstrated to be true. As asserted of an earlier point in this treatment of Soteriology, the primary motive which actuates God in the salvation of the lost is the satisfying of His own love. To the end that infinite love may be gratified, He accomplishes infinite transformations. Compared to this, the thought that men are rescued from their plight, though an achievement which transcends all human understanding and naturally appeals to the mind of man, is secondary to the extent that man is secondary to God. The truth that the salvation of men affords an opportunity for God to gratify His infinite love for His creatures, is a theme which is too often neglected. It will always be remembered that because of His divine character of holiness,

God can do nothing for sinners until satisfaction for their sin has been secured—this is accomplished in the finished work of Christ—and that because of God's recognition of the free, moral agency of man, God can do nothing apart from man's own elective choice of Christ as Savior—even though that choice is engendered in the heart of man by the enlightenment of the Spirit. But when these fundamental conditions are met, every barrier is removed and infinite love instantly responds by lavishing on the man who exercises saving faith the whole measure of divine benefit, even the riches of grace in Christ Jesus. This, it will be seen, is no less than the greatest thing that Almighty God can do. One consideration alone will serve to demonstrate this truth, namely, that the saved one is destined to be conformed to the image of Christ. Infinity can conceive of nothing beyond that exalted reality, nor can omnipotence accomplish more. To be conformed to the image of Christ, to have been purified to infinite perfection by the blood of cleansing, to have received the gift of eternal life, to be clothed upon with the righteousness of God, and to have been constituted a citizen of heaven disposes practically of all that enters into the estate of fallen humanity. This great transformation is well described by the words: "the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12); yet, of all these marvels, none could be greater than that of being conformed to the image of Christ (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2).

Another revelation, which as perfectly demonstrates the truth that salvation in its immediate aspect is the supreme divine achievement, is recorded in Ephesians 2:7. In preparation for this declaration, the Apostle has mentioned one out of all the believer's possessions, namely, the gift of eternal life—announced by the words, "hath quickened us together with Christ"—and from all the believer's positions, one, namely, "in Christ Jesus," and these two represent the great reality of eternal salvation. The answer to the question of why God should undertake the measureless benefit for which these representative possessions and positions stand, is that by so great salvation God may manifest the attribute of grace, which could be manifested in no other way. Ephesians 2:7 declares: "That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." There was that in God which no created being had ever seen. They had seen His glory, His majesty, His

wisdom, and His power; but no angel or man had ever seen His grace. Other attributes might be subject to a variety of demonstrations; but the manifestation of grace is restricted to what God may do for those among men who, in spite of the fact that they deserve His judgments, are objects of His grace. As every other attribute or capacity of God must have its perfect exercise and exhibition—even for His own satisfaction—in like manner His grace must also have its infinitely perfect revealing within the restricted undertaking by which He saves the lost. To say that a sinner is saved by grace is to declare that, on the ground of a Substitute's death and in response to faith in that Savior, God has wrought a work so perfect in its entirety and so free from the cooperation of other beings that it is a complete all-satisfying-to-God demonstration of His grace. A statement of this kind may be made as easily as words may form a sentence; but who on earth or in heaven is able to comprehend the infinity of such a salvation? This demonstration, it should be added, will, by the very nature of the case, have its outshining in the life of each individual thus saved. It may be assumed that, had but one of all the human family been selected for the supreme honor of exhibiting eternally before all created beings the infinity of sovereign grace, the salvation of that one would be no different than the salvation of any one of the unnumbered throng from every kindred, tribe, and people who are saved by grace.

Too often it is assumed that divine grace in salvation is a willingness on the part of God to complete in each person's life what, perchance, may be lacking when the individual's own merit has been duly valued, the thought being that, as some, because of human virtue and faithfulness in character, are possessed of more worthiness than others, less grace would be required for those of supposed merit than would be required for those of little or no merit. The truth, already treated at length in Volume II, is that all men are now divinely reckoned and declared to be "under sin"—a state in which no merit of man is accepted by God—to the end that a standardized grace, wholly complete in itself, may be bestowed upon all alike. Were men permitted to contribute the smallest fraction toward their salvation, it would cease to be a grace manifestation and become an imperfect display of one of God's most glorious attributes. No thoughtful person will conclude that a fallen being could, under any circumstances or to any degree, cause a divine attribute to become an experienced reality. Man may become the recipient

of grace, but he cannot contribute to it in the sense that he enables it to become what it is. No more conclusive setting forth of this sublime truth will be found than that recorded in Romans 4:16, “Therefore it is of faith [nothing on man’s part], that it might be by grace [everything on God’s part]; to the end the promise might be sure to all the [Abrahamic] seed” (that which is of the flesh, Israel, and that which is of the Spirit, the elect from among the Gentiles). On what other basis than faith on man’s part and grace on God’s part could any divine promise or purpose be *sure?*

In concluding these introductory words, it may be restated that saving grace is that which God accomplishes on the ground of Christ’s death — accomplished and provided as a divine responsibility—and in response to the individual’s faith in Christ—a human responsibility. This general division of this theme will be presented in three parts: (1) the estate of the lost, (2) the essential character of God’s undertakings, and (3) the riches of divine grace.

I. The Estate of the Lost

The word *lost* is used in the New Testament in two widely different ways. An object may be lost in the sense that it needs to be found. This use of the word does not imply that a change in the structure or character of the lost object is thereby indicated. It is lost only to the extent that it is out of its rightful place. Israel wandering from their covenants were styled by Christ as “the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. 10:6). In like manner, a Christian who is out of fellowship with God because of sin is misplaced; yet he remains unchanged with respect to the essential realities which make him a child of God—eternal life, imputed righteousness, and union with God. The God-given illustration of this wonderful truth is declared in the threefold parable of Luke 15. A sheep is lost and is “found.” It was a sheep all the time, but was out of its place. A coin is lost from its place in the woman’s headdress and is “found.” It was the same coin all the time. A son was lost and is “found.” And he was a son in every step of his wanderings. On the other hand, a person may be lost in such a manner as to need to be *saved.* “The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost” (Luke 19:10). It is because of the fact that in salvation the structural changes are such as to demand divine provisions and divine creative

powers, that the transition from the lost estate to that of the saved can be wrought only by God.

The body of truth now being considered contemplates at least four reasons why those who are of this fallen race are lost:

1. The lost soul has attained to none of the eternal realities that make a Christian what he is. All that may be said of the unsaved is *negative*. No Scripture makes this clearer than Ephesians 2:12, in which the Ephesian Christians are reminded of the lost estate from which they were saved: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

2. Individuals are lost, also, because of the fact that they are born with a fallen, sinful nature. This is no doubt the most condemning feature of man's lost estate. When Adam sinned, he experienced a conversion downward. He became an entirely different kind of being. After the fall, he could propagate only "in his own likeness," and his first son was a murderer. Adam—in whom Eve is reckoned as one—is the only human being who ever became a sinner by sinning. All other members of the race commit sin because they are born sinners. Though this evil nature remains in the Christian as long as he is in the world, it was judged for the Christian by Christ on the cross (Rom. 6:10), and its condemnation removed. The death of Christ unto the sin nature is also the ground of the believer's deliverance by the Holy Spirit from the power of inbred sin. It is true that men are lost because of personal sins; but, since personal sins are the normal fruit of the evil nature, they should never be made the only, or even important, basis upon which a soul is lost. In reply to a claim that he is lost because of personal sin, an unregenerate person might easily assert that he had never been one percent as evil as he might have been, therefore he is only one percent lost. The lost estate consists primarily in a fallen nature, which is one hundred percent evil. An effort to be good or to form a worthy character is a poor remedy for a fallen nature. Only the grace of God acting on the ground of the death of His Son will avail.

3. Again, men are lost because of a decree which God has made concerning all who live on earth—Jew and Gentile alike—in the present age, which age is bounded by the two advents of Christ. It is written: "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved

both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (Rom. 3:9); "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" (Gal. 3:22). The phrase "under sin" means, as stated above, that God will accept the merit of no person as a contributing factor in his salvation. This decree, which eliminates all human merit, is essential if salvation is to be by grace. This does not imply that a good life is not of value in its place; but the issue under consideration is the problem of how a holy God can *perfectly* save those who, in His sight, are *perfectly* lost. He disregards that which men deem to be good—and some possess more of this goodness than others—that He may replace it with the perfection of Christ. What, for the moment, seems to be a complete loss, thus in the end becomes an infinite gain. Since, by the very way in which He saves the lost, God is preparing the material for a heavenly demonstration of the unsearchable riches of His grace (Eph. 2:7), the inclusion in this salvation of any human element is impossible.

4. Similarly and finally, men are lost because of the fact that they are under the power of Satan. Only the Word of God can speak with authority on this theme. But four passages need be cited:

2 Corinthians 4:3–4. This text declares that the unsaved are blinded in their minds by Satan, lest the saving gospel of Christ should shine unto them.

Ephesians 2:1–3. The testimony at this point is that the unsaved are "children of disobedience"—being in the headship of disobedient Adam — and that everyone is energized by Satan. In contrast to this it would be well to note Philippians 2:13, where, by use of the same word, the Christian is said to be energized by God.

Colossians 1:13. This text points to the striking fact that a soul when saved is translated out of the power of darkness, in which darkness it naturally dwells.

1 John 5:19 (R.V.). The *cosmos,* it is asserted, including the unregenerate (as being a part of it), "lieth in" the wicked one. The word *wickedness,* found in the Authorized Version, is better translated *evil* or *wicked one* (note the preceding verse where the same word occurs). Likewise, the phrase *lieth in* is deeply suggestive, indicating as it does that in some measure the unsaved are *in Satan,* while the Christians are *in Christ.*

There is strong enough intimation with regard to the condemnation that rests upon the unsaved in the Scriptures, to assert that when they are saved it is from the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13), from wrath (1 Thess. 5:9; John 3:36), from death (2 Cor. 7:10), and from destruction (2 Thess. 1:9).

II. The Essential Character of God's Undertakings

Before entering upon an enumeration of the thirty-three supernatural divine achievements which constitute the riches of grace, it is important to observe something of the essential character of these riches. Of these, seven vital singularities appear: (a) they are not experienced; (b) they are not progressive; (c) they are not related to human merit; (d) they are eternal in their character; (e) they are known only by revelation; (f) they are wrought by God alone; (g) they are not wrought by man.

1. THEY ARE NOT EXPERIENCED. This is not to imply that these riches are not real; it is rather to point out that they do not manifest their reality to the emotional nature or through the medium of the nervous system. No better illustration of this fact will be found than is afforded by the supreme divine undertaking of justification; for, obviously, justification is not felt. There is no sensation which gives corroborative evidence that the believer is justified; it rests wholly on the testimony of God. So, likewise, it is with all these riches. They are not such as human experience can identify.

2. THEY ARE NOT PROGRESSIVE. This feature of these riches is of major importance. Since it is the way of almost every human experience, it is natural to conclude that whatever God may undertake will begin with immaturity and progress by degrees to eventual completion. However, in the case of these riches, it will be discovered that the process is different. Every divine undertaking is instantly wrought to that degree of infinite perfection which it will exhibit in the eternal ages to come. Sonship well illustrates this truth. There are many features of the relation between father and son which are subject to progression and change; but sonship itself knows no advancement or development. A child is as much a son at birth as he is at any subsequent point in his existence. Thus it is with every divine accomplishment that enters into the immediate salvation of men.

3. They are Not Related to Human Merit. Beneath this truth, which truth is foreign to all human processes of life and experience, is the sovereign purpose of God to do all that He does according to His own good pleasure, and this He is free to do because the believer is seen to be—as he really is—a member in the Body of Christ, and therefore meet to be blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus. Whatever would be accorded the Son of God will be accorded a member in His Body. It is thus that these riches of grace are built solely on the merit of the Son of God, and, for that reason, are as abiding as the merit on which they rest.

4. They are Eternal in Their Character. As stated above, the work of God for the believer is based on the enduring perfection of Christ and is not, therefore, subject to the variations which characterize a vacillating human experience. As in the case of imputed righteousness, wherein no trace of human worthiness can be included, every work of God in the immediate salvation of the lost is divinely sustained and consequently eternal in its nature. The gift of eternal life is of that divine nature which has existed from all eternity and will exist forever. God's election of believers is never a fortuity.

5. They are Known Only by Revelation. Human imagination and speculation can serve to no degree in attaining to the knowledge of all that God achieves when His love is released by the death of His Son and by the faith of the sinner. No title deed or earthly record ever tabulated such treasures. Their knowledge-surpassing blessedness can be approached only as they are considered one by one in the light of all that God has declared respecting them.

6. They are Wrought by God Alone. By their very nature, the riches of grace are of necessity the work of God for man. Who could so save himself that he will be on a peace footing with God forever, and eternally justified? Who can translate himself out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God's love? Who can constitute himself a citizen of heaven, or write down his name there? God alone is able to save, according to those marvels which He declares are the portion of all who put their trust in Him.

7. They are Not Wrought by Man. In certain respects this declaration is but the negative of the preceding assertion; however, it may be observed that one who is a sinner can take no step in the direction of his own redemption. He who is on earth can devise nothing for himself in heaven. He who is only a creature cannot conform himself to the likeness of his Creator. He who is of time cannot design and execute for eternity. Salvation is more than the continued existence of a good man; it provides the most radical transformations, the acquiring of infinite possessions, and the entering into positions which are in the sphere of heaven and of God. "And ye are complete in him" (Col. 2:10).

III. The Riches of Divine Grace

As the thirty-three stupendous works of God which together comprise the salvation of a soul are now presented, the essential facts, already tabulated, respecting these vast realities should be borne in mind. They are wrought of God; they are wrought instantaneously; they are wrought simultaneously; they are grounded on the merit of Christ; and, being grounded on the merit of Christ, are eternal. It follows that each person of the human family at a given moment is either perfectly saved, being the recipient of every spiritual blessing in Christ Jesus, or perfectly lost, being without one of these spiritual blessings—in the estate of those who are condemned because of a sin nature, because of personal sins, because of an estate under sin, and because they are to such a degree under the power of Satan. These thirty-three riches of grace are:

1. In the Eternal Plan of God. To be in the eternal plan of God is a position of surpassing importance both with regard to the reality itself and its timeless character. The human mind cannot grasp what it means to be in the divine purpose from all eternity, nor what is indicated when it is declared that the same divine purpose extends into eternity to come —"whom he predestinated, he glorified." Whatever may be required as intermediate steps between the predestination and the glory will be under the absolute control of God and wrought of God regardless of the human element that may of necessity enter into it. No human will was ever created to defeat the will of God, but rather the human will is one of the instruments

by which God realizes His purposes for humanity. It has always been thus and must be so of necessity, since God is what He is. The student who meditates on the Person of God, the eternity of God, the omnipotence of God, the sovereignty of God as Creator of, and Ruler over, all things, and the elective purpose of God, will be fortified against that form of rationalism—subtle in character and natural to the human heart—which imagines that, in His creation, God has unwittingly so tied His own hands that He cannot with that absoluteness which belongs to infinity realize His eternal purpose.

Five terms are employed in the New Testament to represent aspects of the truth respecting the sovereign purpose of God.

Foreknown. As difficult as it may be for a finite being to grasp the thought, it yet remains true that God foreknew from all eternity every step in the entire program of this universe to its minutest detail. The doctrine of the divine foreknowledge is properly restricted, since it is outside the range of that in God which causes things to come to pass. It is just what the term implies and no more—merely that God knows beforehand. Closely akin to foreknowledge is *foreordination* (Acts 2:23; 1 Pet. 1:2, 20).

Predestinated. As used in the New Testament, this great doctrinal word declares that God determines beforehand that which comes to pass. Destination is determined. In its New Testament use it refers only to that which God has predetermined for His elect. It should therefore not be used in reference to the nonelect and their destiny, though there can be no reasonable doubt but that, in ways beyond human understanding, the destiny of the nonelect is in the mind of God from all eternity. The question of whether, in point of time, foreknowledge precedes predestination, or predestination precedes foreknowledge, is not only useless but wholly uncalled for. God could not predestinate what He did not foreknow. Nor could He foreknow as certain to come to pass that which He had not made certain by predestination. Three passages are in evidence and in two of them foreknowledge stands first: “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29); “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” (1 Pet. 1:2), while, in the third, foreknowledge is second: “Him, being delivered by the

determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23). The two ideas which these words represent must of necessity be stated in sequence; but there could be no sequence in their relation the one to the other. It is, therefore, God's message to every believer that he has been both foreknown in predestination and predestinated through foreknowledge to the unending realization of all of God's riches of grace.

Elect of God. The term *elect,* as related to Christians, is distinctive in that it designates those who are predestinated, but with only an implication relative to destiny. They are the elect in the present age and will manifest the grace of God in future ages (cf. 1 Thess. 1:4; 1 Pet. 1:2; Rom. 8:33; Col. 3:12; Titus 1:1).

Chosen. Again an important aspect of truth is indicated by a specific word. The term *chosen,* when referring to that which God has wrought in behalf of the saved, emphasizes the peculiar act of God which separates unto Himself His elect who are both foreknown and predestinated. The Christian bears the high distinction that he has been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4).

Called. As far as New Testament terms have been traced, the words *predestination, elect,* and *chosen* are not used of those whom God has selected for salvation when still in their unregenerate state. The word *called,* however, may include in the breadth of its meaning those who, at a given time, are unregenerate but who in the divine purpose are to become regenerate. The angels are not only ministering spirits in behalf of those who are now saved, but of them also who shall be heirs of salvation (Heb. 1:14). "Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it" (1 Thess. 5:24). Reference in all this discussion is to an *effectual* call, such as is indicated in Romans 8:30, implying that God not only gives an invitation, but inclines the heart to glad acceptance of it.

How great, then, is this characterizing work of distinctive position! and how immeasurable the opulence of the one who is included in the eternal purpose of God!

2. Redeemed. Redemption, as a doctrine and as it obtains in the present age, is properly subject to a threefold classification: (1) It is universal in character in the sense that it includes the whole world and provides a

sufficient ground of righteousness upon which God may save those who are lost. (2) It is specific when contemplated as the position into which the saved one has been brought. He is purchased out of the bond slave market and set free with that liberty which is the rightful portion of the sons of God (Gal. 5:1). It is not a position to be sought or secured by faithfulness; it is that which God has wrought in behalf of every regenerate person. The exercise of divine grace—even to the finality of justification—is said to be "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24). It is in connection with redemption that the believer has "forgiveness of sins," and this is "according to," and a part of, "the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1:7). (3) There is yet a redemption of the body of the believer and for that redemption the Christian is waiting (Rom. 8:23). The thought here, as in all the riches of grace, is that redemption is a position of transforming reality and is the possession of all who are saved.

3. Reconciled. Again, a special reconciliation is in view, one which reaches far beyond that aspect of it which contemplates the whole world. It is the reconciliation of the believer to God as presented in 2 Corinthians 5:20. A difference will be recognized between the reconciliation of the world—as declared in 5:19—and the reconciliation of the individual—as declared in 5:20–21. The reconciliation of the world does not obviate the reconciliation of the individual. The latter is that form of reconciliation which is applied to the believer's heart and results in a perfect and unending peace between God and the reconciled believer. To be perfectly reconciled to God on the ground of the merit of Christ, as is true of every child of God, is a position of blessedness indeed and is one of the riches of divine grace.

4. Related to God Through Propitiation. The central truth contained in this doctrine—and more engaging than any other aspect of it —is the abiding fact that God *is* propitious. He has been rendered free toward sinners by the death of His Son for them. That which constitutes the divine problem in the salvation of sinners, namely, the solution of the problem of sin, has been solved perfectly. In the case of the unsaved, that which remains is the human responsibility of saving faith. The truth that all that enters into the divine responsibility has been perfectly wrought indicates that God is propitious toward sinners; but He is also propitious toward His

blood-bought child who has sinned, which sin Christ bore on the cross. The truth is of greatest import that “He is the propitiation for our sins” (1 John 2:2). The ever recurring need of adjustment between the Christian and his Father is possible on the ground of the truth that the Father is propitious. To be in that relation to God in which He is propitious toward the specific sins of the child of God is a benefit of infinite grace. It is a position more advantageous than heart or mind can comprehend.

5. Forgiven All Trespasses. In the sense that there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, believers are forgiven all trespasses. The declaration of Colossians 2:13—“having forgiven you all trespasses”—covers all trespasses, past, present, and future (cf. Eph. 1:7; 4:32; Col. 1:14; 3:13). In no other way than to be wholly absolved before God, could a Christian be on an abiding peace footing with God or could he be, as he is, justified forever.

The divine dealing with sin is doubtless difficult for the human mind to grasp, especially such sins as have not yet been committed. However, it will be remembered that all sin of this age was yet future when Christ died. Its power to condemn is disannulled forever. In this connection the Holy Spirit inquires, “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?” and, “Who is he that condemneth?” The inspired answers are conclusive: God justifies rather than charges with sin; and condemnation has been laid upon Another, who died, who is risen, who is at the right hand of God for us, and who also maketh intercession for us” (Rom. 8:33–34). This chapter of Romans which begins with “no condemnation” ends with “no separation”; but such complete forgiveness is possible only on the ground of Christ’s work in bearing sin and in releasing His merit to those who are saved through His mediation and are in Him. Men either stand in their own merit or in the merit of Christ. If they stand in their own merit—the only conception that is within the range of reason and that which is advocated by the Arminian system —there is only condemnation for each individual before God; but if they stand in the merit of Christ, being in Him—whether all its righteous ground is comprehended or not—there remains naught but continued union with God and therefore no condemnation and no separation.

At this point a distinction is called for between this abiding judicial forgiveness and the oft-repeated forgiveness within the family of God. The

seeming paradox that one is forgiven and yet must be forgiven, is explained on the ground of the truth that there are two wholly and unrelated spheres of relationship between the believer and God. Regarding his *standing*, which like his Sonship is immutable since it is secured by his place in Christ, he is not subject to condemnation and will never be unjustified or separated from God. Regarding his *state*, which like the daily conduct of a son is mutable and is wholly within the family relationship, he must be both forgiven and cleansed (1 John 1:9). The writer to the Hebrews declares that, had the old order of sacrifices been as efficacious as the sacrifice of Christ, those presenting an animal sacrifice for their sin would "have had no more conscience of sins" (10:2). On the other hand, it is the believer's portion to be free from the sense of the condemnation of sin—he never thinks of himself as a lost soul, if at all instructed in God's Word; however, this is not to say that the Christian will not be conscious of the sins he commits. Sin, to the believer, is more abhorrent than ever it could have been before he was saved; but, when sinning, he will not have broken the abiding fact of his union with God though he has injured his communion with Him. Within the family relation—which relation cannot be broken—he may sin as a child (without ceasing to be a child) and be forgiven, and restored back into the Father's fellowship on the basis of his own confession of his sin and the deeper truth that Christ has borne the sin which otherwise would condemn.

None of the believer's positions before God, when rightly apprehended, is more a blessing to the heart than the fact that all condemnation is removed forever, God for Christ's sake having forgiven all trespasses.

6. Vitally Conjoined to Christ for the Judgment of the Old Man "Unto a New Walk." The essential doctrine of union with Christ appears as the basis of many of these riches of divine grace. In the present aspect of truth, only that which has to do with the death of Christ unto the sin nature is in view, and the central passage which declares this truth is Romans 6:1–10. This important Scripture will be brought forward in various places in this work on theology, but always it will be pointed out that it refers neither to self-judgment by self-crucifixion nor to a mode of ritual baptism. If the passage does not contemplate more than these interpretations imply, one of the most vital truths of the New Testament is deprived of its most important affirmation. The death of Christ, quite apart from its achievement as a final

dealing with sins, is a judgment of the sin nature, which judgment does not mean that that nature is rendered incapable of action or that it is changed in its character; it does mean that a perfect judgment is gained against it and that God is now righteously free to deal with that nature as a judged thing. The evil character of that nature does not, after it is judged, restrain the Holy Spirit from curbing its power for us. Thus, by faith in the indwelling Spirit, the believer may be delivered from the reigning power of sin and on the ground of Christ's death as a judgment of the sin nature. This feature of Christ's death is substitutionary to the last degree. The central passage asserts that the death of Christ is so definitely an act in behalf of the believer, that it is a cocrucifixion, a codeath, a coburial, and a coresurrection (cf. Col. 2:12). The application of this truth is not an injunction to enact all or any part of it; it is rather something about himself which the Christian is to believe or reckon to be true, being, as it is, the ground upon which he may by an intelligent faith claim deliverance from the power of the inbred sin nature.

To be placed thus permanently before God as one for whom Christ has died a judgment death against the sin nature is a position of privilege of infinite blessedness.

7. Free from the Law. As now considered, the law is more than a code or set of rules governing conduct. Too often it is thought that to be free from the law is to be excused from doing the things which the law prescribes, and, because the law is "holy, and just, and good," it is difficult for many to accept the New Testament teaching that the law is not the prescribed rule of life for the believer. Why, indeed, it is inquired, should the believer do other than to pursue that which is holy, just, and good? Over against this idea is the uncompromising warning to the Christian that he by the death of Christ is free from the law (cf. John 1:17; Acts 15:24–29; Rom. 6:14; 7:2–6; 2 Cor. 3:6–13; Gal. 5:18). In one passage alone—Romans 6:14—the child of God is told that he is not under the law, and in another—Romans 7:2–6—he is said to be both dead to the law and delivered from the law. Since every ideal or principle of the law, except the fourth commandment, is carried forward and restated and incorporated in the grace manner of life, it hardly seems reasonable to contend that the believer should be warned so positively against doing the things contained in the law. The solution of the problem is

to be found in the fact that the law is a system demanding human merit, while the injunctions addressed to the Christian under grace are unrelated to human merit. Since the child of God is already accepted in the Beloved and stands forever in the merit of Christ, application of the merit system to him is both unreasonable and unscriptural. When the principles contained in the merit system reappear in the grace injunctions, it is always with this vital change in the character. It is one thing to do a thing that is contained in the law in order that one may be accepted or blessed; it is a wholly different thing to do those same things because one is accepted and blessed. Freedom from the merit obligation is that "liberty" to which reference is made in Galatians 5:1. It is not liberty to do evil; but it is a perfect relief from the crushing burden—the yoke of bondage (Acts 15:10)—of works of merit.

To be "free from the law" (Rom. 8:2), to be "dead to the law" (Rom. 7:4), and to be "delivered from the law" (Rom. 7:6; cf. Rom. 6:14; 2 Cor. 3:11; Gal. 3:25), describe a position in grace before God which is rich and full unto everlasting blessing.

8. Children of God. To be born anew by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit into a relationship in which God the First Person becomes a legitimate Father and the saved one becomes a legitimate child, is a position which is but dimly apprehended by any human being in this world. This far-flung reality is more a matter of heavenly values than of the earth. Nevertheless, this very regeneration is one of the foundational realities of everyone who has believed upon Christ as Savior. This birth from above accomplishes a measureless transformation. To be born into an earthly home of outstanding character is of great advantage, but to be born of God with every right and title belonging to that position—an heir of God and a joint heir with Jesus Christ—passes the range of human understanding. This new existence is not only intensely real, but it, like all begotten life, is everlasting in its very nature. The theme is so vast that it includes other positions and possessions which, in turn, will be mentioned as this analysis progresses.

Varied terms are used in the New Testament to identify this new birth. Each of these is distinct in itself and revealing.

Born again. It is of more than passing import that the Lord Jesus Christ selected Nicodemus, the most religious and ideal man of his day in Judaism,

to whom and as applied to himself Christ declared the necessity of the new birth. The word ἄνωθεν is rendered *anew*, and its implication is that it is not only an actual birth, but it is new in the sense that it is no part of that first birth which is after the flesh. It is not a reordering or revising of the birth by the flesh. It is new in the sense that it is complete in itself and no product of the flesh. Of this distinction Christ said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6). Other confirming passages are John 1:12–13; 1 Peter 1:23.

Regenerated. This expressive term, which appears in Titus 3:5—"by the washing of regeneration"—conveys the same idea of a rebirth. The passage relates a cleansing to this birth, but the birth does not consist in a mere cleansing of the old being; it is rather that a cleansing, like forgiveness, accompanies the regeneration.

Quickened. The word *quickened* expresses the thought that an object is made alive that did not possess that life before. Through regeneration by the Spirit, as in the case with the flesh, there is an impartation of life. Regeneration imparts the divine nature. Attention should be given also to Ephesians 2:1 and Colossians 2:13.

Sons of God. This title, used many times (cf. 2 Cor. 6:18; Gal. 3:26, R.V.; 1 John 3:2), publishes the true relationship between God and those who are saved. They are sons of God, not by a mere title or pretense, but by actual generation the offspring of God. The reality which the title designates cannot be taken too literally.

A new creation. Thus again, and by language both appropriate and emphatic, the mighty creative power of God is seen to be engaged in the salvation of men. As respects their salvation it is said that they are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus. That exalted new creation is not only the direct work of God, but owes all that it is to its vital relation to Christ Jesus.

9. Adopted. The peculiar position of one who is adopted is an important feature of the riches of divine grace. Its unique place in the following passage indicates its major import: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his

will" (Eph. 1:4–5). In attempting to discover what this position really is, it is needful to recognize that divine adoption has almost nothing in common with that form of it as accepted and practiced among men. According to human custom, adoption is a means whereby an outsider may become a member of a family. It is a legal way to create father and son relationship as a substitute for father and son reality. On the other hand, divine adoption, while referring both to Israel's kinship to God (Rom. 9:4) and to redemption of the believer's body (Rom. 8:23), is primarily a divine act by which one already a child by actual birth through the Spirit of God is placed forward as an adult son in his relation to God. At the moment of regeneration, the believer, being born of God and therefore the legitimate offspring of God, is advanced in relationship and responsibility to the position of an adult son. All childhood and adolescent years, which are normal in human experience, are excluded in spiritual sonship and the newly born believer is at once in possession of freedom from tutors and governors—who symbolize the law principle—and is responsible to live the fullorbed spiritual life of an adult son in the Father's household. No period of irresponsible childhood is recognized. There is no body of Scripture which undertakes to direct the conduct of beginners in the Christian life as in distinction to those who are mature. Whatever God says to the old and established saint, He says to every believer—including those most recently regenerated. There should be no misunderstanding respecting the "babe in Christ," mentioned in 1 Corinthians 3:1, who is a babe because of carnality and not because of immaturity of years in the Christian life. In human experience legitimate birth and adoption never combine in the same person. There is no occasion for a father to adopt his own child. In the realm of divine adoption, every child born of God is adopted at the moment he is born. He is placed before God as a mature, responsible son. Thus adoption becomes one of the important divine undertakings in the salvation of men and is a position of great importance.

10. Acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. As a position before God, none could be more elevated or consummating than that a believer should be "made accepted in the beloved" (Eph. 1:6) and "acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 2:5). Such an estate is closely akin to that already mentioned wherein there is no condemnation, and to that, yet to be

considered, of justification; but this aspect of truth not only announces the marvelous fact that the Christian is accepted, but grounds that acceptance in the position which he holds in Christ. As definitely as any member that might be joined to a human body would partake of all that the person is to whom it is joined—honor and position—so perfectly and rightfully a member joined to Christ by the baptism of the Spirit partakes of all that Christ is. In respect to this union with Christ and that which it provides, wonderful declarations are made:

a. Made Righteous. Reference here is neither to any merit nor good works on the part of the individual believer, nor has it the slightest reference to the unquestioned truth that God is Himself a righteous Being. It rather represents that standing or quality which Christ released by His death according to the sweet-savor aspect of it, and which rightfully becomes the believer's portion through his living union with Christ. It is righteousness imputed to the believer on the sole condition that he has believed on Christ as his Savior. Two major realities which constitute a Christian are: imparted eternal life (John 20:31) and imputed righteousness (2 Cor. 5:21). Of the two great salvation books in the New Testament, it may be said of John's Gospel that it stresses the gift of eternal life, and it may be said of the Epistle to the Romans that it stresses imputed righteousness. Eternal life is defined as "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27), and imputed righteousness is based on the truth that the believer is in Christ. These two supreme truths are compressed by Christ into seven brief and simple words, when He said: "ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). Whether it be the reception of eternal life or of imputed righteousness, but one condition is imposed on the human side, namely, to believe on Christ as Savior (John 3:16; Rom. 3:22).

In an earlier treatment of this theme the essential features of imputed righteousness have been recorded and the extended body of Scripture bearing on this doctrine has been cited. The believer is "acceptable to God," even the infinitely holy God, since he has been *made* accepted in the Beloved; and this constitutes a transforming feature of the riches of divine grace.

b. Sanctified Positionally. That there is a *positional* sanctification which is secured by union with Christ has too often been overlooked, and, because of

this neglect, theories of a supposed sinless perfection in daily life have been inferred from those Scriptures which assert the truth that the believer has been "perfected for ever" through his sanctification. The point of misunderstanding is with regard to the *design* of sanctification, which may be defined as the setting apart of a person or thing, a classifying. It is thus that Christ sanctified Himself by becoming the Savior of the lost with all that that involved (John 17:19), which sanctification certainly could not imply any improvement in moral character on His part. Likewise, the sanctification of an inanimate object, such as the gold of the temple or the gift on the altar (Matt. 23:17, 19), indicates that a moral change in the thing sanctified is not demanded. Thus, in the case of the sanctification of a person, the moral change in that person's life may not be the result of sanctification; but no person or thing is sanctified without being set apart or classified thereby. Christ has been "made unto us … sanctification" (I Cor. 1:30), and the Corinthians—even when being corrected for evil practices—are assured that they were not only "washed" and "justified," but that they were "sanctified" (1 Cor. 6:11). Such sanctification was neither the estate of those believers nor did it refer to their ultimate transformation when they would appear in glory (Eph. 5:27; 1 John 3:2). It evidently indicated that greatest of all classifications, which resulted in the standing and position of every believer when he enters the New Creation through being joined to Christ and partakes of all that Christ is. This truth is declared in the phrase,

c. Perfected Forever. This consummating phrase appears in Hebrews 10:14 and applies equally to every believer. It, too, relates to the Christian's standing and position in Christ. Such a union with Christ secures the perfection of the Son of God for the child of God.

d. Made Accepted in the Beloved. The student would do well to observe the force of the word *made* as it appears in a considerable number of passages, where it indicates that the thing accomplished is not wrought by the believer for himself, but is the work of God for him. If he is made something which he was not before, it is evidently the work of another in his behalf. In this instance, the believer is said to be *made accepted*. He is accepted on the part of God who, because of His infinite holiness, could accept no one less perfect than Himself. All of this is provided for on the basis of the truth that the believer is made accepted "in the beloved" (Eph. 1:6). Without the

slightest strain upon His holiness, God accepts those who are in union with His Son; and this glorious fact, that the one who is saved is accepted, constitutes a measureless feature of divine grace.

e. Made Meet. Here, again, the word *made* with all its significance appears, but with respect to that requirement which must be demanded of all who would appear in the presence of God in heaven. The text in which this assuring phrase occurs is Colossians 1:12, and it asserts that the believer is, even now, fitted for that celestial glory: "giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." No mere pretense or bold assumption is indicated in this passage. The least believer, being in Christ, is even now *made meet* to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light. It therefore becomes no arrogance or vainglory to accept this statement of God's Word as true, and as true from the moment one believes on Christ as Savior.

To be acceptable to God by Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:5), is a reality in every aspect of it and this truth, incomprehensible as it is, constitutes an important item in the whole field of the riches of grace in Christ Jesus.

11. JUSTIFIED. No present position in which the believer is placed is more exalted and consummating than that of being justified by God. By justification the saved one is lifted far above the position of one who depends on divine generosity and magnanimity, to the estate of one whom God has declared justified forever, which estate the holy justice of God is as much committed to defend as ever that holy justice was before committed to condemn. Theological definitions respecting justification are more traditional than Biblical. Only inattention to Scripture can account for the confusion of justification with divine forgiveness of sin. It is true that each of these is an act of God in response to saving faith, that none are forgiven who are not justified, and that none are justified who are not forgiven; but in no particular do these great divine undertakings coalesce. Likewise, though they are translated from the same Greek root, the terms *righteousness* (imputed) and *justification* represent wholly different conceptions. The believer is constituted righteous by virtue of his position in Christ, but he is justified by a declaratory decree of God. Righteousness imputed is the abiding fact, and justification is the divine recognition of that fact. In other considerations of the doctrine of justification incorporated in this general

work, a more exhaustive treatment is undertaken, including the scope of this divine enterprise in which God justifies the ungodly (Rom. 4:5) without a cause (Rom. 3:24), and on a ground so worthy, so laudable, and so unblemished that He Himself remains just when He justifies. He reserves every aspect of this measureless benefit to Himself, for the only human obligation is that of *believing* in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). It is the Christian's right to count this work done and to say, as in Romans 5:1, "Therefore being justified by faith …" Though language may describe it, only the Spirit of God can cause the mind to realize this essential position so elevated and so glorified.

12. MADE NIGH. The saved one, according to Ephesians 2:13, is said to be "made nigh." This text states: "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." As seen before, the word *made* is significant in that it assigns the whole undertaking to another than the one who receives the blessing. Various terms are employed in the New Testament to describe the close relation which is set up and exists between God and the believer. To be "made nigh" is not only a work of God, but is to be brought into a relationship to God which is of infinite perfection and completeness. To it nothing could be added in time or eternity. What such a nearness may mean to the Christian when he is present with the Lord cannot be anticipated in this life; nevertheless, the reality which the phrase *made nigh* connotes is as cogent an acquirement at the inception of the Christian's salvation as it will be at any point in eternity.

Divinely wrought positions are often accompanied by a corresponding Christian experience. This is true of the subject in hand. While, as has been stated, the position which is described as nigh to God is itself complete and final, the one who is thus *nigh* is exhorted to "draw nigh" to God. It is written: "Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded" (James 4:8); "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. 10:22). These exhortations belong wholly in the realm of Christian experience, in which realm there may be a consciousness, more or less real, of personal fellowship with the Father and the Son (1 John 1:3).

The process by which a believer may draw nigh—as required by James and in response to which God will Himself draw nigh to the believer—is that of a confession of sin and an adjustment of one's life to the will of God. Over against this it will be observed that, whether in fellowship or out of fellowship as respects conscious experience, the Christian is, because of his position in Christ, ever and always made nigh.

13. Delivered from the Power of Darkness. As declared in Colossians 1:13, this special position, as described here in this passage, may be taken as representative of all the Scripture bearing on the Christian's deliverance from the power of Satan and his evil spirits. Previously, certain passages have been cited relative to the power of Satan over the unsaved. One passage, 2 Corinthians 4:3–4, reveals the blinding power of Satan over the unregenerate person's mind respecting the gospel; Ephesians 2:1–2 declares the whole company of the lost—designated "children of disobedience" (disobedient in the headship of disobedient Adam)—to be energized by Satan; 1 John 5:19 states that the *cosmos* world, in contrast to believers who are of God, "lieth in" the wicked one. The passage under consideration—Colossians 1:13— reads: "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." It will be observed that all these passages, to which reference is made, assert that the unsaved are under the power of Satan and that the believer is delivered from that power, though he must continue to wage a warfare against these powers of darkness; and the Apostle assures the Christian of the victory made possible by an attitude of faith in the Lord (Eph. 6:10–12). The same Apostle, when relating his own divine commission, mentions one certain result of his ministry, namely, that the unsaved were to be turned "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God" (Acts 26:18).

To be liberated thus is a great reality and constitutes one of the major positions into which the believer is brought through divine grace.

14. Translated into the Kingdom of the Son of His Love. As Dean Alford points out in exposition of Colossians 1:13 (*N.T. for English Readers*, new ed., *in loc.*), the translation *into the kingdom* is "strictly local"; that is, it is *now* that it is accomplished, when saving faith is exercised, and

the entrance is into the present form of the kingdom of God and of Christ. Two other passages shed light upon this great change which is experienced by all who pass from the lost estate to the saved estate: “that ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory” (1 Thess. 2:12); “For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ” (2 Pet. 1:11). In Colossians 1:13, the term “translated” evidently refers to the removal from the sphere of Satan’s dominion to that of Christ. The kingdom is that of God, which may be considered also the kingdom of the Son of His love. Entrance into the kingdom of God is by the new birth (John 3:5). Such a position is far more than merely to be delivered from darkness, however much the advantage of that may be; it is to be inducted into and established in the kingdom of God’s dear Son.

15. On the Rock, Christ Jesus. In the consideration of divine grace as exercised in behalf of the lost, it is essential, as in other matters of similar import, to distinguish between the foundation and the superstructure. In the parable of the two houses—one built upon the rock and one built upon the sand (Matt. 7:24–27)—Christ made no reference to the superstructure, but rather emphasized the importance of the foundation. The smallest edifice built on the rock will endure the tests which try foundations, and only because the rock endures. Over against this, the Apostle writes (1 Cor. 3:9–15) of the superstructure which is built upon the rock, which superstructure is to be tested by fire. Reference is thus made, not to salvation, but to the works in which the Christian engages. It is not character building, but Christian service. There are, again, two general classes of superstructure being built upon Christ the Rock, and these are likened to gold, silver, and precious stones, on the one hand, and to wood, hay, and stubble, on the other hand. As gold and silver are refined by fire, and wood, hay, and stubble are consumed by fire, so the judgment of Christian service is likened to fire in which the gold and silver will stand the test and receive a reward, while that which corresponds to wood, hay, and stubble will suffer loss. It is declared, however, that the believer who suffers loss in respect to his reward for service will himself be saved, though passing through that fire which destroys his unworthy service.

The important truth to be recognized at this point is that, while the unsaved build upon the sand, all Christians are standing and building on the Rock, Christ Jesus. They are thus secure with respect to salvation through the merit of Christ, apart from their own worthiness or faithfulness. While this figure used by Christ does not lend itself to a literal development in every particular, it is clearly stated by this object lesson that Christ is the Foundation on which the Christian stands and on which he builds. To be taken off the sand foundation and to be placed on the enduring Rock which is Christ, constitutes one of the richest treasures of divine grace.

16. A GIFT FROM GOD THE FATHER TO CHRIST. No moment in the history of the saints could be more laden with reality than that time when, as a consummation of His redemptive mission—foreseen from all eternity and itself the determining factor in the character of all ages to come—the Lord Jesus Christ reviewed in prayer to the Father that which He had achieved by His advent into this *cosmos* world. He fully intended for His own who are in this world to hear what He said in that incomparable prayer (John 17:13). Devout minds will ponder eagerly every word spoken concerning themselves under such august and solemn circumstances. What, indeed, would be the designation by which believers will be identified by the Son? What appellation is proper in such converse? What cognomen answers the highest ideal and conception in the mind of Deity with respect to Christians? Assuredly, the superlative title, whatever it is, would be employed by the Son when He presents formally His own, and petitions the Father in their behalf. Seven times in this prayer by one form or another and quite exclusively His saved ones are referred to as *those whom Thou hast given Me.* Nothing but ignorance of the great transaction which is intimated in this title will explain the inattention of Christians to this descriptive name. When it is considered, it is seen that in the background are two important doctrines, namely, that all creatures belong inherently to their Creator and, hence, that in sovereign election He has determined in past ages a company designed to be a peculiar treasure for His Son; but the title itself tells its own story of surpassing interest and importance, which is, that the Father has given each believer to the Son. This is not the only instance in which the Father gives a company of people to the Son. In Psalm 2:6–9 it is predicted that, at His second advent and when He is seated upon the

Davidic throne, the then rebellious and raging nations will be given by Jehovah to the Messiah. The imagination will not have gone far astray if it pictures a situation in eternity past when the Father presents individual believers separately to the Son—each representing a particular import and value not approached by another. Like a chest of jewels, collected one by one and wholly diverse, these love gifts appear before the eyes of the Son of God. Should one be missing, He, the Savior, would be rendered inexpressibly poor. Immeasurable and unknowable riches of grace are latent in that superlative cognomen, *those whom Thou hast given Me*.

Dr. C. I. Scofield's comment on this truth is clear and forceful: "Seven times Jesus speaks of believers as given to Him by the Father (vs. 2, 6 [twice], 9, 11, 12, 24). Jesus Christ is God's love-gift to the world (John 3:16), and believers are the Father's love-gift to Jesus Christ. It is Christ who commits the believer to the Father for safe-keeping, so that the believer's security rests upon the Father's faithfulness to His Son Jesus Christ" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1139).

17. Circumcised in Christ. One of the Apostle's threefold divisions of humanity is the "Uncircumcision" with reference to unregenerate Gentiles, "the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands" with reference to Israel, and "the circumcision made without hands" with reference to Christians (Eph. 2:11; Col. 2:11). However, the important truth that the believer has been circumcised with a circumcision made without hands and wholly apart from the flesh, is the grace position which is now in view. In the Colossians passage (2:11), the believer's spiritual circumcision is said to be the "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Two closely related words occur in this passage, namely, *body* (σῶμα) and *flesh* (σάρξ) The physical body does not commit sin except as it is dominated by the flesh—which flesh includes the soul and spirit, and manifests that fallen nature which all possess, saved and unsaved alike. The physical body is not put off in a literal sense, but, being the instrument or sphere of sin's manifestation, the flesh with its "body of sin" may be annulled (Rom. 6:6), or rendered inoperative for the time being. As the sin nature was judged by Christ in His death, so the believer, because of his vital place in Christ, partakes of that "putting off" which Christ accomplished, and which fell as a circumcision upon Him and becomes a

spiritual circumcision to the one for whom Christ substituted. It is a circumcision made "without hands." To stand thus before God as one whose sin nature, or flesh, has been judged and for whom a way of deliverance from the dominion of the flesh has been secured, is a position which grace has provided, and is blessed indeed.

18. Partakers of the Holy and Royal Priesthood. In his First Epistle, Peter declares that the believers form a holy priesthood (2:5) and a royal priesthood (2:9), and their royalty is again asserted by John when in Revelation 1:6 (R.V.) they are titled "a kingdom … priests," or according to another reading (A.V.), "kings and priests." The truth that Christ is a king-priest is reflected here. The believer derives all his positions and possessions from Christ. The child of God is therefore a priest now because of his relation to Christ the High Priest, and he will yet reign with Christ a thousand years—when Christ takes His earthly throne (Rev. 5:10; cf. 2 Tim. 2:12).

Priesthood has passed through certain well-defined stages or aspects. The patriarchs were priests over their households. Later, to Israel was offered the privilege of becoming a kingdom of priests (Ex. 19:6); but it was conditional and Israel failed in the realization of this blessing, and the priesthood was restricted to one tribe or family. On a grace basis, in which God undertakes through the merit of His Son, in the New Testament is introduced the true and final realization of a kingdom of priests. Every saved person in the present age is a priest unto God. The Old Testament priest is the type of the New Testament priest. Israel had a priesthood; the Church is a priesthood. To be a priest unto God with the certainty of a kingly reign is a position to which the one who believes on Christ is brought through the saving grace of God.

19. A Chosen Generation, a Holy Nation, a Peculiar People. All three of these designations (1 Pet. 2:9) refer to one and the same general idea, namely, that the company of believers of this age—individuals called out from the Jews and Gentiles alike—are different from the unsaved Jew and Gentile to the extent to which thirty-three stupendous miracles transform them. They are a *generation,* not in the sense that they are restricted to one span of human life, but in the sense that they are the

offspring of God. They are a *nation* in the sense that they are separate, a distinct grouping among all the peoples of the earth. They are a *peculiar people* in the sense that they are born of God and are therefore not of this *cosmos* world. They are not enjoined to try to be peculiar; any people in this world who are citizens of heaven, perfected in Christ, and appointed to live in the power of and to the glory of God, cannot but be peculiar.

These three designations represent permanent positions to which the believer has been brought and they, likewise, make a large contribution to the sum total of all the riches of divine grace.

20. HEAVENLY CITIZENS. Under this consideration, commonwealth privilege, or what is better known as *citizenship*, is in view. Writing of the estate of the Ephesians, who were Gentiles before they were saved, the Apostle states that they were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel." Israel's citizenship, though earthly, was specifically recognized by God as separate from all other peoples. Into this position no Gentile could come except as a proselyte. Thus it is said that the Gentile, being a stranger to Israel's commonwealth, had not so much as any divine recognition; yet immeasurably removed and heaven-high above even Israel's commonwealth is the Christian's citizenship in heaven. Of Christians it is written, "For our citizenship is in heaven" (Phil. 3:20, R.V.); their names are written in heaven (Luke 10:20), and they are said to have "come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22). To enforce the same truth, the Apostle also writes, "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. 2:19). Actual presence in heaven is an assured experience for all who are saved (2 Cor. 5:8); but citizenship itself—whether realized at the present moment or not—is an abiding position accorded to all who believe. In truth, the occupation of that citizenship by instant removal from this sphere would be the normal experience for each Christian when he is saved. To remain here after citizenship has been acquired in heaven creates a peculiar situation. In recognition of this abnormal condition, the child of God is styled a "stranger and pilgrim" (1 Pet. 2:11; cf. Heb. 11:13) as related to this *cosmos* world-system. In like manner, he is said to be an "ambassador" for Christ (2 Cor. 5:20). To remain here as a witness, a stranger, a pilgrim, and an

ambassador is but a momentary experience; the heavenly citizenship will be enjoyed forever. It is a glorious feature of the riches of divine grace.

21. Of the Family and Household of God. Closely akin to citizenship and yet more restricted in their extent, are the positions the Christian is said to occupy in the family and household of God. As has been observed, there are various fatherhood relations which God sustains; but none in relation to His creatures is so perfect, so enriching, or so enduring as that which He bears to the household and family of the saints. So great a change has been wrought in the estate of those who are saved respecting their kinship to God, that it is written of them: “Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God” (Eph. 2:19). With this position an obligation arises which makes its claim upon every member of the household. Of this claim the Apostle writes: “As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith” (Gal. 6:10). In the present human relationship sustained in the *cosmos* world, there is, of necessity, but a limited difference observable between the saved and unsaved; yet those who comprise the household of faith are completely separated unto God, and into that family none could ever enter who sustains no true relation to God as his Father. Human organizations, including the visible church, may include a mixed multitude, but “the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his” (2 Tim. 2:19). In a great house there are some vessels to honor and some to dishonor, some of gold and silver, and some of wood and of earth. If a man purge himself from vessels of dishonor, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the Master’s use, and prepared unto every good work (2 Tim. 2:20–21). This picture of household relationships does not imply that there are those in the family of God who are not saved; the truth set forth is that not all believers are, in their daily life, as yielded to God as they might be, and that by self- dedication they may be advanced from the position of vessels of dishonor —of wood or of earth—to the position and substance of vessels of honor—of gold and of silver.

Like citizenship in heaven, a participation in the household and family of God is a position exalted as high as heaven itself, and honorable to the

degree of infinity. Thus there is correspondence with all other features of the riches of divine grace.

22. In the Fellowship of the Saints. A Christian citizenship pertains to a relation to heaven, and as the household pertains to God, so the fellowship of the saints pertains to their relation the one to the other. The fact of this kinship and the obligation it engenders is stressed in the New Testament. The fact of kinship reaches out to incomparable realities. Through the baptism of the Spirit—by which believers are, at the time they are saved, joined to the Lord as members in His Body—an affinity is created which answers the prayer of Christ when He petitioned the Father that the believers might all be one. Being begotten of the same Father, the family tie is of no small import, but to be fellow members in the Body of Christ surpasses all other such conceptions. To be begotten of God results in sonship; but to be in Christ results in a standing as exalted as the standing of God's Son. To be partners in this standing added to regeneration's brotherhood, constitutes that vital relationship for which Christ prayed when He asked "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee" (John 17:21). A repetition of any statement as it occurs in the Bible is for emphasis. It would seem, however, that, when speaking to His Father, there would be little occasion for reiteration; yet in that one priestly prayer Christ prays four times directly and separately that believers may be *one*, and once that they may be *one* in their relation to the Father and to Himself (John 17:11, 21–23). With all this in view, it must be conceded that few, if any, truths are so emphasized in the Word of God as the unity of believers. This prayer of Christ's began to be answered on the Day of Pentecost when those then saved were fused into one corporate Body, and it has been answered continuously as, at the moment of believing, those saved are also joined to Christ's Body by the same operation of the Holy Spirit.

An unknowable unity exists between the Father and the Son. It is the mystery of the Trinity itself; yet it is on this very level that Christ has requested that believers may stand in relation to each other—"that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee … that they may be made perfect in one" (John 17:21–23). This prayer, as all that Christ ever prays, is answered, and the fact of oneness between the saints of God is a present truth whether anyone ever comprehends it in this world or not.

This marvelous unity between believers becomes the logical ground for all Christian action, one toward another. Such action should be consistent with the unity which exists. Never are Christians exhorted to *make* a unity by organization or combines; they are rather besought to *keep* the unity which God by His Spirit has created (Eph. 4:1–3). This can be done in but one way, namely, by recognizing and receiving, as well as loving and honoring, every other child of God. The spirit of separation from, and of exclusion of, other believers is a sin that can be measured only in the light of that ineffable union which separation and exclusion disregard.

To be in the fellowship of the saints is a position in grace too exalted and too dignified for mere human understanding.

23. A HEAVENLY ASSOCIATION. What is termed "the heavenly places" is a phrase which is peculiar to the Ephesian Letter and has no reference to heaven as a place or to specific places of spiritual privilege here on earth; but it does refer to the present realm of association with Christ, which association is the inherent right of all those who are in Christ Jesus. The association is a partnership with Christ which incorporates at least seven spheres of common interest and undertaking.

a. Partners with Christ in Life. The New Testament declares not only that the believer has partaken of a new life, but asserts that life to be the indwelling Christ. In Colossians 1:27 a mystery is revealed which is "Christ in you, the hope of glory"; and in Colossians 3:4 it is also said that "Christ … is our life." Likewise in 1 John 5:11–12 it is written: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Upwards of eighty times in the New Testament the truth appears, that among the major features which characterize a Christian is the impartation of a new life from God. Thus a unique partnership in life is established between Christ and all who believe which is both a position and a possession.

b. Partnership in Position. As an incomparable position, the Christian is raised with Christ (Col. 3:1), and seated with Christ in the heavenly association. This truth is clearly revealed in Ephesians 2:6, which declares, "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." To be raised with Christ and to be seated with Christ is a partnership

in position which is real and abiding. Its contribution to the entire fact of the believer's association with Christ is enough to characterize the whole. The honor and glory of it are knowledge-surpassing.

c. Partners with Christ in Service. A number of passages unite in a testimony that the service of the Christian is one of copartnership with Christ. Of these, none is more direct and convincing than 1 Corinthians 1:9, which reads: "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord." In the A.V. the word κοινωνία is rendered *fellowship.* As the word is at times rendered *communion* (cf. 2 Cor. 6:14) with the thought of agreement or partnership, and to be in harmony with the message of Christian service, which theme characterizes this Epistle, the idea of joint undertaking may be read into this passage. Some, as Meyer and Alford, see a sharing here in Christ's coming glory; but as this Epistle is almost wholly one parenthesis which begins with the verse following this notable text and ends with 15:57, it is important to observe the next verse in the direct course of the message, namely, 15:58. With the rendering of κοινωνία by *partnership,* the two dominant and connecting verses would read: "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the partnership of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord … Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." The same Epistle states, "For we are labourers together with God" (3:9); and 2 Corinthians 6:1 designates the believers as "workers together with him"—in the same context they are said to be "ministers of God" (6:4) and "ministers of the new testament" (3:6). To be thus in partnership with Christ is a position of limitless responsibility as well as exalted honor.

d. Partners with Christ in Suffering. Of the entire field of the doctrine of human suffering, a well-defined feature of that experience is *suffering with Christ.* "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him" (2 Tim. 2:12). Likewise, "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake" (Phil. 1:29); and, again, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy" (1 Pet. 4:12–13). The Apostle testified of himself,

“who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body’s sake, which is the church” (Col. 1:24), and, “For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us” (Rom. 8:18); similarly, “That no man should be moved by these afflictions: for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto” (1 Thess. 3:3).

While the child of God may suffer the reproaches of Christ, which is a definite form of copartnership suffering with Christ, the form of fellowship suffering which is closest to the heart of the Savior is to share with Him His burden for lost souls—those for whom He died. Such longings are not natural to any human nature, but are generated in the heart by the Holy Spirit who causes the yielded believer to experience the compassion of God. It is written, “The fruit of the Spirit is love” (Gal. 5:22), and, “The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us” (Rom. 5:5). As an illustration of this ability of the believer to experience the compassion of Christ, the Apostle testifies of himself thus, “I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:1–3). Partnership with Christ in suffering is real and reflects the fact that the Christian occupies a position of untold distinction.

e. Partners with Christ in Prayer. The very act of praying in the name of Christ is in itself an assumption that He also makes petition to the Father for those things that are in the will of God and for which the Christian prays. The central passage bearing on this aspect of partnership is John 14:12–14: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.” “Greater works” are to be done by the Son of God in answer to the believer’s prayer in His name. The partnership in responsibility is defined thus, “If ye shall ask … I will do.”

f. Partners with Christ in Betrothal. To be betrothed to a person is a position which is both definite and demanding. It is also a partnership. The Church is espoused as a bride to Christ. The marriage day is that of His return to receive her unto Himself. It was the Apostle's desire that he might present believers a chaste virgin (not *as* a chaste virgin) to Christ (2 Cor. 11:2); and from Ephesians 5:25–27 it is to be understood that Christ loves the Church as a bridegroom might love a bride and that He gave Himself for His Bride.

g. Partners in Expectation. The "blessed hope" (Titus 2:13) is ever the expectation of the instructed Christian; for the coming of Christ will be the moment of release from these limitations into the fulness of glory, and the moment of seeing Him who is the center of all reality for the believer. But Christ, too, is now "expecting" (Heb. 10:13), and His longings to claim His bride are as great as ever His willingness to die for her.

All partnerships in human relations create their corresponding positions and possessions; in like manner the sevenfold partnership which the child of God sustains with Christ creates positions and possessions, and these are riches of divine grace.

24. Having Access to God. Could any human being catch but one brief vision of the glory, majesty, and holiness of God, from that time forth that one would marvel that any human being—even if he were unfallen—could have access to God; yet, through Christ as Mediator, sinners are provided with an open door into the presence of God. In attempting to understand what is granted in that access to God, it would be well to pursue certain revealed truths in a purposeful order.

a. Access into His Grace. Divine grace in action is that achievement which God is free to undertake because of the satisfaction respecting sin which Christ provided by His death and resurrection; therefore, access into the grace of God is access into the value of His finished work. This door is open to all; but only those who have believed have entered in. Of this position which Christ procured, it is written: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand" (Rom. 5:2). The believer is not only *saved* by grace (Eph. 2:8), but he *stands* in grace. He is ensphered in divine grace. The same grace that saved him sustains him. The same principle upon which he is saved when he believes, is continually applied to

him for safekeeping throughout his earthly pilgrimage. Of the ensphering grace, Peter wrote these words, “But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ” (2 Pet. 3:18). The thought seems to be that the Christian, being in grace, is appointed therein to grow in the knowledge of Christ. Certainly no one who has not found entrance into divine grace through faith, will grow. It is not a matter of growing more gracious, but of coming to know Christ, which knowledge is possible since the believer has entered the sphere of grace (cf. 2 Cor. 3:18).

b. Access Unto the Father. Of this specific access it is written: “For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father” (Eph. 2:18). All three Persons of the Godhead appear in this brief text. It declares that both Jew and Gentile, being saved, have access through Christ and by the Spirit unto the Father. The essential part which Christ has accomplished has been considered at length, but there is also a part which the Holy Spirit undertakes. The Christian’s apprehension (1 Cor. 2:10), communion (2 Cor. 13:14), and much of his qualification for the divine presence (1 Cor. 12:13), are directly the work of the Holy Spirit. The all-important truth—marvelous beyond comprehension— is that each believer has perfect and immutable access unto the Father.

c. Access is Reassuring. So perfect, indeed, is this admission into the divine presence and favor that the Christian is urged to come *boldly.* In this instance, boldness becomes the believer, since every obstacle has been removed. Two passages, both in the Epistle to the Hebrews, enjoin this boldness: “Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need” (4:16); “having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh” (10:19–20).

To be one to whom unrestrained access into the presence of God is accorded is to occupy a position of superior privilege and standing, whether it be measured by the standards of heaven or of earth.

25. Within the Much More Care of God. It will be conceded by all who are awake to the divine revelation, that the love of God for the unsaved is as immeasurable as infinity; yet there is clear revelation that the

expression of divine love for those who are saved is even "much more." The argument is that, if God loved sinners and enemies enough to give His Son to die for them, His attitude will be "much more" toward them when they are reconciled and justified. The Apostle states: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life" (Rom. 5:8–10). This inconceivable devotion on the part of God for those He has saved leads on to various blessings for them.

a. Objects of His Love. The unchangeable love of God underlies all that He undertakes. It was His love that originated the way of salvation through Christ and thus by infinite grace. It is true that God is propitious; that is, He is able through the death of Christ to receive the sinner with unrestrained favor. The death of Christ did not cause God to love sinners; it was His love which provided that propitiation in and through Christ (John 3:16; Rom. 5:8; 1 John 3:16). The satisfaction which Christ rendered released the love of God from that demand which outraged holiness imposed against the sinner. The love of God knows no variations. It experiences no ups and downs, moods and tenses. It is the love of One who is immutable in all His character and ways.

b. Objects of His Grace. Men are not saved into a state of probation, but into the sphere of infinite grace—a sphere in which God deals with them as those for whom Christ has died, and whose sins are already borne by a Substitute. That grace contemplates:

(1) *Salvation.* Thus it is written: "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. 2:7–9).

(2) *Safekeeping.* As the Scripture declares: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand" (Rom. 5:2).

(3) *Service.* Of this it is said: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world" (John 17:18); "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. 4:7).

(4) *Instruction.* So, also, it is asserted: “teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:12–13).

c. Objects of His Power. A full induction of all passages in which God is said to be *able* to work in behalf of those who trust Him will prove a real help to the student. It will be seen that infinite power is ever actively engaged in the support and defense of the believer. It is written: “And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power” (Eph. 1:19); “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Phil. 2:13).

d. Objects of His Faithfulness. Limitless comfort is provided for those who recognize the faithfulness of God. It is said: “I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee” (Heb. 13:5); “being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ” (Phil. 1:6); “Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it” (1 Thess. 5:24).

e. Objects of His Peace. Not only is that peace *with* God in view (Rom. 5:1) which is due to the fact that all condemnation is removed, but the imparted, experimental peace is promised also: “Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid” (John 14:27); “And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful” (Col. 3:15), and “The fruit of the Spirit is … peace” (Gal. 5:22).

f. Objects of His Consolation. Respecting divine consolation it is written: “Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work” (2 Thess. 2:16–17).

g. Objects of His Intercession. While it is revealed that the Holy Spirit “maketh intercession” for the saints according to the will of God (Rom. 8:26) and they are enjoined to pray “in the Spirit” (Eph. 6:18; Jude 1:20), it is also indicated that one of the present ministries of Christ in heaven is His unceasing intercession for the saints. In His Priestly prayer He said that He

prayed not for the *cosmos* world, but for those the Father had given Him; and it is probable that His present intercession, like this Priestly prayer, is restricted to His own who are in the world. Three passages assert this heavenly intercession: “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us” (Rom. 8:34); “Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:25); “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. 9:24).

To be included thus in the “much more” love and care of God becomes a position in divine grace which is of surpassing value.

26. His Inheritance. A partial anticipation of this position in grace has been expressed under the previous heading, which announced that each Christian is a gift of the Father to the Son; however, beyond the treasure which he is to Christ as a gift from the Father, Ephesians 1:18 asserts that the believer is also the inheritance of the Father. This exalted truth is the subject of the Apostle’s prayer. As though, apart from the supernatural revelation of the Holy Spirit, they could not understand, he prays “the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints” (Eph. 1:18). Much is promised the believer respecting his future place in glory. It is written: “And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one” (John 17:22); “Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:30); “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory” (Col. 3:4). It is only by such changes as He shall have wrought in fallen sinners that God will be glorified. They will reflect the “glory of his grace” (Eph. 1:6). Each child of God will serve as a medium or material by which the Shekinah glory of God will be seen.

27. The Inheritance of the Saints. Far easier to comprehend than that just considered is the truth that the believer has an inheritance in God. The believer’s inheritance is God Himself and all that God bestows. This is

asserted by Peter thus: “An inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you” (1 Pet. 1:4). The present blessings which the Spirit brings into the Christian’s heart and life are likened to an earnest or comparatively small payment of all that is yet to be bestowed. The Apostle writes: “which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory” (Eph. 1:14); “knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ” (Col. 3:24). An eternal inheritance (Heb. 9:15) is a possession under grace; its specifications are unknowable until they are claimed in heaven.

28. Light in the Lord. As presented in the Scriptures with its symbolic meaning, an extensive body of truth is related to the general theme of light. Above all and supreme is the revelation that “God is light” (1 John 1:5). The meaning of this term as thus applied to God is that He is transparently holy and in Him is no moral darkness at all. That holy light which God is, has its manifestation on the face of Christ (2 Cor. 4:6). The believer has, by divine grace, become light (Eph. 5:8)—not merely that divine light shines upon him, but *is* light in the Lord. This great reality does not dismiss the truth that the believer is commanded to “walk in the light” (1 John 1:7), the light which God is. Both truths obtain and each engenders its own obligation. To walk in the light is not to become the light; it is rather to be wholly subject to the mind and will of God and adjusted to the holy character of God. In this respect, the Bible is a lamp to the feet and a light upon the path (Ps. 119:105). However, with regard to the light which the believer is, it may be observed that to have received the light into one’s being is a possession and to be light in the Lord is a position. No person becomes the light by attempting to shine; rather, having become light in the Lord and that as a divine achievement, he is appointed to shine as a light in a dark world. It is reasonable to conclude that the light which the believer is may be identified as the indwelling divine nature, and that that light is veiled in this world, but will have its manifestation in glory.

29. Vitally United to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. As perplexing as it may be to the human mind, the Scriptures advance six distinct revelations regarding relationships between the Godhead and the

believer, and these relationships represent realities which find no comparisons in the sphere of human intercourse. It is said (1) that the believer is in God the Father (1 Thess. 1:1), (2) that God the Father is in the believer (Eph. 4:6), (3) that the believer is in the Son (Rom. 8:1), (4) that the Son is in the believer (John 14:20), (5) that the believer is in the Spirit (Rom. 8:9), and (6) that the Spirit is in the believer (1 Cor. 2:12). The force of these stupendous declarations is centered in the intensity of meaning which must be assigned to the word *in* as used in each of these six declarations. It is evident that to be in the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit is a position; and for the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit to be in the believer constitutes a possession. A corresponding truth grows out of all this which is a result of it, namely, that the believers are one in each other as the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the Father (John 17:21). Since the believer's physical body is a corporate entity, it is not as difficult to think of that body as an abode; and the body is termed a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19). On the other hand, it is exceedingly difficult to understand the truth asserted that the believer is in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. This peculiar relationship to the Son is amplified by a sevenfold declaration or under seven figures: (1) the believer is a member in Christ's Body (1 Cor. 12:13), (2) the believer is to Christ as a branch to the vine (John 15:5), (3) the believer is to Christ as a stone in the building of which Christ is the Chief Cornerstone (Eph. 2:19–22), (4) the believer is to Christ as a sheep in His flock (John 10:27–29), (5) the believer is a part of that company who forms the Bride of Christ (Eph. 5:25–27), (6) the believer is a priest in a kingdom of priests over which Christ is High Priest forever (1 Pet. 2:5, 9), and (7) the believer is a part of the New Creation over which Christ as the Last Adam is the Head (2 Cor. 5:17). In John 14:20: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you," three great truths are declared as those which the believer is to know specifically in this age, namely, (1) Christ is in the Father, (2) the believer is in Christ, and (3) Christ is in the believer.

Similarly, there is much in the New Testament respecting the relationship which obtains between the Holy Spirit and the believer, which will yet be considered more fully in Volume VI.

The truths declared and distinguished under this heading represent not only the most vital positions and possessions which infinite grace can

create, but are the very heart of Christianity, being never intimated in the Old Testament.

30. Blessed with the Earnest or First-Fruits of the Spirit. As before intimated, the immeasurable blessings which come to the child of God because of his relation to the Holy Spirit are as a comparatively small down-payment which binds with certainty the larger gifts of heaven's glory. These present ministries of the Spirit are said to be an "earnest" (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:14) and "firstfruits" (Rom. 8:23) of the Spirit. There are five of these present riches: (1) The believer is *born* of the Spirit (John 3:6), by which operation Christ is begotten in the one who exercises saving faith. (2) The believer is *baptized* by the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13), which is a work of the Holy Spirit by which the believer is joined to Christ's Body and comes to be in Christ, and therefore a partaker of all that Christ is. (3) The believer is *indwelt* or *anointed* by the Spirit (John 7:39; Rom. 5:5; 8:9; 2 Cor. 1:21; Gal. 4:6; 1 John 2:27; 3:24), by which Presence the believer is equipped for every conflict and service. (4) The believer is *sealed* by the Spirit (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 4:30), which is the work of God the Holy Spirit by which the children of God are made secure unto the day of redemption. (5) The believer may be *filled* with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18), which ministry of the Spirit releases His power and effectiveness in the heart in which He dwells.

The Spirit's work in and through the Christian results in both positions and possessions that are themselves marvelous realities of the riches of divine grace, and all of these together form but a foretaste of the glory which is assured in heaven.

31. Glorified. What God has determined, though it be yet future, is properly looked upon as sufficiently certain to be considered a present achievement. He is the One "who … calleth those things which be not as though they were" (Rom. 4:17). Awaiting the child of God is a surpassing heavenly glory—even partaking of the infinite glory which belongs to the Godhead. Of this fact it is written: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:18); "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4). It is not to be concluded that there is a present and a future glory which are unrelated. The

present glory is the divine reckoning of the future glory to be even a present reality. No passage more clearly asserts this fact than Romans 8:30, which states: “Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.”

To be a glorified saint is a position in divine grace of immeasurable riches and, in the certainty of the divine purpose, it becomes a possession.

32. Complete in Him. This, with the theme which follows, serves as a conclusion of that which has gone before in this attempt to record the riches of divine grace; yet these are specific disclosures of all that enters into the exceeding grace of God. What may be included in the word *complete* when the Apostle says, “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power” (Col. 2:9–10), is beyond the range of human understanding. No careless use of terms will be discovered in any Scripture, and this passage presents the voice of the Holy Spirit declaring that, to the degree by which God values things and according to those standards which God employs, the child of God is complete; but so great a transformation is due to the all-determining fact that he is in Christ. The truth is thus once more presented that, because of his vital union with Christ, the believer partakes of all that Christ is. The Father finds infinite delight in the Son, nor can He find delight in that which is less than the perfection of the Son. While men may ever be before the Father as the creatures of His hand, those who are saved are, even now, perfected in His sight by and through their vital relation to the Son. Thus a principle is introduced which is far removed from human custom or practice and, naturally, beyond human understanding, but not beyond the range of human acceptance or belief, since it is declared in the Word of God. To be complete in Christ is a glorious reality and is a portion of that grace which is extended to all who believe.

33. Possessing Every Spiritual Blessing. No text of Scripture more perfectly accounts for *all* the riches of grace than Ephesians 1:3, which reads: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.” All the riches of grace tabulated in the thirty-two points made before are to be

included in this sweeping term—"all spiritual blessings." These are again and finally declared to be realized on the basis of the believer's relation to Christ. Thus all positions and possessions which together measure the riches of divine grace are traced to the believer's place in Christ. These are accorded the one who believes on Christ to the saving of his soul.

Conclusion

It would hardly be amiss to restate the truth that salvation is a work of God for man and not a work of man for God. It is what God's love prompts Him to do and not a mere act of pity which rescues creatures from their misery. To realize the satisfaction of His love God has been willing to remove by an infinite sacrifice the otherwise insuperable hindrance which sin has imposed; He is, likewise, overcoming the wicked opposition to His grace which the fallen human will presents by inclining His elect ones to exercise saving faith in Christ. When the way is thus clear, God is free to do all that infinite love dictates. Nothing short of transformations which are infinite will satisfy infinite love. An inadequate record of these riches of grace which together represent the infinity of saving grace has been submitted; but it still remains true that "the half has never been told." The student who is ambitious to be accurate in gospel preaching will not only observe but ever contend for the truth that all these riches are purely a work of God, and that to secure them the individual could do no more than to receive at the hand of God what He is free to give in and through Christ Jesus. Those who believe on Christ in the sense that they receive Him (John 1:12) as their Savior enter instantly into all that divine love provides. These thirty-three positions and possessions are not bestowed in succession, but simultaneously. They do not require a period of time for their execution; but are wrought instantaneously. They measure the present difference which obtains between one who is saved and one who is not saved.

"Oh to grace how great a debtor
Daily I'm constrained to be!
Let thy goodness, like a fetter,
Bind my wandering heart to Thee."

The Eternal Security of the Believer

Chapter XIV

Introduction to the Doctrine of Security

This aspect of Soteriology, commonly styled by earlier theologians *the perseverance of the saints*, contends that no individual once the recipient of the saving grace of God will ever fall totally and finally from that estate, but that he shall be "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation" (1 Pet. 1:5). The doctrine of security is one of the five points of the Calvinistic system, but it is more distinguished by the fact that it is set forth in the New Testament in the most absolute terms and is there seen to be an indivisible feature of that which God undertakes when a soul is saved. This major doctrine is well stated in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, which declares: "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved" (17.1).

That the Scripture on this theme requires careful exposition to the end that it may not even seem to contradict itself is readily conceded, and this feature of this truth will not be overlooked. In such a consideration, a "verily, verily" should not be countermanded by an "if." The words of certainty must stand as they appear on the Sacred Page.

The Calvinistic system, which is here both held and defended as being more nearly Pauline than any other, is built upon a recognition of four basic truths, each of which should be comprehended in its basic character. These truths are: (1) *Depravity*, by which term is meant that there is nothing in fallen man that could commend him to God. He is an object of divine grace. (2) *Efficacious grace*, by which term is meant that fallen man, in being saved, is wrought upon wholly by God—even the faith which he exercises in his salvation is a "gift of God" (Eph. 2:8 . (3) *Sovereign and eternal election*, by which term is meant that those who are saved by efficacious grace from the estate of depravity have been chosen of God for that blessedness from before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4; Rom. 8:30). (4) *Eternal security*, by which term it is meant that those chosen of God and

saved by grace are, of necessity, preserved unto the realization of the design of God. Since sovereign election purposes this and sovereign grace accomplishes it, the Scriptures could not—being infinitely true—do other than to declare the Christian's security without reservation or complication. This the Scriptures assuredly declare.

Rationalism in its varied forms and Arminianism in particular challenge these sovereign verities. To the Arminian the limiting effect of depravity is annulled to a large degree by the supposed bestowment upon all men of a so-called "common grace" which provides ability on the sinner's part to turn to Christ. According to this belief, men are saved by divine grace into a momentary right relation with God from which they can fall. The continuation in that right relation with God—regardless of the fact that it is the realization of the divine purpose—is made by the Arminian to depend on human merit and conduct. Similarly, sovereign election is to the Arminian no more than divine foreknowledge by which God is able to make choice of those who will act righteously in respect to His offers of grace—a foreseeing and consequent recognition of human merit, which recognition contradicts the doctrine of sovereign grace (Rom. 11:6).

Of all New Testament doctrines two—sovereign election and sovereign grace—are most closely related to the doctrine of eternal security. This is obvious. Personal election, which is that form of it that is alone involved, is distinctly unto eternal realities which, of necessity, can be realized only by the safekeeping to final fruition of all who are included in election. Similarly, it is to be seen that the ground upon which sovereign grace advances provides a holy God with the requisite freedom, not merely to save those who are unworthy, but to preserve them after they are saved—even when, as all are, they are unworthy. It is in this larger field of operation for the grace of God, when not comprehended, that Arminian notions of insecurity arise.

Therefore, if God in sovereign election has determined in eternal past ages that some shall be "before him" in glory (Eph. 1:4) and these are predestined to that glory (Rom. 8:30), and if God in sovereign grace has removed every barrier to that purpose which sin and the human will impose, security is assured, and to deny it is to contend that either sovereign election or sovereign grace (or both together) is impotent. By such a line of

indisputable reasoning, it is concluded that the doctrine of security is an indispensable feature of Pauline and Calvinistic theology.

On the vital importance of this aspect of truth in its relation to a right understanding of Biblical doctrine, Principal Cunningham in his *Historical Theology* (3rd ed., II, 493) writes:

> If it be true that God has, from eternity, absolutely and unconditionally chosen some men, certain persons, to eternal life, these men assuredly will all infallibly be saved. If it be also true that He has arranged that no man shall be saved, unless upon earth he be brought into a state of grace, unless he repent and believe, and persevere in faith and holiness, He will assuredly give to all whom He has chosen to life faith and holiness, and will infallibly secure that they shall persevere therein unto the end. And as it is further taught by Calvinists, that God produces in some men faith and conversion in the execution of His decree of election, just because He has decreed to save *these* men, —and does so for the purpose of saving them, —the *whole* of what they teach under the head of perseverance is thus effectually provided for, and thoroughly established,—faith and regeneration being never produced in any except those whose ultimate salvation has been secured, and whose perseverance, therefore, in faith and holiness must be certain and infallible. All this is too plain to require any illustration; and Calvinists must of course, in consistency, take the responsibility of maintaining the certain perseverance of all believers or saints,—of all in whom faith and holiness have been once produced.

To this may be added the testimony of Dr. Ralph Wardlaw, who writes:

> Respecting this doctrine we may observe in general, that it follows as a necessary sequence from the doctrine of personal election which we have just been endeavouring to illustrate in its scriptural meaning, and to establish on the basis of scriptural authority. Election is election to salvation; not to privilege merely, or the enjoyment of the means of salvation, but, through these means, to salvation itself. If this be the Bible doctrine, then it follows inevitably, that all who are elected to salvation shall obtain salvation. To hold the former, and question the latter, would be self-contradictory. Perseverance is a consequence of election, and involved in it. There can properly be no personal election to salvation without it. The one doctrine is necessary to the integrity of the other. Instead of being distinct doctrines, they are integrant parts of the same doctrine. To suppose any who are of the elect to fail of final salvation, is to render election altogether nugatory. The arguments, therefore, on these two of the five points are clearly reciprocal; that is, every proof of election is a proof of perseverance, and every proof of perseverance is a proof of election.—*System of Theology*, II, 550

While Christians and their creeds are divided into the two groups—Calvinists with their certainty of security and Arminians with their doubts and imaginary dangers—it will be found that belief or disbelief in security is personal and individual, depending on the degree of understanding of the Word of God and conformity to that Word which the individual possesses. Many members in Calvinistic churches are, for want of training in doctrine,

unable to rise above the rationalism of the Arminian view, while a few who are enrolled in Arminian memberships have discovered the gracious reality of eternal security. The significant fact will speak for itself, that great multitudes upon right instruction turn from Arminianism to Calvinism, while, on the other hand, none have been known to turn from an instructed, intelligent Calvinism to Arminianism.

At least three exceptional beliefs which are outside the range of either Calvinism or Arminianism should be noted: (1) Augustine held that some might be saved who were not of the elect and that these might fall away. His view never gained a worthy following. Of this Augustinian view Principal Cunningham has written:

> Augustine seems to have thought that men who were true believers, and who were regenerated, so as to have been really brought under the influence of divine truth and religious principle, might fall away and finally perish; but then he did not think that those persons who might, or did, thus fall away and perish belonged to the number of those who had been predestinated, or elected, to life. He held that all those who were elected to life must, and did, persevere, and thus attain to salvation. It was of course abundantly evident, that if God chose some men, absolutely and unconditionally, to eternal life,—and this Augustine firmly believed,—these persons must, and would, certainly be saved. Whether persons might believe and be regenerated who had not been predestinated to life, and who, in consequence, might fall away, and thereby fail to attain salvation, is a distinct question; and on this question Augustine's views seem to have been obscured and perverted by the notions that then generally prevailed about the objects and effects of outward ordinances, and especially by something like the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which has been, perhaps, as powerful and extensive a cause of deadly error as any doctrine that Satan ever invented. Augustine's error, then, lay in supposing that men might believe and be regenerated who had not been elected to life, and might consequently fail of ultimate salvation; but he never did, and never could, embrace any notion so irrational and inconsequential, as that God could have absolutely chosen some even to life, and then permitted them to fall away and to perish; and the negation of this notion, which Augustine never held, constitutes the sum and substance of what Calvinists have taught upon the subject of perseverance.—*Op. cit.*, p. 490

(2) Arminius, whatever his followers have embraced of part-truth or error, did not himself renounce the belief in security. To quote Principal Cunningham again:

> Arminius never wholly renounced the doctrine of the certain perseverance of all believers, even after he had abandoned all the other principles of Calvinism, but spoke of this as a point on which he had not fully made up his mind, and which, he thought, required further investigation,—thus virtually bearing testimony to the difficulty of disposing of the scriptural evidence on which the doctrine rests. His immediate followers, likewise, professed for a time some hesitation upon this point; but their contemporary opponents do not seem to have given them much credit for sincerity in the doubts which they professed to entertain

> regarding it, because, while they did not for a time directly and explicitly support a negative conclusion, the whole current of their statements and arguments seemed plainly enough to indicate that they had already renounced the generally received doctrine of the Reformed churches upon this subject. They very soon, even before the Synod of Dort, openly renounced the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, along with the other doctrines of Calvinism; and I am not aware that any instance has since occurred, in which any Calvinist has hesitated to maintain this doctrine, or any Arminian has hesitated to deny it.—*Ibid.*, pp. 490–91

(3) Certain Lutherans have contended that one once saved might fall away, but that such a one would, with absolute certainty, be restored and saved in the end. This conception, too, has secured no following.

It hardly seems necessary to point out that this discussion concerns those only who are saved in the New Testament meaning of that word. Obviously, there are those who are mere professors who possess every outward appearance—baptism, church affiliation, sympathy, and service—who are lacking features that really identify a saved person. It is assured that mere professors "go out" eventually from the company of the believers. The Apostle John states respecting mere professors that "they went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us" (1 John 2:19). In the words "They went out from us," there is a superficial relationship acknowledged. Similarly, in the words "They were not of us," another relationship is recognized. The former could mean no more than a profession, while the latter implies the existence of the eternal bonds which those who went out did not share. God does not fail to discern the true classification of men. It is written of Him: "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (2 Tim. 2:19). None could go out from the company of believers who had not first been with them; and those thus with them, of whom it could be said that they were not of them, could be *with* them only in the sense that they were mere professors (cf. Matt. 13:3–7).

The keeping power of God is vouchsafed only to those who are saved. When Arminians assert that supposed Christians have ceased to function as such, it is well to recall the sifting process which is described by the words,

“They went out from us … that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.”

In concluding this word of introduction, it may serve a worthy purpose to point out (1) that the truth of eternal security is inherent in the nature of salvation itself. This fact, it is anticipated, will be made clear in the discussion which follows, as it has been made clear from the analysis of divine grace which has gone before. If salvation is no more than a detached coin which one holds in the hand and is secure only by virtue of a feeble human grasp, it might easily, nay, almost certainly, be lost. On the other hand, if salvation is the creation of a new being composed of unchangeable and imperishable elements, and in every aspect of it is made to depend on the perfect and immutable merit of the Son of God, there can be no failure. Indeed there can be, and too often is, personal sin on the part of the one who is saved; but, as has been seen, that is accounted for to the infinite satisfaction of God’s holiness upon another and all-sufficient basis. (2) Actually, there are no proper grounds for drawing a distinction between salvation and safekeeping, though for practical purposes such a distinction may be set up. The conclusion of the preceding discussion on that which God undertakes when He saves a soul, demonstrates the truthfulness of the assertion that God is not offering a salvation to men which is not eternal in its very nature; and in spite of all human experience, which is too often cited as a determining factor, it is true that no soul once saved has ever been, or ever will be, lost again. Doubts about the security of those who are saved may be traced almost universally to a failure to comprehend the reality of that which God accomplishes in sovereign grace.

These declarations, confessedly dogmatic, will be defended in the following pages. This thesis will follow a twofold analysis in the next two chapters, namely, (1) the Arminian view and (2) the Calvinistic view.

Chapter XV

The Arminian View of Security

Though but little reference has been made in this work to one of them, three systems of theology have flourished which offer their varying contentions in the field of Soteriology. These systems are Socinianism, Arminianism, and Calvinism. Socinianism and Calvinism are as far removed the one from the other as midnight and noontime. Socinianism in its day denied almost every feature of Christian doctrine, while Calvinism adheres rigidly to the revelation God has given. It is Calvinism which seeks to honor God—Father, Son, and Spirit—by its views respecting depravity, human guilt, and human helplessness, and these in the light of divine sovereignty, divine supremacy, and the sufficiency of divine grace. On the other hand, Arminianism sustains an intermediate ground between the rationalism of Socinianism and the determined Biblical character of Calvinism. A certain group of Arminians have leaned toward Socinianism and were these advocates consistent, they, like the Socinians, would deny the work of Christ and much of the work of the Holy Spirit. The more conservative Arminians—such as Arminius himself—though inconsistent with themselves and steeped with Socinian rationalism in their approach to every soteriological truth, do evince a degree of amenability to the Word of God and the doctrines which that Word exhibits.

There are truths, such as the lost estate of man through sin and the need of salvation, that are common to Arminians and Calvinists alike. On the ground of these common beliefs a degree of united effort in evangelism has been possible between the representatives of these two systems. The real controversy between the two, however, has not been abandoned, nor could it be. It will be found that in the case of each major theme related to Soteriology the Arminian position is weak and inaccurate and to that extent misleading. The instructed preacher and teacher will contend for the precise meaning of the Scriptures. What may be passed over in the interests of harmony in united Christian service cannot as easily be passed over when a worthy declaration of truth is called for. Along with this, it should be pointed out—and history will verify the assertion—that sustained, extended, unprejudiced study of the Sacred Text must and, therefore, does lead to the Calvinistic position. It is conceivable hypothetically that both

Arminianism and Calvinism are wrong, but it is wholly impossible for both to be right. The Bible offers no contradictions. If one system is right, the other is wrong. There is no compromise possible. Through extended study uncounted multitudes have turned from Arminianism to Calvinism; but history offers few, if any, examples of an opposite movement.

It will be remembered that, after all, the appellations *Arminianism* and *Calvinism* are no more than convenient names for general systems and that in each of these systems there is represented a wide latitude of variation in the doctrine being held. As already indicated, Arminius himself did not hold the extreme views which some of his followers have advanced, yet they retain the Arminian name. In like manner, the very fact that there are at least two schools of Calvinists precludes the possibility of Calvin being the promoter of every form of doctrine which appears under his name. Under other disciplines the student would do well to read attentively the extended history covering the development of each of these systems.

In respect to the truth of eternal security, it will be noted, as of other major doctrines, that it is impossible to be in agreement with all sincere men. In the light of the disagreement which obtains, the student can do no more than to be amenable to the Word of God. The two claims—that the Christian is secure and that he is insecure—present a complete contradiction and no middle ground of compromise could possibly be found.

While the doctrine of security may not represent the most important difference which exists between these two theological systems, neither the claim respecting security nor the claim respecting insecurity can be maintained apart from the effort to harmonize each with the whole body of soteriological truth. Bitterness between the advocates of these divergent systems could hardly be avoided when there is no way of reconciliation between them; and this controversy is greatly stimulated by the immeasurable importance of the question. The issue that is paramount is whether the saving work of Christ on the cross includes the safekeeping of the one who trusts Him, or not. This is the central and precise issue in the controversy. Either Christ did enough by His death concerning the believer’s sins that it can be said that “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (though it is not said that there is no chastisement), or He did not. Again, either Christ did enough by

His death and resurrection in fulfilling the sweet savor type, that it can be said that the believer possesses eternal life and the perfect standing of the Son of God, being in Him, or He did not. If there is no sufficient ground for the removal of condemnation and no sufficient ground for the impartation of eternal life and the imputing of Christ's merit, then the most vital teachings of the New Testament are rendered void. It is these so-compelling features of truth which are conspicuous by their absence from Arminian writings. Arminian theologians are a product of the limited teachings which are presented in their schools from generation to generation, and therefore the deeper realities are not known by them. To know these realities is to embrace them, for they constitute the warp and woof of the Pauline gospel.

The Arminian view may be divided for convenience into three general features: (1) the Arminian view of major soteriological doctrines, (2) the Arminian emphasis upon human experience and reason, and (3) the Arminian appeal to the Scriptures.

I. The Arminian View of Major Soteriological Doctrines

The field is properly restricted in this discussion to problems of soteriological doctrine. The consideration of the Arminian view of the value of Christ's death is not entered upon here and this is due to the fact that it has had an extended treatment in an earlier portion of this work. The doctrines to be noted are: (a) the Arminian view of original sin, (b) the Arminian view of universal and efficacious calling, (c) the Arminian view of divine decrees, (d) the Arminian view of the fall, (e) the Arminian view of omniscience, (f) the Arminian view of divine sovereignty, and (g) the Arminian view of sovereign grace.

1. The Arminian View of Original Sin. It is exceedingly difficult for a system of doctrine, which builds so much on the freedom of the human will and contends that all men are by virtue of a common grace enabled to act without natural or supernatural restraint in the matter of their own salvation, to defend unconditionally the doctrine of total depravity. It is observable that Arminianism has put but little emphasis upon the teaching respecting that inability which is the nature and essence of original sin. The Arminian

notion of depravity, whatever it is supposed to be in its original form, is largely overcome, it is contended, by a fancied common grace. However, in the working of this scheme, one of the Arminian inconsistencies—a withdrawing with one hand what is bestowed with the other—is displayed. It is rather too much to suppose that a common grace—itself without Biblical justification—is a complete corrective of total depravity; and it will not be without explanation, in part at least, if, starting with such a premise as their idea of common grace provides, the Arminians drift into equally unscriptural notions respecting sanctification and sinless perfection. Naturally, the will of man, which is supposed to be emancipated by common grace, may, as effectually, defeat the realization of that which is best. It is certain that, when given an unrestrained freedom of volition, that volition will not always turn in the right direction or toward God. It may as readily turn from God, and that, it is contended, even after years of life and experience in a regenerate state. Over against this fallacious rationalism—this unsupported theory and feeble deification of man—the Scriptures assert, and in accordance therewith the Calvinists teach, that man is totally depraved, that God must and does move in behalf of fallen man for his salvation—even engendering saving faith—and that salvation, being distinctly a work of God, is, like all His works, incapable of failure. It is thus demonstrated that the erroneous exaltation of the human ability in the beginning becomes man's effectual undoing in the end. Over against this, the man who is totally incompetent, falling into the hands of God, who acts in sovereign grace, is saved and safe forever. For such an achievement the glory is not to be shared by fallen man but is altogether due God alone.

2. The Arminian View of Universal and Efficacious Calling. Without reference to a limited or an unlimited redemption—which theme some theologians are determined to bring into the discussion of an efficacious call and which it is believed has but a remote relation to the subject in hand—the real question is whether, as the Arminian contends, the divine influence upon men whereby they are enabled to receive the gospel and to be saved is that common grace which the Arminian claims is bestowed upon all men, or whether that divine enablement, as the Calvinist declares, is a specific, personal call of the individual by which the Holy Spirit moves that one to understand and intelligently to accept the saving

grace of God as it is in Christ Jesus. If the contention of the Arminian be true—that God gives no more enablement to one than to another—the fact that, when the gospel is preached alike to each, one is saved and another is not, becomes a matter of the human will which, it is claimed, either accepts or rejects the gracious invitation. Such an arrangement might seem plausible were it not for that array of Scripture, already considered in another connection, which declares that man has no power to move himself toward God. The New Testament not only lends no support to the Arminian notion of common grace, but definitely teaches that men are helpless in their fallen estate (cf. Rom. 3:11; 1 Cor. 2:14; 2 Cor. 4:3–4; Eph. 2:8–9). On the other hand, the Calvinist contends that, when God by His Spirit inclines one to receive Christ, that one, in so doing, acts only in the consciousness of his own choice. It is obvious that to present a convincing argument to a person which leads that person to make a decision, does not partake of the nature of a coercion of the will. In such a case, every function of the will is preserved and, in relation to the gospel, it remains true that "whoever will may come"; yet back of this truth is the deeper revelation that no fallen man wills to accept Christ until enlightened by the Holy Spirit (John 16:7–11). Principal Cunningham writes on this general problem as follows:

> It is important to fix in our minds a clear conception of the *alternatives* in the explanation of this matter, according as the Calvinistic or the Arminian doctrine upon the subject is adopted. The thing to be accounted for is,—the positive production of faith and regeneration in some men; while others continue, under the same outward call and privileges, in their natural state of impenitence and unbelief. Now this is just virtually the question, Who maketh those who have passed from death to life, and are now advancing towards heaven, to differ from those who are still walking in the broad way? Is it God? or is it themselves? The Calvinists hold that it is God who makes this difference; the Arminians—however they may try to conceal this, by general statements about the grace of God and the assistance of the Spirit—virtually and practically ascribe the difference to believers themselves. God has given sufficient grace—everything necessary for effecting the result—to others as well as to them. There is no difference in the call addressed to them, or in the grace vouchsafed to them. This is equal and alike. There is a difference in the result; and from the sufficiency and consequent substantial equality of the universal grace vouchsafed, this difference in the result must necessarily be ascribed, as to its real adequate cause, to something in themselves,—not to God's grace, not to what He graciously bestowed upon them, but to what they themselves were able to do, and have done, in improving aright what God communicated to them. If sufficient grace is communicated to all who are outwardly called, then no more than what is sufficient is communicated to those who actually repent and believe; for, to assert this, is virtually to deny or retract the position, that what was communicated to those who continue impenitent and unbelieving, *was sufficient or adequate*, and thus to contradict their

> fundamental doctrine upon this whole subject. And when the true state of the question, and the real alternatives involved, are thus brought out, there is no difficulty in seeing and proving that the Arminian doctrine is inconsistent with the plain teaching of Scripture,—as to the great principles which regulate or determine men's spiritual character and eternal destiny, —the true source and origin of all that is spiritually good in them,—the real nature of faith and regeneration, as implying changes which men are utterly unable to produce, or even to cooperate, in the first instance, in originating; and as being not only the work of God in men, —the gift of God to men,—but also, and more particularly, as being in every instance the result of a special operation of the Holy Ghost,—an operation represented as altogether peculiar and distinguishing,—bestowed upon some and not upon others, according to the counsel of God's own will, and *certainly* or infallibly effecting, wherever it is bestowed, all those things that accompany salvation.—*Historical Theology*, 3rd ed., II, 404–5

Again it will be seen that the Arminian exaltation of the human will in the matter of personal salvation encourages those same Arminians to contend, as they do, that the same free will by which the individual accepts Christ is itself able to depart from God after he is saved. To such rationalistic conclusions, the Word of God, which asserts the inability of man to turn to God, lends no support. It is rather revealed that, after one is saved, "it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13); nor does this continuous inclination by the Spirit of the Christian's volition partake in any respect of a coercion of the human will.

3. The Arminian View of Divine Decrees. Under this aspect of the general theme, this solemn truth respecting God is approached again. None but the most careless will fail to recognize that the subject of divine decrees, with its corresponding doctrines of predestination, election, and reprobation, involves the contemplation of the most fathomless, inaccessible, and mysterious themes to which the human mind may be addressed. To comprehend this vast subject would be equivalent to comprehending the mind of God. That difficulties arise in the mind of man when reflecting on so great a subject is to be expected, since it could not be otherwise. Similarly, it is generally conceded that this topic in all its bearings—philosophical, theological, and practical—has been more considered than any other; yet the mysteries involved must remain inscrutable until the greater light of another world breaks upon the human mind.

In its simple form, the question now in view may be stated thus: Did God have a plan in eternity past which He is executing in time? The two extreme positions—Socinianism and Calvinism—may well be compared at this point. The former held that all future events which depend upon secondary causes, such as the human will, are by necessity unknowable even to God, while the Calvinists maintain that God has not only ordained whatsoever cometh to pass, but is executing the same through His providence. Midway between these so divergent conceptions is the position of the Arminians—a position in which conflicting ideas appear. Arminians have not been willing to deny the foreknowledge of God in agreement with the Socinians; nor have they been willing to accept that estimation of God which accords to Him the unconditional authority to act, power to achieve, and purpose to govern, in all that cometh to pass. Therefore, the doctrines of divine decrees, of predestination, of sovereign election, and of retribution are by the Arminians either directly denied or explained away by recourse to reason. At times the plain assertions of the Sacred Text have been distorted in this effort. They claim that God had no other decree respecting the salvation of men than that He would save those who believe, and condemn and reprobate those who do not believe. Beyond this, man is responsible apart from any divine relationship. Having sent His Son into the world to remove the insuperable obstacle of sin and having removed man's inability by a bestowal upon him of a supposed common grace, man is left to make his own choice, though, of course, the gospel must be preached unto him. According to this plan, God determines nothing, bestows nothing apart from the removal of inability, and secures nothing. Certain individuals are chosen of God only in the sense that He foresaw their faith and good works—which faith and good works arise in themselves and are not divinely wrought. In the end, according to this system, man is his own savior. A salvation which originates in such uncertainties, builds upon mere foreknowledge of human merit, and exalts the human will to the place of sovereignty, cannot make place for the doctrine of security, since eternal security of those who are saved depends on the sovereign undertakings of God.

4. The Arminian View of the Fall. A return to a full discussion of the fall of man, already pursued at length in Volume II, is uncalled for here.

What has been written before must serve as a background for this brief reference to a theme so extended and mysterious.

Far more than is sometimes realized, the doctrine of the fall of man is closely related to the whole Biblical scheme of predestination. Apart from the fall with its complete ruin of the race, there could be no sufficient basis for the doctrine of sovereign grace with its utter disregard for human merit, nor for a defense against the notion that sovereign election represents a respect of personal qualities in man on the part of God. Arminians of the older school have not denied the fall of man, or the extent of that fall. They suppose, however, no matter how complete the fall, that it is overcome by the bestowal of common grace. From the moment that grace is bestowed, the case of a man is different. Ability on man's part to act for or against the will of God becomes the cornerstone of the Arminian structure of Soteriology. The supposed ability to reject God not only conditions and makes contingent the salvation of men to the extent that God may assume no more than to foreknow what man will do, but that supposed ability survives after regeneration and renders it possible for the redeemed to degenerate back to their original lost estate. Calvinists maintain that men are wholly unable to deliver themselves or to take one step in the direction of their own salvation, that men have no claim upon God for salvation because of merit, and that the salvation of men is a divine undertaking built upon a righteous ground which not only provides a holy God with freedom to save meritless men, but provides as well the same righteous freedom on God's part by which He can keep them saved forever.

When this divinely wrought arrangement for the salvation of men through grace is abandoned and a merit system for man is substituted, as the Arminians choose to do, they find themselves beset with fears, backslidings, and failures which have no recognition in the New Testament. A grave question arises under the Arminian system, namely, whether men who have been impressed with the notion that they are to a large degree their own saviors and keepers, will ever find the rest and peace which is the portion of those who have ceased from their own works and are wholly cast upon God.

5. The Arminian View of Omniscience. No slight difficulty for the Arminian system arises from the obvious fact that God could foreknow

nothing as certain in the future unless He had Himself made it certain by foreordination. Neither could foreknowledge function apart from foreordination, nor foreordination apart from foreknowledge. Merely to foreknow what will be determined by secondary causes, leaves the entire program of events adrift without chart or compass. According to His Word, God assuredly foreknows, foreordains, and executes. Every prediction of the Bible incorporates these elements, and nowhere more conclusively than in the events connected with the death of Christ. God foreknew that His Son would die upon a cross, but He did more about it than merely to foreknow. Peter declares that Christ as the Lamb was "foreordained before the foundation of the world" (1 Pet. 1:20); and so great an event could not be left to the uncertainties of human wills. "Wicked hands" crucified the Son of God, but this was according to the "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23). The salvation of each individual who believes on Christ is no more an accident of human determination than is the death of Christ. The Arminian idea of election to eternal glory on the part of some, is that it includes those who believe on Christ, persevere, and die in the faith, whereas the Scriptures teach that certain men believe, persevere, and die in the faith because of the fact that they are elect and destined to eternal glory. When man is given the responsibility of working out his own eternal destiny, as Arminianism expects him to do, it will be remembered that all this could be done as effectively whether God foreknew it or not. Security, according to the Arminian conception of it, is that which God foreknew men would do in their own behalf and, since the human element bulks largely in it, the actual arrival of a soul in heaven's glory is more or less accidental—certainly not predetermined and executed by God.

6. The Arminian View of Divine Sovereignty. It is conceded by all who are of a pious mind that God is the Supreme Ruler of the universe and that He exercises His authority and power to that end. That He is putting into effect precisely what He had before designed, would not create prejudice as a proposition by itself, were it not for the fact that such an admission leads on logically to the Calvinistic position respecting the predestination, justification, and glorification of all whom He has chosen for eternal salvation. Calvinists contend that God acts in perfect reason, but

upon a level much higher than may be comprehended by the human understanding; and therefore they do not assume to assign a reason for all of God's ways in the universe and with men. Arminians, however, seek to assign a reason for God's dealings with men and do, by so much, deny His sovereignty. It is a worthy attitude to believe that God rules over all things, executing precisely His own will and purpose, and that in doing this He acts always within the limitations which His adorable attributes impose. It follows, also, that, because of His omnipotence, God could have prevented any and every form of evil, and that, as evil is present, it is serving a purpose which is worthy of God and which will, in the end, be recognized as worthy by all intelligences. Arminians tend to discredit the sovereignty of God by assuming that events are not necessarily to be considered as having a place or part in the divine will. This has led to much discussion regarding the divine volition. Arminians are wont to distinguish an antecedent will from a consequent will in God. The former moves Him to save all men, while the latter is conditioned by the conduct of men. The antecedent will is not a sovereign will; it, too, is restricted by human action. Such a conception is far removed from the Calvinistic teaching concerning the efficacious will of God—that which not only elects to save some, but actually does save them and preserve them, having anticipated all things requisite to that end and having provided those requisite things. As before stated, the two impediments or barriers which stood in the way were sin and the freedom of the human will. In the sacrificial death of His Son, God dealt finally with the obstacle which sin engenders. By moving the hearts of men to desire His saving grace (which acts have no semblance to coercion), He removes the obstruction which the free will of man might impose. The two systems—Arminianism and Calvinism—are each consistent at this point within themselves. The Arminian contends that man is supreme and that God is compelled to adjust Himself to that scheme of things. The Calvinist contends that God is supreme and that man is called upon to be conformed to that revelation. The Arminian is deprived of the exalted blessing which is the portion of those who believe the sublime facts of predestination, election, and the sovereignty of God, because he hesitates to embrace them in their full-orbed reality. Having incorporated into his scheme the finite human element, all certainty about the future is for the Arminian overclouded with doubts. Having made the purpose of God contingent, the

execution of that purpose must be contingent. By so much the glorious, divine arrangement by which the ungodly may go to heaven, is replaced by the mere moral program in which only good people may have a hope.

7. The Arminian View of Sovereign Grace. As certainly as there are two widely separated and divergent forms of religion in the world—in the one, God saves man and in the other, man saves himself—so definitely Calvinism and Arminianism are withdrawn the one from the other. All the forms of religion that men cherish are, with one exception, in the class which is identified by the obligation resting upon man to save himself; and in this group, because of its insistence that the element of human merit must be recognized, the Arminian system is classed. Standing alone and isolated by its commitment to the doctrine of pure uncompromising grace, the true Christian faith, as set forth by the great Apostle and later defended by Calvin and by uncounted theologians before and since his day, is a system of Soteriology characterized by its fundamental feature that God, unaided and to His own unshared and unchangeable glory, originates, executes, and consummates the salvation of man. The sole requirement on the human side is that man receive what God has to give. This he does, he is told, by believing upon Christ as his Savior. Arminianism distorts this sublime, divine undertaking by the intrusion of human features at every step of the way. It can rise no higher in the interpretation of the Word of God respecting sovereign election, than to claim that it consists in the action of divine foreknowledge by which God foresees the men of faith, holiness, and constancy. This interpretation not only reverses the order of truth—the Scriptures declare that men are elected unto holiness and not on account of holiness—but intrudes at the very beginning of the divine program in salvation the grace-destroying element of human merit. In the matter of the one condition of believing on Christ for salvation, the Arminians have constantly added various requirements to the one which is divinely appointed, and all of these infringe upon this one essential of pure grace by adding to it the element of human works. Similarly, in the sphere of the believer’s safekeeping, which is declared to be altogether a work of God, Arminianism makes security to be contingent upon human conduct. Arminians seem strangely blinded in the matter of comprehending the divine plan by which, apart from all features of human merit, sinners are

elected in past ages without respect to future worthiness, saved at the present time on the sole condition of faith in Christ, and kept to the eternal ages to come through the power of God on a basis which sustains no relation to human conduct. In reality, to assert so much is to declare that Arminians are blind to the true gospel of divine grace which is the central truth of Christianity—that is, if the Pauline revelation is to be considered at all. Over against this and in conformity to the New Testament, Calvinists assert that election is on a basis of grace which foresees no human merit in those chosen, that present salvation is by faith or belief alone, and that those saved are kept wholly by divine grace without reference to human worthiness.

It would seem wholly unnecessary to remind the student again that there is an important body of truth which conditions the believer's daily life after he is saved, and that his life is motivated, not by a requirement that works of merit must be added to the perfect divine undertaking and achievement in saving grace, but is motivated by the most reasonable obligation to "walk worthy of the vocation [calling] wherewith he is called" (Eph. 4:1). Behaving well as a son is far removed in principle from the idea of behaving well to become a son. It is the blight of Arminian soteriology that it seems incapable of recognizing this distinction, and therefore does not allow a place for the action of pure grace in the realization of the sovereign purpose of God through a perfect salvation and an eternal safekeeping apart from any and every form of human merit or cooperation.

Though much must be made of this theme in other connections, a word is in order at this point respecting the meaning of the term *sovereign grace*—a term employed by Calvinists with genuine satisfaction, but both rejected and avoided by Arminians. Sovereign grace originates and is at once a complete reality in the mind of God when He, before the foundation of the world, elects a company who are by His limitless power to be presented in glory conformed to the image of His Son. By so much they are to be to all intelligences the means by which He will manifest the exceeding riches of His grace (Eph. 2:7). This manifestation will correspond to His infinity and will satisfy Him perfectly as the final, all-comprehensive measurement of His attribute of grace. Two obstacles, allowed by Him to exist, must be overcome—sin and the will of man. That His grace may be manifest and its demonstration enhanced, He undertakes by Himself—for

no other could share in its achievement—to overcome the obstacle of sin. That this obstacle is overcome is declared in many texts of the Scriptures. Two may be quoted here: “The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29); “to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation” (2 Cor. 5:19). There remains, therefore, but the obstacle of the human will. Having designed that man as creature shall be possessed of an independent will, no step can be taken in the accomplishment of His sovereign purpose which will even tend to coerce the human volition. He does awaken the mind of man to spiritual sanity and brings before him the desirability of salvation through Christ. If by His power, God creates new visions of the reality of sin and of the blessedness of Christ as Savior and under this enlightenment men choose to be saved, their wills are not coerced nor are they deprived of the action of any part of their own beings. It is the unreasoned objection of Arminians that the human will is annulled by sovereign election. On this important point Principal Cunningham writes:

> The Arminians usually object to these views about the certain efficacy or insuperability of the grace of God in conversion, that they are inconsistent with the nature of the human will, and with the qualities that attach to it. They usually represent our doctrine as implying that men are forced to believe and to turn to God against their will, or whether they will or not. This is a misrepresentation. Calvinists hold no such opinion; and it cannot be shown that their doctrine requires them to hold it. Indeed, the full statement of their doctrine upon the subject excludes or contradicts it. Our Confession of Faith, after giving an account of effectual calling, which plainly implies that the grace of God in conversion is an exercise of omnipotence, and cannot be successfully resisted, adds, “Yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by His grace.” That special operation of the Spirit, which cannot be overcome or frustrated, is just the renovation of the will itself, by which a power of willing what is spiritually good—a power which it has not of itself in its natural condition, and which it could not receive from any source but a divine and almighty agency—is communicated to it. In the exercise of this new power, men are able to co-operate with the Spirit of God, guiding and directing them; and they do this, and do it, not by constraint, but willingly,—being led, under the influence of the news concerning Christ, and the way of salvation which He has opened up to and impressed upon them, and the motives which these views suggest, to embrace Christ, and to choose that better part which shall never be taken away from them. In the commencement of the process, they are not actors at all; they are wholly passive,—the subjects of a divine operation. And from the time when they begin to act in the matter, or really to *do* anything, they act freely and voluntarily, guided by rational motives, derived from the truths which their eyes have been opened to see, and which, humanly speaking, might have sooner led them to turn to God, had not the moral impotency of their wills to

> anything spiritually good prevented this result. There is certainly nothing in all this to warrant the representation, that, upon Calvinistic principles, men are forced to repent and believe against their wills, or whether they will or not.—*Ibid.*, pp. 413–14

After all, though the human will is preserved in its normal freedom throughout the process by which men are brought into eternal glory, the all-important factor in the undertaking is the will of God. The Arminian contention that the will of the creature may defeat the will of the Creator is both dishonoring to God and a deification of man. It is nearly puerile to assert that He who creates all angels, all material things, all human beings by the word of His command, He who preserves all things and by whom they hold together, He who can promise to Abraham that through him all nations shall be blessed, and to David that a kingdom will be his portion forever, He who has made innumerable predictions concerning His purpose in future times which necessitate the immediate direction of the lives of countless beings, that He cannot guide the destiny of one soul in the way of His choosing.

No Arminian has questioned that God desires to keep those whom He has saved through Christ; their sphere of doubt is simply that God *cannot* do what He desires, even though He has removed every obstacle that could hinder Him.

It is thus demonstrated that the Arminian view of seven major soteriological doctrines tends to dishonor God, to pervert and distort the doctrine of divine grace, and that it displays unbelief toward the revelation God has given.

II. The Arminian Emphasis Upon Human experience and reason

Though Scripture is cited by Arminians to defend their contention that the Christian is not secure—and these Scriptures are yet to be considered—their appeal is usually more to experience and reason than to the testimony of the Bible. When turning thus to experience, it is often recounted that some individual has first been a Christian and then, later, became unsaved; but in every such instance two unsupportable assumptions appear. It could not be demonstrated finally that the person named was saved in the first place, nor could it be established that he was unsaved in the second place. If

Demas be cited because he forsook the Apostle Paul (2 Tim. 4:10), it will be remembered that that is far removed from the idea that God forsook Demas. Similarly, if it be observed that Judas—one of the twelve—went to his own place, it is also as clearly stated by Christ that he was "the son of perdition" (John 17:12) with no implication that he was ever saved. On the question which Judas engenders, Dr. Wardlaw remarks:

> (1). There is no evidence of anything like true grace in Judas, but evidence to the contrary (John 6:64). The only thing that can be advanced against this is the passage in which he seems to be spoken of as one of those given unto Christ (John 17:12). This leads me to observe—(2). That in the context of these words, Jesus says things regarding "those given to Him," which could not possibly be true of Judas (John 17:2, 6, 9, 11, 12). Surely, if Judas had been "kept" as the rest were, he could not have been the "son of perdition." It follows that he was not among the "given" and the "kept." (3). In this passage, it is true, the phrase is used which usually denotes exception:—"None of them is lost, but," etc. (εἰ μή.) It may be remarked, however, that there are instances in which εἰ μή is used, not exceptively, but adversatively, in the same sense as ἀλλά (Gal. 1:7; Rev. 9:4; 21:27). This explanation may be confirmed by the consideration that to interpret otherwise is to make the Saviour contradict Himself (John 6:39). If Judas was of those given to Him and perished, what Jesus says would not be true. (4). It is true that Judas is spoken of as chosen (John 6:70, 71). It is obvious, however, that this choice relates exclusively to office. The very terms of the verses quoted may suffice to show this. As to the reason for which Jesus did choose such a character to be one of the Twelve, that is a totally distinct question, having nothing to do with our present inquiry. We have further proof that the choice was not personal but official (John 13:10, 11, 16). From these verses it appears that Judas was not one of His chosen; and had not, like them, the cleansing of His Spirit. When we distinguish between the two meanings of "chosen," all is plain. (5). On the principle so repeatedly adverted to, of persons being spoken of according to profession, appearance, and association, Judas appeared amongst the Twelve as one of them; and might be included under the same general designations with them, though not spiritually, or in strict propriety of speech, belonging to those given Him of the Father (John 15:2; Mat. 15:13).—*System of Theology*, II, 570

At this point the extended New Testament doctrine relative to the fact of the Christian's sin and the divine provision for that sin through the death of Christ and on the condition that the sin is confessed, is logically introduced—a doctrine greatly neglected and by none more than the Arminian theologian. Recognition of the sublime truth that, by His bearing all sin on the cross, Christ has secured a propitious attitude on the part of God the Father toward "our sins" (the sins of the Christian) and toward "the sins of the whole world" (the sins of the unsaved), is lacking in the Arminian way of thinking. This lack is seen in the almost universal reply which is made to the question of what power or agency might serve to render a true child of

God unregenerate again. The answer is that it is *sin* that unsaves the Christian—not little sins such as all Christians commit, else none could hold out an hour, but great and terrible sins—but, if this were true, then there are sins which the Christian may commit which Christ did not bear on the cross, and these still have condemning power over the believer who has been sheltered under the provisions of the cross. As for this the Scriptures declare: "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18); "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life" (5:24); "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1, R.V.); "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. 8:34); "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:31–32). These are positive, unconditional covenants giving the assurance that the believer will never be condemned. It is certain from the last of these passages that the Christian who sins will be chastened, and, indeed, God is a faithful disciplinarian and His child in His household will not escape correction if he sins; but chastisement and condemnation are wholly unrelated. So, also, the corresponding contrast is again in evidence at this point. Union, which depends altogether on the merit which is secured by being in Christ, is far removed in its essential character from communion, which depends on the believer observing to do all the will of God. Union with Christ, being based on the unchanging merit of Christ—He is the same yesterday, today, and forever—must and does continue forever, and all problems respecting the believer's daily life are, of necessity, dealt with upon a wholly different ground. To base the Christian's continuance in the saved state upon his daily life is to demand of him that which no Christian ever experienced in this world—sinless perfection. Holding over Christians the requirement of sinlessness as the only hope of security—as Arminians do—is to call forth that peculiar form of carelessness or discouragement which is the reaction of every serious person when confronted with an impossibility. All of this becomes another

approach to the same misunderstanding that is the curse of that form of rationalism which cannot comprehend the gospel of divine grace. Such a rationalism plans it so that good people may be saved, be kept saved because of their personal qualities, and be received into heaven on their merit. The gospel of divine grace plans it so that bad people—which wording describes every person on earth—may be saved, be kept saved as they were saved through the saving work and merit of Christ, and be received into heaven, not as specimens of human perfection, but as objects of infinite grace. Arminianism, with its emphasis upon human experience, human merit, and human reason, apparently has little or no comprehension of the revelation that salvation is by grace alone, through faith.

Few Arminians have been consistent in the matter of the effect of sin on the child of God. They seem not to know of a vast body of Scriptures which disclose the entire truth of sin and its cure as related to the believer, but, if logical, must require as many regenerations as there are separate sins. Arminians are not consistent at this point; being confronted by the obvious, indisputable fact that Christians do remain saved who are confessedly imperfect, they advance the notion, before cited, that it is only extreme forms of wickedness that are able to unsave the believer. God declares of Himself that He cannot with allowance look on sin and in His own holiness there is not so much as a shadow of turning, and to infer that He is not disturbed by lesser sins is not only contrary to truth but a flagrant insult to Him. Calvinism, because it follows the truth contained in the divine revelation, imposes no such outrage upon divine holiness, but rather follows the divine arrangement by which all sin, both before and after conversion, is righteously dealt with, but to the glory of God and the eternal salvation of the believer. After all, in view of the demands of divine holiness, there are but two alternatives, namely, either to stand in the perfection of Christ or to be sinless in one’s self. The latter is impossible and could exist, if it existed at all, wholly apart from the saving intervention of the Son of God; the former is possible to all and is offered to all on the sole ground of faith in the Savior that God has provided. Salvation through Christ is the essence of Christianity, while salvation through personal worthiness is no better than any pagan philosophy, and it is of this notion, so foreign to the New Testament revelation, that Arminianism partakes.

Another experimental consideration of the Arminian is the claim that if, as the Calvinist teaches and as is certainly set forth in the New Testament, the believer will not be lost because of sin, the effect of that doctrine is to license the saved one to sin, thus tending to antinomianism. In other words, God has no other motive to hold before the believer that will insure a faithful manner of life, than the one impossible proposition that he will be lost unless he is faithful. As one man declared, “If I believed that I am safe as a Christian, I would at once engage in the fullest possible enjoyment of sin.” This sentiment will be recognized as the mind of an unregenerate person. The saved person’s answer to the question, “Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?” is “God forbid.” That is, though the mind of the flesh is present in the Christian and he does have that tendency to evil, he also has the mind of the Spirit and that voice is never wholly silent. Security does not mean, as the Arminian supposes, that God merely keeps unholy people saved regardless of what they do. He has made immeasurable divine provisions respecting the daily life of the believer, namely, the Word of God which may be hid in the heart that one thus fortified may not sin against God, the presence of the victorious Spirit as a delivering power in every believer’s life, and the incomparable sustaining power of the unceasing prayer of Christ for those who are saved. If one who professed to be saved, later departed from the way of truth and evinced no desire for a holy life, he would give no assurance that he had ever been saved and would, by so much, be an exception and not an exhibition of that which is true of a Christian. No system of theology may boast that its scheme of doctrine guarantees that those who are saved will never sin. It would be difficult to prove, though constantly asserted by Arminians, that those, like the Puritans, who believe they are secure in Christ, were and are greater sinners than Arminian adherents who make no such claim. It may be repeated that the greatest incentive in any person’s life is that which rightfully impels a true believer and which no Arminian has given a worthy trial in his own life, namely, to honor God in his life because he believes he is saved and safe in the redeeming grace of God, rather than to attempt to honor God because by so much he hopes to be saved and safe. Doing right never saved a sinner nor did it ever preserve a saint; but it is true that being divinely saved and preserved is the most imperative obligation to do right.

In conclusion, it may be restated that, as for human experience which the Arminian believes is at times a proof that one once saved can be lost again, it cannot be proved that such a case ever existed. On the contrary, revelation so defines the saving and keeping power of God that it can be said with all assurance, that not one of those who have been truly regenerated has ever been lost nor could such a one be lost. As for human reason, which the Arminian employs against the doctrine of security, it need only be pointed out that no human reason is able to trace the divine undertaking which provides both salvation and safekeeping on the ground of the sacrifice and imputed merit of the Son of God, and with no other requirement resting on the sinner than that he believe on Christ as his Savior. What God accomplishes is according to reason, but it is that higher reason which characterizes every divine undertaking.

III. The Arminian Appeal to the Scriptures

Of all the contentions offered by the Arminians, their appeal to the Scriptures is that feature most worthy of candid consideration; for it will be admitted by all who attempt to expound the Word of God that there are several passages which, when taken in what appears on the surface to be their meaning, do seem to imply that one once saved might be lost again. The challenge is one respecting the exact meaning of the portions of Scripture involved and how in the divine mind, since the Word of God cannot contradict itself, they are to be harmonized with a much greater array of Scripture testimony—a body of truth which Arminians seldom essay to discuss—which permit of no varied interpretations and which dogmatically assert the eternal security of the true child of God. The challenge is also how these supposed insecurity passages may be made to harmonize with the truth of the believer’s position both in the elective purpose of God, as an object of sovereign grace, and in the Body of Christ with all that that membership secures. It will be seen, also, that there is no strain placed upon those Scriptures, when so interpreted that they harmonize with the passages which declare the safekeeping of Christians. Over against this, the passages asserting security, along with the demands of the doctrines of sovereign election and sovereign grace, can be interpreted in but one way, unless great violence is done to them by the taking from or

adding to them of mere human opinions. That Arminians do not discuss them is a significant fact in itself.

With respect to the place the doctrine of security fills in its relation to other great doctrines, an observing student of Bible teachings will recognize the fact that the Arminian contention does not broaden out to contemplate with any fullness the doctrines of sovereign election and sovereign grace. It is satisfied to present a partial consideration of the doctrine of security; and yet both sovereign election, with its unalterable purpose to bring those whom God has predestinated into eternal glory, and sovereign grace, which answers every requirement that is involved and meets to the point of infinite perfection every issue that can arise in the process of bringing a lost sinner into that glory, are censurably neglected. These two doctrines are supreme and, comparatively, the doctrine of security is no more than a straw floating on the surface of those unplumbed depths of divine reality—*sovereign election* and *sovereign grace.* Upon any worthy consideration of these great doctrines, an unprejudiced person will concede that were God to fail in His eternal purpose for even one soul, after having wrought every provision in grace to meet every existing obstacle, He would become thereby a colossal failure. The reason for this disproportionate emphasis, on the part of Arminians, upon the one doctrine of security is not hard to recognize. The surface question of whether a Christian will continue saved is easily apprehended, while the themes of sovereign election and sovereign grace are too involved for certain types of minds.

Good men may be cited as authority on either side of this controversy and any man may be mistaken; but the Word of God is not in error, nor does it contradict itself. It does not present alternative systems of theology from which men may choose. Divine election is either sovereign and therefore as unalterable as the character of God, or it is not. Saving and sustaining grace is either infinitely capable of presenting the chief of sinners faultless before the holy divine presence, or it is not. The one for whom, by regeneration, God has begun a good work will have this continued and consummated unto the day of Jesus Christ (Phil. 1:6), or he will not. Intermediate or compromising positions on these great propositions are impossible. God is either supreme, with all that such a statement implies, or He is not; and those who doubt His supremacy may well examine themselves to see whether they be in the faith at all (2 Cor. 13:5). A collection of mere

negatives sustained by human guesses has no claim to the title *a system of Christian theology.*

For clarity and for convenience the passages—even those obviously misunderstood—which the Arminians present in defense of their claim of insecurity are here grouped in various classifications with the implication that what is true of one passage in a group is more or less true of all in that classification. In entering upon a consideration of these passages, certain underlying facts should be restated, namely, (1) that the issues do not concern any merely nominal professor of the faith who is not actually regenerate after the manner set forth in the New Testament; (2) that a doubtful passage—one concerning which worthy expositors disagree—shall not be made to annul a positive statement of Scripture over which, in its intended meaning, no question can arise; and (3) all recourse to human experience or even to human reason, valuable as these may be in their place, cannot be allowed to serve as a contradiction, or even a qualification, of the direct declarations of revelation.

The passages involved in this aspect of this discussion are:

1. Scriptures Dispensationally Misapplied. Like "the love of money," failure rightly to divide the word of truth is a root of (doctrinal) evil. Under the present division, it is largely a failure to distinguish the primary from the secondary application of a text.

Matthew 24:13. "But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved."

The context is altogether of a coming tribulation (cf. vss. 21–22) and the address is to Israel. Their identification as those to whom Christ is speaking appears in numerous parts of the Olivet Discourse, but in none more clearly than in verse 9 where it is predicted, "And ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." The passage in question accords with all Scripture bearing on the experience of Israel in the coming tribulation. She shall be saved out of it (Jer. 30:7). Of this time the Savior said to the Jews to whom He was speaking, "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved." Over against this, it will be remembered that the Christian is *now* saved when he believes (John 3:36; 5:24). Had the passage been addressed to Christians, it, to be in keeping with Christian doctrine, would read, *He that is saved will endure to the end* (cf. John 3:16; 10:28).

Matthew 18:23–35. This extended passage sets forth a law of forgiveness, namely, that the one who is forgiven should himself forgive. To make what is distinctly said of the King in relation to the kingdom of heaven (vs. 23) to apply to the Church is a confusion of truth for which there is no excuse. Also, to make the mere act of forgiveness to be equivalent to eternal salvation is likewise all but unpardonable. If the King's salvation is equal to the salvation of those forgiven, their obligation is to save their debtors by forgiving them. A Christian in Christ and under the protection of infinite grace, is not to be delivered to the tormentors until he pays a debt which Christ has already paid.

Ezekiel 33:7–8. "So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand."

It would seem wholly irrelevant to bring forward a passage which is so clearly a warning and instruction addressed to Israel through the prophet in the time of their dispersion; yet this passage, like Ezekiel 18:20–26, is constantly used by Arminians as evidence that the Christian may suffer the awful consequences of bearing the blood of some lost soul. Additional passages in this class are Psalm 51:11; 2 Thessalonians 2:3.

2. Passages Related to the False Teachers of the Last Days. The period identified as the "last days" for the Church, though exceedingly brief, as compared to other ages and dispensations, occupies a disproportionate place in the New Testament. The time is the very end of the Christian era, and immediately preceding the removal of the Church from the earth and the introduction of the tribulation into the world. These "last days" are characterized by false teachers. These teachers are never said to be saved, but, because of the peculiar character of their wickedness, they bring swift destruction upon themselves. They appear only in the "last days" and are therefore not a part of the age as a whole. Three passages are especially in evidence:

1 Timothy 4:1–2. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and

doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron."

Not all of this context is quoted, but enough is presented to indicate that by a peculiar and unequivocal inspiration it is said that men of authority in the church will, in the latter times, turn from that system of doctrine which is termed *the faith*, and substitute in its place doctrines of demons. Some suppose, without warrant, that these teachers are believers who become unregenerate apostates. The passage, in harmony with other Scriptures bearing on the same general truth, asserts no more than that these important persons, having had some understanding of "the faith" (cf. Jude 1:3), reject it to the extent that they turn from it and embrace in its place the doctrines of demons. The notion that some once saved are lost again, receives no support from this Scripture.

2 Peter 2:1–22. This passage, too extended for quotation, is largely an identification of the teachers of the last days. They are said to bring in heresies, they discount former divine judgments, they despise angels and divine governments, and they have forsaken the right way. These, having escaped the pollution of the *cosmos* world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ—not through the acceptance of Christ as Savior but being indebted to Christ for much truth, which truth they forsake and pervert—they turn from what they know. Instead of being blessed and saved by the truth, they turn to heresies. To them—perhaps as ordained ministers—was committed "the way of righteousness" and the "holy commandment"; yet they turn to that which marks them as false teachers. They are likened to a dog and to a sow. In the present day there should be no hesitation in the recognition of unregenerate clergy. On this passage Burt L. Matthews in a tract which is in reply to one by Millard respecting security (p. 23), writes:

> If the writer had considered the 22nd verse he would have understood the one quoted. Read it— "the dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." This is true of the best bred dog, and of the prize blue-ribboned sow, because their natures remain unchanged. It is likewise true of those who know the way of righteousness, but turn according to their unchanged nature to unholy things. They have never been born again, and received a new nature, and become a new creation in Christ. Consulting the 20th verse, how many unnumbered thousands have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by being born in a Christian home and in a nation where the ethics of Christ have raised the morals of living,

> and have never acknowledged their debt by the personal acceptance of Jesus Christ as Saviour? How many have turned to the pollutions of the nations that know not God, and how much worse is their state, than if they had never known the way of righteousness? Light and knowledge increase responsibility.

Jude 1:3–19. Again, the passage in question exceeds the reasonable bounds of a quotation. As Jude is like a second witness to the truth that the Apostle Peter presents in the above passage, there is similarity to be noted. Jude's specific identification of the false teachers is disclosed in verses 4 and 16–19, which read: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. … These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage. But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit."

Little thought is given to this and other passages related to the false teachers of the last days when it is claimed that, because of the course pursued by these false teachers with respect to the truth of God, Christians might be expected to apostatize. Granting for the moment that which is not true, namely, that these are degenerated believers, it will be seen that there is no claim to be set up here respecting believers who do not live in the last days, and that there is no reference to people of that period in general, but only to the false teachers themselves.

3. A Mere Reformation or Outward Profession. A wide range of human experience is accounted for under this division of this theme. If there is to be any clear understanding of the facts involved, it is essential that precisely what enters into salvation shall be kept in mind. Four passages call for special consideration:

Luke 11:24–26. "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits

more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first."

The Savior is here presenting a phase of truth related to demonology which is not even remotely related to salvation by grace. A demon going out of a person, leaving that former abode free from such an unholy tenant, may return, taking with him other demons worse in character than the first tenant. The fallacy of the use of this Scripture to teach insecurity is seen in the fact that the removal of a demon is not the equivalent of salvation, in which salvation the divine nature is imparted. Likewise, the presence of the divine nature in any individual is a certain guarantee that no demon can enter (1 John 4:4). This incident may represent a reformation or improvement in the case of a suffering one, but it contributes nothing to the question of whether one once saved might be lost again.

Matthew 13:1–8. This parable doubtless anticipates conditions which obtain in the present age, and warning is given that there will be profession without possession on the part of many. Whatever seeming reality may be attached to the experience of those who are represented by that which fell by the wayside, or by seed that fell in stony places, or by seed that fell among thorns, the determining test is that these did not mature into *wheat*, as did the seed which fell into good ground. The three failures do not represent three classes of people, but rather the effect of the Word of God on various people. That Word does move many superficially, but those who are saved by it are likened to wheat. The three failures do not represent those who first became wheat and after that were reduced to nothing.

1 Corinthians 15:1–2. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain."

The Apostle is not implying that some of the Corinthian believers were lost for want of faith; rather it is that their faith has never been sufficient for salvation (cf. 2 Cor. 13:5).

Hebrews 3:6, 14. "But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. … For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end."

In both of these verses but one thought about security obtains, namely, that the genuine endures and that which fails—except it be accounted for otherwise—is proved to be false.

The entire field of profession is recognized in the New Testament and with this body of truth in hand there is little excuse for misunderstanding. The general theme of profession appears directly or indirectly in more than one of these divisions of this general subject. It is important to note again the divine discrimination and the final disposition of that which God classes as mere profession. The fact of the divine penetration is published in 2 Timothy 2:19: “Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his.” And the final disposition of profession is announced in 1 John 2:19: “They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.” The “going out” indicates that those who go out “are not of us,” and they go out that this, so important fact may be made “manifest.”

4. A True Salvation is Proved by Its Fruits. In the parable just considered respecting wheat, the thought of fruitage represents the reality which the Christian is. In the present field of discussion, fruit depicts the normal expression of a genuine regeneration—a reasonable test of that regeneration. It will be remembered, however, that there is such a condition possible as a Christian who, for a time, may be out of fellowship with Christ. In such a state there will be no fruit borne. Such a situation is exceptional rather than normal when the test of salvation by its fruits is made. Both lines of truth—that salvation is to be tested by its fruits, and that a believer may be for a time out of fellowship with his Lord—are abundantly sustained in the text of the New Testament.

John 8:31. “Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed.”

There is no implication to be admitted here that these Jews have the obligation of keeping themselves in the disciple’s place; it is rather that, if they are true disciples, they will continue in the words of Christ. It should be noted, also, that Christ has indicated no more than that these Jews were *disciples*, which could mean simply that they were *learners*. However, the

same principle obtains whether it be in the case of a true Christian or a mere learner—that which is genuine continues.

James 2:17–18, 24, 26. "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. … Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. … For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

The entire context, James 2:14–26, will be recognized as the central passage bearing on the general Biblical contention that a true regeneration is demonstrated by its fruits. The Apostle Paul discloses the truth in Romans 5:1 that the requirement on the human side for justification before God is *faith*; but the Apostle James declares that the requirement on the human side for justification before men is *good works.* It is a supreme divine undertaking for a sinner to be justified eternally before God which can neither be recognized nor understood by the *cosmos* world; and it is of such a nature that the one who is the object of that justification can sustain no other relation to it than to receive it, with all other divine riches, from the hand of God on the principle of faith. The outmost bounds of the discernment of those who are of this world consists in the quiet reasonable demand, that the one who professes to be saved shall live on a plane which corresponds to that profession. It is to be expected that the world will judge and reject the profession which does not meet their own ideals respecting what a Christian should be, namely, what he pretends to be. The ideals of the world are far below those which God marks out for His child; but of this, as in the fact of justification by faith, the world knows nothing. Nevertheless, in the sphere of the Christian's testimony, the Scriptures stress the reaction of the world to the Christian's profession as of vital importance. The believer is appointed to "walk in wisdom toward them that are without" (outside the family of God—Col. 4:5). The believer's security is not in the hands of the *cosmos* world, but, like justification, is wholly in the grace-empowered hand of God. This passage by James lends no support to an Arminian claim that believers are insecure.

John 15:6. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

Arminian writers generally look upon John 15:6 as the most formidable Biblical testimony in behalf of their claims in the field of insecurity. The passage merits consideration and, like many others, requires that attention be given to its context. The real question at issue concerning the passage is whether Christ, by His use of the figure of the vine and the branches and His call for an abiding life, is referring to the Christian's *union* or the Christian's *communion* with Himself. Unless this doctrinal distinction is apprehended, there can be no basis for a right understanding of the text in question. The idea of abiding in Christ as a branch in a vine could serve as an illustration of either union or communion with Him. It is easily discernible that He is employing this figure to represent communion with Himself. Union with Him is a result of the baptism of the Spirit, by which divine operation believers are joined to the Lord (cf. 1 Cor. 6:17; 12:13; Gal. 3:27). That such an eternal union with Christ does not, and could not, depend upon human effort or merit is a fundamental truth. On the other hand, communion with Christ does depend on the Christian's faithfulness and adjustment to God. John declares that "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship [communion] one with another"—that is, the believer has communion with Christ (1 John 1:7). The term *walk* refers to the daily life of the believer. As might be expected in respect to a matter so vital and yet so easily misunderstood, Christ defines precisely the use He is making of the term *abide*—whether it be *union* depending on divine sufficiency, or *communion* depending on human faithfulness. Christ removed all uncertainty when He said, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love" (John 15:10). To keep Christ's commandments is a human responsibility—akin to walking in the light. As a parallel He cites the fact that He abode in His Father's love, or communion, by doing His Father's will. It is certain that Christ was not attempting to preserve *union* with His Father—the fact of the eternal Trinity—by obedience; to give it the human resemblance, He was not "attempting to keep saved."

Still another declaration by Christ in this same context—equally as conclusive—is found in the words, "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away" (vs. 2). It is distinctly a branch *in Him,* which is union with Him, that is not bearing fruit. Certainly, if union with Christ depended on fruit bearing, few would pass the test. That the unfruitful branch is

“taken away”—literally, lifted up out of its place—is a reference to that removal from this life which God reserves the right to accomplish for the one who is persistently unfaithful (cf. 1 Cor. 11:30; 1 John 5:16). The word αἴρω, here to be translated “lifteth it up,” occurs many times in the New Testament and almost universally means a removal from one place or position to another. Significant, indeed, is its use with the prefix ἐπί in Acts 1:9, where the Lord is said to have been “taken up” out of their sight (cf. John 17:15; Acts 8:33). It does not follow that the death of any Christian may be identified as a divine removal on account of fruitlessness. If, as is doubtless true, no person knows of such an instance, that fact only confirms the truth that the matter is a divine responsibility which does not concern other Christians to the slightest degree. If it is claimed that an unfruitful Christian should not go to heaven, it will be remembered that the assurance of heaven does not depend on communion, or fruit bearing, but on union with Christ. It is also to be considered that all Christian success or failure is to be judged at the *bema*—the judgment seat of Christ in heaven—and that the fruitless Christian must thus go to heaven before he can appear before that tribunal. If entering heaven is not due to a divine undertaking in behalf of all who are in union with Christ and apart from every aspect of human merit, there is little hope for anyone on this earth.

It may be concluded, then, that in this context Christ is dealing with the Christian’s communion with Himself, which communion depends upon human faithfulness. It is also important to observe that it is the lack of this very faithfulness which is condemned by the world.

With the background of what has gone before, approach may be made to John 15:6, in which the truth is declared that if a man abide not in Christ, he will come under the condemning judgment of men. The believer’s testimony to the world becomes as a branch “cast forth” and “withered.” The judgment of the world upon the believer is described in the severest of terms—“Men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” To read into this passage the idea that God casts them forth and that God burns them is to disregard important language, and to contradict the great truths which belong to salvation by grace alone. If it be asked how in practical experience men burn each other, it will be seen that this language is highly figurative, for men do not in any literal sense burn each other; but they do abhor and repel an inconsistent profession. This passage and its

context witness to the truth that communion, which depends on the believer, may fail, but it does not declare that union, which depends on Christ, has ever failed or ever will fail.

2Peter 1:10–11."Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

At the outset, it is important to observe that the word πταίω, here translated *fall*, is properly translated *stumble* (cf. Rom. 11:11; Jude 1:24), and that an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom is more than a mere entrance, regardless of the glory of that entrance. It is reward for faithfulness added to entrance into that kingdom. Both calling and election are wholly within the sovereignty of God. To these undertakings man can add nothing. Yet, within the sphere of a testimony that is consistent and especially as a demonstration in outward life of that which is eternally wrought within, the believer may add the element of certainty which a holy life provides.

Dr. John Dick has written the following:

> Election, being the purpose which God purposed in himself, an intrinsic act of the Divine mind, remains unknown till it be manifested in its execution. No man can read his own name, or that of another, in the Book of life. It is a sealed book, which no mortal can open. We are assured that there is such a decree, by the express testimony of Scripture; but of the persons included in it, nothing is known or can be conjectured, till evidence be exhibited in their personal character and conduct. An Apostle points out the only means by which this important point can be ascertained, when he exhorts Christians to "give all diligence to make their calling and election sure." To make sure, signifies in this place to ascertain, to render a thing certain to the mind. Now, the order of procedure is, first to make our calling certain, or to ascertain that we have been converted to God, and thus our election will be sure, or manifest to ourselves. It is the same kind of reasoning which we employ, in tracing out the cause by the effect. The operation of divine grace in the regeneration of the soul, is a proof that the man in whom this change is wrought, was an object of the divine favour from eternity.—*Lectures on Theology*, p. 190

One qualifying condition arises in connection with this theme which Dr. Dick has not mentioned, which is, that a believer overtaken by sin will not exhibit the experience which is normal, but he will exhibit other evidence of his regeneration that becomes manifest under such circumstances—such as a burden over his sin which no unregenerate person ever knows (cf. 1 John 3:4–10; Ps. 32:3–5). It is therefore designed of God that, even in the state of

unconfessed sin, the believer will have clear evidence—if perchance he knows his own heart at all—that he is saved and that evidence will, to him at least, demonstrate that his calling and election are sure.

1 John 3:10. "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother."

Here, again, the whole context (vss. 4–10) is involved. The sin of a true Christian is not a *lawless* sin—as that term is used in this Scripture. Because of the presence of the indwelling Spirit, the believer cannot sin and remain indifferent to it. The grieving of the Spirit is an experimental reality, and is well illustrated in the case of David as recorded in Psalm 32:3–4. Over against this, the unsaved are able to sin without self-condemnation beyond that which may arise from an accusing conscience. Verse 9 of this context declares that those born of God cannot sin lawlessly, and verse 10 asserts that this personal reaction of the heart to sin is a final test between those who are saved and those who are not. The conclusion is that whosoever sins lawlessly, or without self-reproach, is not of God. It is not said that a Christian who sins is not of God, else would all Scripture bearing on the fact of the Christian's sin and its specific cure through confession be rendered a contradiction. Other Scriptures to be included in this classification are: Matthew 5:13; 6:23; 7:16, 18–19, which passages might as well be listed as those dispensationally misapplied; 2 Timothy 2:12, in which the element of divine recognition with respect to reigning with Christ is in view, and not salvation or the believer's place in Christ Jesus; 2 Peter 3:17, where a danger of falling from steadfastness is suggested, yet often confused by Arminians as equivalent to falling from salvation itself; Acts 13:43; 14:22, where a true salvation will be demonstrated by continuing in *the* faith—not personal faith, but continuing true to the body of distinctively Christian doctrine; 1 Timothy 2:14–15, which is another specific warning that only that endures which is genuine. Note, also, 1 Thessalonians 3:5 and 1 Timothy 1:19 (cf. 1 John 2:19).

5. Warnings to the Jews. Three important passages are grouped under this head; and, while the truth they convey is addressed primarily to Israel, there is, in two of them, a secondary application to all Gentiles.

Matthew 25:1–13. The entire Olivet Discourse, in which this portion appears, is Christ's farewell word to Israel. Having told them of their tribulation which is to be ended by His glorious appearing, they are warned by all the context from 24:36 to 25:13 to be watching for the return of their Messiah. That return is not imminent now, but will be at the end of their own age which is terminated by the tribulation. In 25:1–13 the Jews are especially warned that when their King returns with His Bride (cf. Luke 12:35–36) they will be judged and separated, and only a portion will enter their kingdom. This oncoming judgment for Israel is the message of the parable of the virgins (cf. Ps. 45:14–15). Five virgins being excluded from the earthly kingdom is in accord with much Old Testament Scripture (cf. Ezek. 20:33–44), but has no reference to a supposed insecurity of those from all nations who are in Christ.

Hebrews 6:4–9. "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessings from God: but that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned. But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

Dr. C. I. Scofield in a note on this passage in his *Reference Bible* declares: "Heb. 6:4–8 presents the case of Jewish professed believers who halt short of faith in Christ after advancing to the very threshold of salvation, even 'going along with' the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightenment and conviction (John 16:8–10). It is not said that they had faith. This supposed person is like the spies at Kadesh-barnea (Deut. 1:19–26) who saw the land and had the very fruit of it in their hands, and yet turned back."

It has been assumed that the five items which appear in verses 4 and 5 are a description of a saved person and therefore it is possible for a Christian to "fall away." Doubtless these five things are true of a child of God, but so much more is true than is indicated here that these five things

are seen to be wholly inadequate to describe the true child of God. As compared to those "once enlightened," the believer is "light in the Lord," and is a child of the light (Eph. 5:8). Compared to "tasting the heavenly gift," the Christian has *received* eternal life and to him righteousness has been imputed. As compared to being made a partaker of the Holy Spirit as an unsaved person does when enlightened with respect to sin, righteousness, and judgment (John 16:8–11), the Christian is born of the Spirit, baptized of the Spirit, indwelt, and sealed by the Spirit. As compared with those who may have "tasted the good word of God," the child of God has believed the Word unto salvation. As compared to those who merely taste the powers of the world to come, the believer experiences that transforming power which wrought in Christ to raise Him from the dead (Eph. 1:19). The illustration which follows in verses 7 and 8 is clarifying. Sunshine and shower on soil which brings forth herbs is nigh unto blessing, while sunshine and shower on soil which brings forth briers and thorns is nigh unto cursing. In like manner the appeal to the Jews addressed may, or may not, result in salvation. The controversy over this passage is determined in verse 9. "But, beloved [a term used only of Christians], we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation." Evidently, then, the preceding five things were not intended by the writer to refer to those who are saved. It may be added that the impossibility of repentance is not due to a withdrawal on the part of God of the offer of salvation, but is due to the unsaved person's rejection of the one and only way that is open to him. If at any time he accepts the way set before him, he will be saved; for "whosoever will may come."

Hebrews 10:26–29. "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, where-with he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

The peculiar character of the hortatory passages in the Hebrews Epistle is evident in this context. The writer is concerned about conditions then obtaining—little appreciated today. This plight was well described by James

when he said to Paul as Paul returned to Jerusalem from years of Gentile ministry: “Thou seest, brother, how many thousands [μυριάδες, literally, *myriads*—cf. Heb. 12:22; Rev. 5:11] of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law” (Acts 21:20). The writer to the Hebrews is addressing Jews who are interested in Christ and have, in a sense, believed; but not to the extent of receiving the death of Christ as the fulfillment and termination of Jewish sacrifices. The confusion of law and grace is always distressing, but no such situation as this has ever existed before or since. These circumstances account for these exhortations which were addressed to Jews who, whatever their religious experience might have been, were yet unsaved. There are seven “if’s” in this epistle which condition this type of Jews. The writer, of course, being a Jew, employs, as a recognition of Jewish unity, the pronoun *we*. These conditional passages are: “How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?” (2:3); “Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end” (3:6); “We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end” (3:14); “This will we do, if God permit. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, … if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance” (6:3–4, 6); “If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins” (10:26); “If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him” (10:38); “Much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven” (12:25).

This particular passage (Heb. 10:26–29) is parenthetical. It is not a continuation of the theme set forth in the preceding verse. Those enjoined in verse 25 are believers, while those addressed in this text are hesitating Jews who demur concerning a right relation to Christ. Sinning wilfully means that form of sin which is recognized in the Old Testament as not being a sin of ignorance. Wilful sin calls for divine forgiveness based on sacrificial blood. This warning reminds the Jew of the new situation in which the Mosaic sacrifices no longer avail, and it is therefore a choice between Christ’s sacrifice or judgment. To sin now, after Christ has died, is more serious. Sin is no longer an insult to the character and government of God alone, but it becomes also a direct rejection of Christ. In so far as Christ has died for men, they are classified, or set apart, as those for whom He died, which is sanctification according to its true meaning. No New Testament

Scripture describes more clearly the sinfulness of sin in this age than this; but it is not a warning to Christians, nor does it imply their insecurity. Dr. James H. Brookes has written this description of the related passage (6:4–6):

> Perhaps there is no passage in the Sacred Scriptures that has caused greater distress to real Christians than this startling declaration. They are ready to ask themselves, is it possible after all that our salvation is an uncertain thing? May we fall away at last, and finally be lost? Do all the assurances of present and perfect safety, do all the promises of everlasting life, addressed to the believer, go for nothing? Does not the living Lord say He gives to His sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of His hand? How then is it here represented that there is danger of their destruction? To the tender conscience and anxious heart of the true child of God the warning of the apostle sounds like the voice of doom; and yet such an one is not the person to whom the faithful admonition is sent. It must be remembered that the epistle was written to Hebrew professors of the Christian walk, and to Hebrews who had become "entangled again with the yoke of bondage."—*The Truth*, XIII, 27

It will be recalled that there is a peculiar blindness upon Israel respecting the gospel. Of this blindness Christ said: "For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind" (John 9:39), and this blindness was predicted by Isaiah: "And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed" (Isa. 6:9–10). The Apostle refers to this again in 2 Corinthians 3:14–16. It is not strange, therefore, that there should be difficulty and hesitation on the part of unregenerate Jews.

6. Warnings to All Men. These warnings include two general themes:

Revelation 22:19. "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

Next only to John 15:6 is this passage of importance in the Arminian contention. The precise meaning of the passage should be determined. In the first place, the warning is of one sin only and that of adding to, or taking from, the prophecy of this book—evincing a peculiar divine protection over this book. The warning proves nothing with regard to the possibility of a Christian being lost because of any other sin. Again, it is evident, since the

book remains unchanged, that no one has ever committed that sin. That a sovereign God would have power to destroy a creature could not be denied, but not when He has entered into covenant with His Son concerning those whom He has given to His Son that they shall be with Him where He is and behold His glory; nor could God break His covenant with the believers as outlined in Romans 8:30. God may not withdraw this terrible warning, but He can and has, in the light of His covenants, permitted no believer to commit this sin or to merit this punishment. Such a specific protection is a guarantee to security.

1 John 5:4–5. "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

The real meaning of this passage is hidden by the failure in the A.V. translation to put the last part of verse 4 in the past tense. It should read, "And this is the victory that overcame the world, even our faith." In other words, everyone, without exception if born of God, does, by that birth overcome the world—being saved out of it. By believing one becomes an overcomer, for an overcomer means simply the same general distinction that is in view when the term *Christian* is employed. There is an overcoming in daily life as described in Revelation 12:11; but the larger use of this specific term is found in the seven letters to the seven churches in Asia (cf. Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21). If the thought of "those that are saved" is read into each of these letters, the meaning is made clear.

7. Gentiles May Be Broken Off Corporately. But one passage appears in this classification:

Romans 11:21. "For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee."

As God set the nation Israel aside who are the "natural branches," that the door might be opened for Gentiles to hear the gospel in this age, in like manner He will set aside the Gentiles when their day of grace is over. The breaking off of either Jews or Gentiles in the corporate sense provides not the slightest ground for assuming that God will break off a Christian from his position in Christ Jesus.

8. Believers May Lose Their Rewards and Be Disapproved. Reference has been made previously to the doctrine of rewards. However, two major passages call for consideration and deserve extended exposition:

Colossians 1:21–23. "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight: if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister."

Two issues appear in this context: that of God's work for man and that of man's work for God. In fact, the contrast between divine responsibility and human responsibility appears many times in the Colossian Epistle. No end of doctrinal disorder has been engendered by the disarrangement of these so widely different ideas. A worthy student will not rest until he can trace his way through, and separate, these two lines of truth. Arminianism has continued very largely by its failure to recognize the far-flung difference between God's work for man, by which man is saved, empowered, kept, and presented faultless before God in glory —undertakings which are far beyond the range of human resources even to aid—and man's work for God, by which man renders devotion, service to God, and experiences the exercise of spiritual gifts—all of which, though divinely credited to man and bearing the promise of rewards, can be wrought by man only as he is enabled by the Holy Spirit.

The Apostle declares that he would have the believers to whom he wrote appear before God "holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight" (vs. 22). Though the Christian is enabled by the Spirit in all that he does, yet these are words which imply human responsibility and faithfulness. It naturally follows that, in the light of this responsibility, all depends upon those believers. This feature of the context is augmented by the further declaration: "if ye continue in the faith [Christian doctrine] grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard" (vs. 23). Over against this statement of human responsibility, this context begins with a reference to the work of God for men—"And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works,

yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death" (vss. 21–22).

Because of a misleading punctuation which introduces only a comma after the word *death*, the two lines of thought have been not only connected, but the work of God for man has been supposed to depend on man's work for God. That would be acceptable Arminian interpretation or doctrine, but it is not the meaning of the passage. With no punctuation in the original text, it is allowable to place a full stop after the word *death* (vs. 22) and to begin a new part of the sentence with the next word *to*. This arrangement, without changing any words, divides properly between the two aspects of truth which are wholly unrelated in the sense that they are not interdependent. Thus the text is rescued from implying what it does not, that the work of God depends on the work of man. Such an idea would constitute a complete contradiction of all New Testament teaching respecting salvation through the grace of God alone. No more complete statement of God's work for man will be found than Colossians 2:10: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power."

1 Corinthians 9:27 "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."

Again the distinction between rewards for Christian service and salvation is in view. The subject is introduced, so far as this context is concerned, with the Apostle's question, "What is my reward then?" (vs. 18). And this question is preceded and followed by an extended testimony on the Apostle's part relative to his own faithful service. Already in 3:9–15 he has distinguished between salvation and rewards; but in this passage he considers only his reward. In this testimony, he likens the Christian's service to a race in which all believers are participating and in relation to which they must strive lawfully, and be temperate in all things. This reference to service as a race is followed by the Apostle's closing testimony in which he declares that he brings his body into subjection "lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." The rendering of ἀδόκιμος by the word *castaway* is not sustained by all. This Greek word is only the negative form of δόκιμος, which certainly means to be *approved* or *accepted.* As for his standing before God the believer is already accepted (Eph. 1:6) and justified (Rom. 5:1). As for his service, or

that which man may do for God, he must yet appear before the judgment seat of Christ, where rewards are to be bestowed and failure in service will be burned (cf. 2 Cor. 5:9–10; 1 Cor. 3:15). The precise meaning of δόκιμος is seen in 2 Timothy 2:15, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." This injunction does not imply that salvation depends on faithful study; it rather asserts that those who are saved should study lest they be disapproved and that is precisely the Apostle's meaning in the text under discussion. The Apostle's desire to be free from the trifling, irresolute, half-hearted manner of preaching which His Lord could never condone is worthy of a great servant of God, and may well be taken to heart by all who are called to preach the Word of God. There is no note of insecurity here. How could the man who wrote the eighth chapter of Romans be fearful lest he be cast away from God? Or how could the Holy Spirit who had said "They shall never perish" now imply that they might perish?

Other Scriptures belonging in this classification are Romans 8:17; Revelation 2:10; and all references to rewards throughout the New Testament.

9. Believers May Experience Loss of Fellowship. This question has to do with the present, as rewards have to do with the future, in the believer's experience. Some vital passages are involved at this point.

John 13:8. "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me."

These are the words of Christ to Peter when Peter objected to the intent of Christ to bathe his feet. The word *wash* (νίπτω) represents a partial bathing and is in contrast here to *washed* (λούω) as used in verse 10, where the meaning is a full bath. All is symbolical of spiritual cleansing. There is a complete bathing (vs. 10) which corresponds to the once-for-all "washing of regeneration," and a partial bathing such as is promised in 1 John 1:9. The partial bathing is as oft repeated in the believer's life as he confesses his sin. Christ said Peter would have "no part" with Him unless Peter was partially bathed. The word "no part" (μέρος) suggests not a full part; that is, Peter would be lacking full fellowship with Christ unless he was cleansed. This is equally true of every Christian. It is after confession of sin that there is cleansing and fellowship; but the question of security with respect to salvation is not involved in this doctrine.

John 15:2. “Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away” (R.V.).

As before indicated, this is of a branch in Christ that is fruitless, and the taking away is evidently removal from this life. That God reserves the right to remove an unfruitful branch need not be questioned; but the removal is not from salvation, as a superficial Arminian interpretation would imply. The same conditions which govern fruit bearing govern fellowship with Christ.

1 Corinthians 11:29–32. “For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.”

It is fitting that this passage which ends the carnality section of this Epistle should present both the effect and cure of carnality. Certain sins are specified in this passage as leading on to physical sickness and physical death. However, it is the direction of all sin that it leads to physical death (Rom. 8:6, 13), but this is far removed from spiritual death. The cure, as in 1 John 1:3–9, is self-judgment; but, if the sinning Christian does not judge himself, he is subject to chastisement and that to the end that he shall never be condemned with the world. Though this discipline might assume the extreme form of “sleep” or removal from this world, there is no basis for the thought that it means spiritual death.

1 John 5:16. “If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.”

This text is explicit. It refers to a “brother,” which term is never used of the unregenerate, and declares definitely that a Christian may sin in such a way that the chastisement of death may fall upon him. If the sin were not unto death, prayer might avail for him. Again, there is no evidence that the “brother” ceases to be what he is in his relation to God, or that this death is spiritual death which leads on to the second death. The possibility of chastisement is also seen in John 5:14.

10. Christians May Fall from Grace. By popular usage the idea of falling from grace, though mentioned but once in the Bible, has been made to include all who, as is supposed, are lost after they have been saved.

Galatians 5:4. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."

Christians may fall from grace, but it is not accomplished by sinning. They will have fallen from grace when they, having been delivered from the law with its merit system, turn back to the merit system again. It is safe to say that no person who has gained even a slight understanding of what it means to be perfected in Christ beyond the need of any human works to complete that perfection, has ever turned back to the law. People who trust Christ as Savior are perfected in Him whether they realize it or not, and it is those who do not realize it who may be influenced by legalists to turn to the merit system from which they have been delivered. Again, the context of the passage is the guide to the right interpretation of the passage in question. In the Galatian Epistle, the Apostle declares two important truths, namely, (1) that the law system is not a means to salvation, and (2) that the law system does not provide the rule of life for those who are saved by the grace of God. The law by its very nature supposes that the one to whom it is addressed needs to establish personal merit before God. It could have, therefore, no application to the one who, being in Christ, has the perfect merit of the Son of God. The liberty to which the Apostle refers and for which he exhorts the Christian to stand fast (Gal. 5:1) is this very freedom from an unbearable yoke of merit obligation. To turn from the blessing of the grace provision to the assumption that merit must be secured by human works, is to fall from grace. Christ becomes of no effect, to the extent that His perfect merit which grace provides is ignorantly abandoned for that which is a bondage to an intolerable merit system. God may be praised that it is impossible for a true believer to depart actually from grace. His departure from grace is only in the sphere of his own contemplation of his responsibility as a saved person. He may thus sacrifice his joy and peace, but there is no intimation that his salvation is sacrificed. If, perchance, men do not know what the position of a believer in grace is—and Arminians evince no such understanding—there is little hope that they would be able to comprehend what is involved in a fall from grace.

11. Miscellaneous Passages. Several texts which are not easily classified with others should be mentioned if this list is to be at all exhaustive: 1 Timothy 5:8, where *the* faith again is mentioned and the truth that to fail to care for one's household is a denial of the faith and constitutes a wrong which unbelievers are careful to avoid; 1 Timothy 5:12, where young widows are condemned for breaking a pledge (cf. R.V.); 1 Timothy 6:10, where *the* faith is mentioned again, and not personal faith. 2 Timothy 2:18 asserts that the faith of some respecting the specific doctrine of the resurrection was overthrown. In Revelation 21:8, 27, certain persons identified as *liars* it is said will be excluded from heaven. In this connection, it may be observed that a child of God who has told a lie is not a liar in the sense in which that word is used to classify the unbelievers—a Christian who has lied is not, from the Biblical viewpoint, the same as an unregenerate liar. This distinction applies equally to other sins by which the unsaved are identified, and to assert this does not even suggest that a sin is any less so when committed by a Christian. The whole intrusion of works of merit into the sphere of grace is the ground of misinterpretation of various passages: Philippians 2:12, for instance, where the believer is to work *out*, not work *for*, his salvation. He is to give expression outwardly of that which God is working *in*. Similarly, in a few instances the gospel is presented as something to *obey*—observe Acts 5:32; Hebrews 5:8–9. There is no intimation that men are saved by being obedient in their daily lives; it is a matter of obedience to the divine appeal which the gospel of grace presents.

Conclusion

Before turning to the consideration of the Calvinistic doctrine of safekeeping, a restatement is made that neither in the sphere of sovereign election, nor in the sphere of sovereign grace, nor in the sphere of human experience, nor in the sphere of Biblical interpretation have the Arminian advocates established their claims, and the insufficiency of their position will be disclosed further as this discussion turns from the negative to the positive. It may well be pointed out that Arminians have not taken up the security passages with candor and with an attempt to reconcile these to their insecurity contention. However, the major feature of this thesis is concerned with the constructive side of the question and it is now to have an extended examination.

Chapter XVI

The Calvinistic Doctrine of Security

Unavoidably, much that enters into the Calvinistic doctrine of security has been alluded to by way of contrast or comparison in the foregoing analysis of the Arminian position. Perhaps enough has been presented respecting the Calvinistic view on the doctrines of original sin, efficacious calling, decrees, the fact and character of the fall, divine omniscience, divine sovereignty, and sovereign grace, though it may safely be restated that what is termed Calvinism—largely for want of a more comprehensive cognomen—is, so far as devout men have been able to comprehend it, the essential Pauline theology, especially in its soteriological aspects. After all, Systematic Theology is the attempt on the part of men to state in orderly arrangement what God has revealed in the Bible. The Word of God is consistent with itself and it is regrettable that good men do not agree among themselves about the interpretation. In seeking a reason, or reasons, for this lack of unity, certain suggestions may be advanced. First, it has pleased God so to embed the truth in the Sacred Text that only those who study unceasingly and who are qualified for the task by educational background, all of this coupled with true spiritual insight, are able to discern with some degree of accuracy its revelation in its length and breadth, its height and depth. Men with little or no conformity to these educational requirements have rendered superficial opinions, which are based on mere human reason and claim to be final. This shallow dogmatism has swept multitudes who think but little into cults and sporadic religious movements. It has long been recognized that the man who is least qualified to speak with authority will be, very often, the most dogmatic. A second explanation of disagreement in Bible interpretation is slavish conformity to human leaders. This tendency can easily beset the best of interpreters. Each sect feels called upon to maintain its theological schools and to pursue its peculiar point of view. Their theology is published and defended by those who are run in their specific molds. In the light of the fact that there is but one body of revealed truth setting forth but one system, that which God has given, the disagreement which obtains between sincere and educationally disciplined men may be accounted for on the basis of this tendency to cleave to the human authorities identified with a given sect. The creed of the

denomination is more to be defended than the Word of God itself. In the present day, there is but little resentment when the Scriptures are discredited, but there is strong opposition experienced when the position occupied by the denomination is questioned. Men seldom change their preconceived views whether good or bad. Their early training and theological discipline serve as a mold from which the individual will seldom be extricated. Such a slavish bondage to human leaders and creeds may impede Calvinists as well as Arminians. It will be recognized by all, however, that Calvinists as a body, judging from their writings, are more concerned to be conformed to the Bible than any other group that is held together by common theological beliefs. Ignorance, intolerance, unteachableness, and slavish devotion to human leaders are the roots of doctrinal confusion with the attending evils which that confusion engenders. The names *Calvinism* and *Arminianism* may well be dismissed if only a clear understanding of the Word of God may be gained. However, these appellations do represent, in the main, two conflicting schools of theological thought, and it is the purpose of this thesis to defend the Word of God and Calvinism is favored only because it, in turn, favors the Scriptures of Truth. The Calvinistic interpretations, especially respecting security, are unstrained and show an amenableness to the Word of God. The great doctrines of Scripture bearing on security—universal depravity, effectual calling, decrees, the fall, omniscience, divine sovereignty, and sovereign grace—are taken by the Calvinists in the plain and natural meaning which may be drawn from the Sacred Text. It is not claimed that there are no truths which are too deep for human understanding; but these, when received in the natural sense of the language of the Scriptures, if not fully understood, are found to be harmonious with the revealed plan and purpose of God. It has been demonstrated in the previous chapter of this thesis that the Scriptures upon which the Arminian depends, for such Biblical appeal respecting insecurity as he chooses to make, are none of them in any final sense a support for his contention. His interpretation of these portions of the Word of God is well described by the text: “as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.” Over against these passages to which the Arminians resort, is the positive, constructive,

and consistent declaration of uncounted New Testament passages which in unqualified terms assert that the believer is secure. Added to these positive assertions of the Word of God are those deductions to be drawn from every doctrine which is at all related to a complete soteriology. No Arminian undertakes to demonstrate that the positive passages are uncertain in their meaning. Their only recourse is to claim that human responsibility must be read into these passages in order to make them harmonize with the interpretation they have placed on so-called insecurity texts. John 5:24 must read, "He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation—that is, *if he holds out to the end."* Romans 8:30 must read, "Moreover whom He did predestinate by foreknowing their faith and works, them He also called provided they are willing to be called: and whom He called, them He also justified provided they do not sin: and whom He justified, them He also glorified provided they do not fall from their own steadfastness." It is no small responsibility to add to, or take from, the Word of God (Rev. 22:18–19), or to handle that Word deceitfully (2 Cor. 4:2).

Having previously discussed the Calvinistic beliefs respecting the great soteriological doctrines, it remains now to consider the direct and positive unfolding of eternal security as presented in the New Testament.

While there are unnumbered secondary declarations and inferences respecting the security of the true Christian, this chapter will present twelve major reasons, declared in the New Testament, why the believer once saved can never be lost. Liberty is to be claimed in connection with each of these reasons to point out what the rationalistic denial of the truth in question involves. These twelve reasons, it will be found, are equally divided in their relation to the three Persons of the Godhead—four are the responsibility of the Father, four are the responsibility of the Son, and four are the responsibility of the Spirit. This threefold fact at once lifts this theme to the level of a major doctrine of Soteriology. Of these twelve reasons it may be said that any one of them is in itself a final and sufficient basis for confidence that the child of God will be preserved unto heaven's glory. When twelve reasons, each complete and conclusive in itself, are contemplated, the evidence is overwhelming. In general, the New Testament presents the Father as purposing, calling, justifying, and glorifying those who believe on Christ; the Son is presented as becoming

incarnate that He might be a Kinsman-Redeemer, as dying a substitutionary and efficacious death, as rising to be a living Savior both as Advocate and Intercessor, and as Head over all things to the Church; the Holy Spirit is presented as administering and executing the purpose of the Father and the redemption which the Son has wrought. It is reasonable, then, that all three Persons of the Godhead should have their individual share in preserving to fruition that which God has determined.

I. The Reasons Which Depend on God the Father

The four reasons for security which are assigned to the Father are: (1) the sovereign purpose of God, (2) the Father's infinite power set free, (3) the infinite love of God, and (4) the influence on the Father of the prayer of His Son.

1. The Sovereign Purpose of God. By no process of worthy reasoning and certainly by no word of revelation can it be concluded that He who created all things according to His sovereign purpose—which purpose extends on into eternity to come and comprehends every minute detail that will ever come to pass—will be defeated in the realization of all His intention; nor should there be failure to accept the truth that the bringing of redeemed men into heaven's glory is a major divine purpose behind all His creative undertaking. The assumption is unfounded and vain which declares that the saving of souls and the outcalling of the Church is but a minor detail which, if unsuccessful, would, on account of its insignificance, have no important bearing on the main divine objective. It is true that, on the human side, man exercises his will in that he acts according to his desires and best judgment. It is also true and of greater importance that God molds those desires and enlightens that human judgment. It is natural for men to conclude that since in the range of their own experience their acceptance of Christ is optional, the salvation of a soul and its attaining to heaven's glory is a matter of indifference or uncertainty in the mind of God. The failure of one soul to be saved and to reach glory whom God has ordained to that end means the disruption of the whole actuality of divine sovereignty. If God could fail in one feature, be it ever so small, He could fail in all. If He could fail in anything, He ceases to be God and the universe is drifting to a

destiny about which God Himself could know nothing. None would doubt that the incarnation and death of Christ were major features in the purpose of God; but all this, it is revealed, is for the purpose of bringing many sons into glory. It is written: “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings” (Heb. 2:9–10). God did not give His Son as a fortuitous venture, with uncertainty about whether a remnant of His purpose would be realized. Every devout mind would be shocked by the recital of such God-dishonoring insinuations; yet every feature of this impious sequence is unavoidably admitted if it be allowed that God could fail in the realization of His purpose in the instance of one soul. Ephesians 1:11–12 is a proper declaration in respect to the divine purpose: “In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will: that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.” And, though often referred to previously, Romans 8:28–30 proclaims the same immutable divine intention, with plenary assurance that the sovereign purpose of God will be realized. The passage reads: “And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.” The primary pronouncement of this passage is that “all things work together for good to them that love God [a reference to those who are saved], to them who are the called according to his purpose.” This entire program centers in His *purpose*, which began with predestination and foreknowledge acting in their combined effectiveness. That this intent which was foreseen and predetermined might be achieved, He calls, He justifies, and He glorifies. This purpose is for each individual who is saved. If it is inquired whether the individual must believe by the action of his own will, it will be remembered that the divine call consists in the moving of the human will—not by coercion, but by persuasion—and

that, by so much, the only human responsibility—believing, which is of measureless importance—is guaranteed. All that God has purposed in behalf of those who are saved He has promised in unconditional covenant and His covenant cannot be broken, else the holy character of God is defamed. Would any pious individual assert that God might promise and not fulfill? Yet He has, by the very revelation of His sovereign intent, promised complete preservation of those who are saved at all. He does not hesitate to include the element of human faith in this great undertaking. When it is thus included, it is not the introduction of an uncertainty, as is easily supposed. There is no uncertainty whatever where He is the Author of faith. When God says He will save those who believe, it is understood from other Scriptures that His elect, under the persuasion which cannot fail, will believe. God's ability to make unconditional covenants in the outworking of His sovereign purpose is demonstrated in the covenants made with Abraham and David. The only responsibility in either of these covenants is contained in the sovereign "I will" of Jehovah. Both covenants reach on for their fulfillment to future ages. Because of their duration, if for no other reason, these covenants could not rest on the faithfulness of either of the men involved. The span of their lives scarcely marked the beginning of the realization of all that God promised in these covenants. It is of peculiar interest to note that, in the case of David—and what may be perplexing to Arminians—God declared that the sins of David's sons, through whom the covenant was to be perpetuated, would not in any case abrogate the covenant; though, it should also be observed, Jehovah reserved the right to chastise those in David's line who offended (2 Sam. 7:8–16; Ps. 89:20–37).

The word *promise* as employed by the Apostle Paul (cf. Rom. 4:13–14, 16, 20; Gal. 3:17–19, 22, 29; 4:23, 28), though much neglected in doctrinal study, represents precisely the form of unconditional promise which God made to Abraham—not the promise of the same thing, but that which in each case is unconditional and therefore an expression of divine sovereignty. The promise made to the believer of this age is not only concerning different objectives, but reaches out to realms unrevealed to Abraham. God did not covenant with Abraham that He would present Abraham faultless before the presence of His glory (Jude 1:24); nor did He promise that Abraham would be accepted in the Beloved (Eph. 1:6). Under present relationships, the word *promise* represents all that God in sovereign

grace designs for the believer. Abraham is the divinely determined pattern of salvation by promise (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3, 20–25); but the scope of the promise now is widely different in the case of the believer as compared to that which was addressed to Abraham. The force of this divinely arrayed principle to make a sovereign covenant of promise and to execute it apart from every human condition is seen in Romans 4:16, where it is written: "It is of faith [nothing on man's part], that it might be by grace [everything on God's part], to the end the promise might be sure." If the end in view depended at any point on human resources or factors, the promise could not be *sure;* but, being an unconditional, sovereign work of God, the result is as sure as the existence of the eternal God. Similarly, in Galatians 3:22 it is written that "the scripture hath concluded all [Jew and Gentile alike] under sin," which means that God accepts no merit from man which might be credited to his account in his salvation. This is so in order that "the promise," which is realized by faith in Jesus Christ, "might be given to them that believe"—meaning, who do no more than to believe. The Apostle is careful to point out that, in the case of Abraham, he was declared righteous by believing. It could not be because of law observance since the law was not given until five hundred years later; nor could it have been merited by circumcision, since Abraham was not then circumcised (Rom. 4:9–16). Thus the grace-promise with all it includes is addressed to the believer apart from the merit system which the law would impose, and apart from all ceremonials. It is the sovereign purpose of the sovereign God, which is accomplished to infinite perfection through sovereign grace on the sole condition of faith in Christ as Savior.

The Arminian insists that human merit is essential for safekeeping and by so much he denies that the eternal purpose in salvation is to be accomplished by unconditional sovereign grace. To him the promise is not sure, and he denies that God has concluded all under sin for the very intent that the human element should be dismissed forever. This Arminian misrepresentation is not an insignificant matter. The gospel he preaches is perilously near being "another gospel," that which merits the unrevoked anathema of Galatians 1:8–9.

The unconditional divine covenant of promise is the substance of a vast body of Scripture. It enters into every passage in which salvation and safekeeping are made to depend upon faith in Christ. The following texts

will serve as illustration: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16); “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life” (John 5:24); “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” (John 6:37); “And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand” (John 10:28); “Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:30).

2. The Father’s Infinite Power Set Free. The problem related to the exercise of divine power in the safekeeping of the believer is more complex than it would be were there no moral features involved. Granting that God is omnipotent, and to this all pious souls will agree, it would not be difficult to imagine a situation in which God could preserve an individual Christian by His arbitrary domination, or a situation in which He could surround the believer with influences which would safeguard him throughout his days; but Christians sin and are imperfect, which fact introduces a moral problem when their safekeeping is considered. Without doubt, it is this moral problem which is the formidable obstacle to security in the Arminian’s mind. This issue will be discussed more fully in Chapter XVIII. The Arminian readily discloses his mind when asked the direct question, What would serve to unsave the Christian? His answer, of course, is *sin*—but not minor sins, such as all believers commit, else no Christian would endure at all and they evidently do endure; even Christians of the Arminian faith endure to some extent, and some do reach heaven at last. No Arminian would contend that those of their number who reach heaven do so on the basis of a sinless life. The contention is, rather, that those thus favored did not commit sins sufficiently wicked to unsave them. By so much, as all will admit, a rationalistic and unscriptural claim is introduced which distinguishes between big sins and little sins. Yet even more daring in its unbelief is the obvious confession involved, which asserts that sin may unsave after Christ has borne it. The Scriptures declare that Christ by His death became the propitiation for *our* sins (1 John 2:2), which certainly

means that the believer's sins, in contrast to "the sins of the whole world," have had their specific and perfect judgment wrought out by Christ in His death—a judgment so perfect that the Father is rendered infinitely propitious by it. It would seem unnecessary to state here the qualifying truth that, though the Christian's sin does not surpass the propitiation which is originated to disannul its power, it does carry with it other penalties, and not the least of these is chastisement by the Father should the sinning Christian continue to sin without repentance and confession (1 Cor. 11:31–32).

The special point which this division of this theme aims to establish is that God the Father not only is able because of omnipotence to keep His own, but that He is set *free* through the death of His Son to keep them, in spite of the moral problem which the imperfection of each Christian engenders. The New Testament bears abundant testimony to the unrestrained ability of God to keep those whom He has saved through Christ. It is written: "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand" (John 10:29); "and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform" (Rom. 4:21); "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? … For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:31, 38–39); "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand" (Rom. 14:4); "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us" (Eph. 3:20); "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:21); "For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day" (2 Tim. 1:12); "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb. 7:25); "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy" (Jude 1:24). To all this may be

added the specific disclosure of Ephesians 1:19–21, wherein it is revealed that the very power which wrought in Christ to raise Him from the dead—the supreme power—is "to us-ward." Who, indeed, is able to estimate the advantage to the child of God of that immeasurable power?

To maintain his position, the Arminian must insert his own unwarranted qualifications into each of these divine declarations and must deny that God's power is free to act in the preservation of believers. The Arminian denial of the revelation that God is propitious toward the believer's sins is equivalent to the denial of all that enters into the doctrine of sovereign grace.

3. The Infinite Love of God. That which actuated God from all eternity in His elective choice of those whom He would bring into glory was His love for them. If, as many scholars believe, the words *in love*, which in the Authorized Version are at the end of Ephesians 1:4, are to be made the opening words of that which follows, a flood of light falls on this important revelation respecting the motive of God. Under this arrangement, the passage would read and probably should read, "in love having predestinated us." Love is one of the attributes of God. "God is love," which means that He has never acquired love, He does not maintain it by any effort whatsoever, nor does His love depend upon conditions; for He is the Author of all conditions. God loved before any being was created, and at a time—if time it be—when there was no other than His own triune Being. He loved Himself supremely, but upon a plane far above that of mere self-complacency. His love is as eternal and unchangeable as His own existence, and it was in that incomprehensible past that He also loved the beings He would yet create. Though expressed supremely by the death of Christ at a moment in time, and though seen in the preservation of, and providence over, His redeemed, His is a love of the dateless past and its continuation is as immutable as the predestination it devises. Yes, predestination is, so far from being a hard and awful predetermination of God, in reality, the supreme undertaking and satisfaction of His infinite compassion.

At an earlier point in this thesis, attention has been called to the truth that salvation springs not from the misery of men which God in mercy might choose to relieve, but it springs from the love God has for His creatures, which love can be satisfied by nothing short of their conformity to Christ in

His eternal presence. It is this unchangeable endearment that the student of doctrine must contemplate and in the light of it he must form his conclusions. In this contemplation, it will not do to invest the divine compassion with the fitfulness and capriciousness which characterize human love, as though God loved His creatures when they were good, but withdrew His love when they were wrong. The fact is, though incomprehensible, that God loved men enough to give His Son to die for them even when they were enemies and sinners (Rom. 5:7–10). He was not merely shocked by their unworthiness enough to provide some relief; He actually died for them in the Person of His Son. It is in this connection—and at Romans 5—that the words "much more" occur twice and when contrasting the outworking of the love of God for the unsaved with the outworking of the love of God for the saved. It is not implied that He loves more, though the individual saved by His grace is more lovable than when unregenerate; it is rather that the opportunity has been made, through salvation, for His love to have a much more manifestation in those who are saved. "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life" (Rom. 5:9–10). The preservation declared in the end of this passage is not due to the indwelling Christ, which is eternal life (Col. 1:27), but is due to the essential fact of Christ's own life and all that He, the resurrected Son of God, is to the believer.

If this truth respecting the immeasurable and immutable love of God for believers is recognized, it will be seen that, because of this unalterable motive, God will conclude perfectly what He has begun—that which He predestinated with infinite certainty. Love removed every barrier that sin erected and love will keep, by a much more manifestation even than that exhibited at Calvary, all whom He hath chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world.

Little place, indeed, does the Arminian make in his system for this unalterable, undefeatable love of God for those whom He has saved. To deny this love its full manifestation and satisfaction, as it is disclosed by God Himself, is to attempt to impair, if not to deny, the essential reality of one of God's most glorious attributes.

4. The Influence on the Father of the Prayer of His Son. Many cognomens are used in the New Testament to designate those from among Jews and Gentiles who are saved—Christians, believers, brethren, children of God, the household of faith, the family of God, "my sheep," a kingdom of priests, His Body, saints—and each of these, to which others might be added, carries a specific meaning and suggests a peculiar relationship. There is, however, one title which, because of the One who used it and the circumstances under which it was employed, surpasses in hallowed exaltation all other appellations combined. The Lord Himself used it exclusively in that supreme hour when He was leaving this world and was returning to the Father—an hour when He was accounting to the Father respecting the completion of His incomparable mission to this world. The time and circumstances thus marked the climax of all that He had wrought while here in the world. Whatever term the Savior might employ at any time would be of the greatest significance, but above all and exalted to the highest heaven is that designation which He employs when He is in holy and familiar converse with His Father in heaven. At once the devout mind is aroused to its supreme attention to catch the terminology which is current in the intercourse between the Father and the Son. It is then in His High Priestly prayer that the Savior seven times refers to those who are saved as "those whom thou hast given me" (John 17:2, 6, 9, 11–12, 24). This so exalted company includes all that believe on Him throughout the age (John 17:20). This title at once suggests an event of measureless import in past ages concerning which but little may be known. It is reasonable to believe that each individual ever to be saved by the grace of God through the Savior, Jesus Christ, was in the ages past individually presented as a particular love gift from the Father to the Son; that each individual represents a thought that could never be duplicated; and that if one of these jewels should be missing from the whole company, the Lord would be deprived as only infinity could be injured by imperfections.

While referring to believers as "those whom thou hast given me," the Son asks the Father this definite petition: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are" (John 17:11). The prayer that they may be *one* no doubt refers to the organic unity of all believers, which is illustrated by the figure of a body and in its relation to its head. The implication is that no member shall be

absent. But, more to the point, is the fact and force of the direct prayer to the Father by the Son, in which He makes request that the Father keep through His name those whom He has given to the Son. Naturally, the question arises whether this prayer of the Son will be answered. The Arminians hesitate to believe that it will be answered in the case of every believer, while the Calvinists assert that the prayer will be answered and point to the fact that no prayer by Christ has ever been unanswered, nor could it be. The request itself which this prayer presents should not be overlooked. The Son asks the Father to keep those saved whom the Father has given to the Son. If it could be demonstrated—which it cannot—that the Father has no interest of His own in these elect people, it must be observed that He, for the Son's sake, to whom nothing is denied, must employ His infinite resources to accomplish precisely what the Son has requested. It is thus that the prayer of the Son of God to the Father becomes one of the major factors in the believer's security. To deny the safekeeping of the believer is to imply that the prayer of the Son of God will not be answered.

II. The Reasons Which Depend on God the Son

While the four reasons for the Christian's security which depend on God the Son are discussed separately in various places in the New Testament, they all appear together in one verse and as a fourfold answer to a challenging inquiry whether the child of God is secure. The passage reads: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. 8:34).

The question with which this passage opens is preceded by a similar inquiry—"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?"—which question draws out the assuring answer, "It is God that justifieth." The argument is that if God has already justified, which is the case with everyone who believes in Jesus (cf. Rom. 3:26; 8:30), how can He lay anything to the charge of His justified one? It is in no wise the common problem of one person discovering imperfections or sin in another person. In such an undertaking, God, above all others, could identify the Christian's failures. He has never shut His eyes to those failures, nor does He fail to give righteous consideration to them. The believer's justification is secured

on the ground of the imputed merit of the Son of God and it is legally his, being, as he is, in Christ Jesus. There could never be such a thing as a justification before God which is based upon human worthiness. On the other hand, a justification which is not subject to human merit could hardly be subject to human demerit. As in human relationships where there are ways by which an earthly father may correct his erring son without disrupting either sonship or family standing, in like manner God as Father maintains the perfect standing—even complete and eternal justification—of His child at the very moment it is necessary for Him to correct that child. The truth therefore stands that God, having justified the ungodly (Rom. 4:5), will not and cannot contradict Himself by charging them with evil, which charge amounts to the reversing of their justification. Bearing on this truth, Dean Alford quotes Chrysostom as saying: "He saith not, 'God who remitteth sins,' but which is much more, 'God who justifieth.' For when the vote of the judge himself acquits, and of such a Judge, of what weight is the accuser?" (*N.T. for English Readers*, new ed., on Rom. 8:34). The absolute equity of this arrangement must be comprehended, else the student will never understand that type of salvation which is wrought by sovereign grace and which he is appointed to preach.

The second question and the one which draws out the fourfold answer now under consideration—"Who is he that condemneth?"—is quite similar to the one which precedes it, though a different body of truth is summoned to serve as the answer. Here, as throughout the New Testament, the inquiry whether the believer is unconditionally safe forever through the provisions of infinite grace is answered in the affirmative. Concerning the complete answer to this second question, De Wette remarks: "All the great points of our redemption are ranged together, from the death of Christ to His still enduring intercession, as reasons for negativing the question above" (Alford, *loc. cit.*).

A sincere attention to this question and its fourfold answer is demanded, to the end that there may be a worthy understanding of the truth embraced in this particular theme which occupies so great a place in Soteriology. This interrogation whether the true believer will ever be condemned is both propounded and answered by the Holy Spirit. These are the words of God and not the words of a man alone. It is as though the divine Author anticipated the doctrinal confusion that was to arise and, with that in view,

caused these momentous questions to be recorded with their unequivocal answers. Nevertheless, such direct questions and conclusive answers have not deterred a form of rationalistic unbelief, which poses as pious and sound, from denying the entire revelation.

The four answers to the question "Who is he that condemneth?" are here taken up separately and in their order, since they constitute the four reasons for the believer's security which belong, for their achievement, to the Son of God. These answers are: (1) Christ has died, (2) Christ is risen, (3) Christ advocates, and (4) Christ intercedes.

1. CHRIST HAS DIED. The first answer to the question "Who is he that condemneth?" is a citation of the fact that Christ has died, and properly so, since that death is a major ground for the assurance that the believer cannot be condemned. To a degree that is complete and final, Christ has Himself borne the condemnation which otherwise would fall on the Christian who has sinned. No new principle is thus introduced. It was on the basis of the efficacy of Christ's death for his sins that the believer was saved in the first place and apart from all penalty or punishment, a holy God being thus set free to pardon righteously every sin that ever was or ever will be, with respect to its power to condemn (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). It is the same divine freedom, based on the fact that Christ died for the Christian's sins (1 John 2:2), which creates the freedom of God to forgive righteously the sin—now within the sphere of fellowship with God—of the believer who confesses that sin (1 John 1:9). The solution of the problem of the salvation of the unregenerate person and of the preservation of those who are saved is identical. This divinely wrought solution is not only equitable and legal, but it is practical and reasonable. Though Satan-blinded minds do not see this truth until they are enlightened, the fact that the Substitute has borne the penalty is the simplest of methods by which a problem, otherwise impossible of solution, may be wholly solved. Though God reserves the right to correct and chasten His child, He has never allowed an intimation to go forth by His authority, that His child would be condemned. In defense of his theological position, the Arminian must either deny that the death of Christ is a sufficient divine dealing with sin and, therefore, the believer may be disowned for the very sins which Christ bore, or he must abandon the testimony of the Bible outright and conclude that Christ did not die

efficaciously for anyone. Such conclusions are the inescapable deductions from the Arminian position respecting the doctrine of substitution. Naturally, there is no intermediate ground. Either the believer must be condemned for each and every sin—which is the logical contention of Arminianism—or his sins are in no way a ground of judgment, the judgment of them having been borne by Another. There is no question about what the Bible teaches on these two propositions, nor about which one it favors.

2. Christ is Risen. The glorious truth of the resurrection of Christ becomes at once the ground on which two conclusive reasons for the security of the child of God are found to rest: (a) that the believer has partaken of the resurrection life of the Son of God, and (b) that the believer is a part of the New Creation over which the resurrected Christ is the all-sufficient Head. The latter of these two reasons will be discussed under those features of security which are the responsibility of the Holy Spirit. The former, now to be considered, is that the child of God partakes of the resurrection life of the Son of God. An exceedingly important statement of truth appears in Colossians 2 and 3. It is to the effect that the Christian is already in the sphere of resurrection by virtue of the fact that he is in the resurrected Christ. In chapter 2, the Apostle asserts directly that the Christian is raised with Christ (vs. 12). This reality is not a mere symbolism or figure; it is as real as Christ's own resurrection, in which it shares. To be "quickened" is to be made alive by the receiving of the resurrection life of Christ. The Christian has been, and is said to be even now, raised up and seated with Christ in the heavenlies (Eph. 2:6). To be in the resurrected Christ and to have the resurrected Christ within, constitutes a spiritual resurrection which, as to the believer's whole being, will be completed in due time by the resurrection of the body or by its transformation in translation. With this spiritual reality in mind, the Apostle writes in Colossians 3:1–4 and in respect to the believer's daily life, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

The life which the believer receives in regeneration is the life of Christ in resurrection. That life cannot decrease or perish. It is the common claim of Arminians that, whatever eternal life may be, it can, and in many instances does, depart. Some have said that it is eternal, resurrection life while it is possessed, but that the Christian may become dispossessed of it. But that life is not a detached something which may come or go. It is a nature secured by divine generation and, like any nature which is possessed, it cannot be detached and dismissed. There seems to be a peculiar bond of relationship between two realities—"eternal life" and "shall not perish"—as these are twice used together by Christ (John 3:16; 10:28).

The denial of eternal security for the child of God—one who has received the resurrection life of Christ as an imparted nature—is to deny either the reality of this life or to deny its imperishable and abiding character.

3. Christ Advocates. In 1 John 1:1–2:2, two important questions are answered, namely, what the effect of the Christian's sin is upon himself and what its cure, and what the effect of the Christian's sin is upon God and what its cure. In a previous section of this work this specific ministry of Christ has had a more complete consideration. At this point, however, the issue is crucial in its bearing on the security of those who are saved. Turning for the moment to the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself, it will be seen that in 1 John alone there are at least seven damaging consequences which result from that sin; yet it is not once intimated that the believer will be lost again. One of these penalties is that of the loss of communion with God the Father and the Son, and the cure—far removed, indeed, from being a re-regeneration—is a simple confession of the sin to God from a penitent heart (1 John 1:3–9). Attention has been called in Chapter XIII to thirty-three divine undertakings which together constitute the salvation of a soul. Among them is the truth that all sin is forgiven. Not one of these thirty-three transformations could be claimed alone or separated from the whole, nor could thirty-two be selected with the intentional omission of one. They constitute one indivisible whole; nor is one of these subject to a second experience of reception. Even the forgiveness of sin—which is unto union with Christ and into a state where there is no condemnation—is never repeated. The Christian's forgiveness in

the household and return to fellowship with the Father and the Son is quite another thing; yet it, too, is based on the same substitutionary death of Christ. The removal of the effect upon himself of the Christian's sin is, through divine grace, perfect and complete when the requisite confession is made. The provision is specific and sufficient whereby the sin is forgiven and the sinner cleansed (1 John 1:9).

On the other hand, the effect of the Christian's sin upon his holy God is most serious indeed. It is asserted with all possible emphasis that the least sin—such as believers habitually commit, as omissions and commissions—has the power in itself to hurl the believer down from his exalted position into perdition, were it not for that which Christ has wrought. It is here that the form of rationalism which characterizes Arminianism asserts itself. Apart from revelation, it is natural to conclude that God cannot get along with one who is sinning, even though that one is His own child by regeneration; but if it is discovered that God does get on with those who are imperfect, then the problem of the security of the believer is solved in so far as the Christian's sin affects God.

The central passage, 1 John 2:1, opens with the address, "My little children," which is complete evidence that this declaration—as is true of this entire Epistle—is addressed to those who are born of God (John 1:12–13). "The things" of which the Apostle writes are doubtless the particular doctrine of forgiveness and cleansing for the Christian as revealed in chapter 1, and that, also, which immediately follows in this verse, wherein the divine way of dealing with the Christian's sin is disclosed. The effect of these truths upon the believer—quite contrary to the claims of Arminians—is to deter him from sinning. The "natural" or unregenerate man who delights to sin will embrace a doctrine which lifts the penalty of sin; and at this point Arminians seem able to comprehend no more than the view of the natural man. That there are greater incentives to purity, holiness, and faithfulness than the mere dread of punishment, they fail to recognize. At least in their writings they make no mention of those higher motives. All this is largely due to the fact that they cannot, because of the very beliefs they profess, look upon themselves as accepted and sealed in Christ. Were they to see themselves in such a relation to God, reason as well as revelation would remind them of the corresponding obligation to live as an accepted and sealed person should live. So to live is the greatest motive that

can actuate a human life. It far transcends in its effectiveness the mere fear of a law or punishment which, after all, everyone on every hand is disregarding. On the antinomian charge against the Calvinists which the Arminians universally enter, Dr. Charles Hodge writes:

> Antinomianism has never had any hold in the churches of the Reformation. There is no logical connection between the neglect of moral duties, and the system which teaches that Christ is a Saviour as well from the power as from the penalty of sin; that faith is the act by which the soul receives and rests on Him for sanctification as well as for justification; and that such is the nature of the union with Christ by faith and indwelling of the Spirit, that no one is, or can be partaker of the benefit of his death, who is not also partaker of the power of his life; which holds to the divine authority of the Scripture which declares that without holiness no man shall see the Lord (Heb. 12:14); and which, in the language of the great advocate of salvation by grace, warns all who call themselves Christians: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. 6:9, 10.) It is not the system which regards sin as so great an evil that it requires the blood of the Son of God for its expiation, and the law as so immutable that it requires the perfect righteousness of Christ for the sinner's justification, which leads to loose views of moral obligation; these are reached by the system which teaches that the demands of the law have been lowered, that they can be more than met by the imperfect obedience of fallen men, and that sin can be pardoned by priestly intervention. This is what logic and history alike teach.—*Systematic Theology*, III, 241

Evidently the Apostle John anticipates that the power of the truth he is disclosing will tend to a separation from sin. This is the force of the words, "that ye sin not." The phrase which follows, "if any man sin," refers to Christians exclusively. It could not include the unsaved along with the saved. It is *any man* within the Christian fellowship. A similar usage, among several in the New Testament, is found in 1 Corinthians 3:12–15 where the restricted classification is equally evident. The term *any man* corresponds numerically to the pronoun "we" which follows here immediately. The sufficient provision for the sinning Christian is indicated by the words, "We have an advocate with the Father." The scene is set in the high court of heaven with the Father as Judge upon the throne (incidentally, it should be noted that, though the child of God has sinned, God is still his Father). A prosecuting agent is present also. The record of his activity as prosecutor is found in Revelation 12:10, which reads: "And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." If any accusing voice

were needed, that need Satan himself supplies. The question "Who is he that condemneth?" easily includes in the sphere of its possibilities vastly more than the charges which one human being might prefer against another. But even the prosecution by Satan cannot avail, for there is an Advocate, a Defender. What this means every hour to the believer will never be known in this life. The truth respecting the advocacy of Christ is in view in these declarations: "who is even at the right hand of God" (Rom. 8:34) and "now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24).

If inquiry be made concerning what influence the Advocate brings to bear on the Father by which the believer is cleared from condemnation, some might venture the opinion that He is making excuses; but there are no excuses. Another might suggest that He pleads with the Father for leniency; but the Father, being holy, cannot be, and therefore is not, lenient with sin. Still another might propose that this Attorney, or Advocate, is a shrewd lawyer who is able to make out a case where no case exists; but—and great is the force of it—at this very point and in connection with the specific work of delivering the sinning Christian from condemnation, the Advocate wins an exalted title which He gains for no other service, namely, *Jesus Christ the Righteous.* The claim to this unique appellation is probably twofold: (1) He presents the evidence of His own sacrifice for the sin in question—the truth that He bore it fully on the cross. Thus when the Father withholds condemnation, His ground for doing so is *just*, since the Savior has died. It is in direct line with this aspect of the Advocate's work that this very context goes on to say: "And he is the propitiation for our sins." By the death of His Son for the Christian's sin, the Father is rendered propitious. (2) Christ is made unto the believer *righteousness* (1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21), and He, as the Source of this imputed righteousness, is the One by whom the Christian is saved and in whom he stands forever.

It is evident then, that, while paternal discipline will be exercised by the Father over His erring child according to His good pleasure (Heb. 12:3–15), that child will not be condemned, since Christ who bore the Christian's sin appears in heaven for him and Christ is the very righteousness in which the Christian is accepted before God.

4. Christ Intercedes. Among the neglected doctrines—and there are many—is that which brings into view the present intercession of Christ in

behalf of all that are saved. The very fact that He thus intercedes implies the danger which besets the believer in this the enemy's land, and the necessity of Christ's prayer in his behalf. The strange inattention which obtains with regard to this ministry of Christ may be due to various causes and none, it is probable, more than the influence and power of Satan, who would rob the believer of the advantage and comfort which this intercession secures. As a practical experience, believers are without the knowledge of this intercession in their behalf and therefore deprived of the help and strength which this knowledge affords. The neglect cannot be attributed to the lack of revelation, for it stands out with more than usual clearness on the Sacred Page. Four major passages appear, and these should be given careful attention. It will be seen that the divine purpose in Christ's intercession, as exhibited in these passages, is the security of all those for whom He intercedes.

John 17:1–26. A quotation, or reproduction, of the text of this supreme chapter is uncalled for. The passage embodies the prayer of Christ and the reasonable conclusion is that it is the norm or pattern of that prayer which Christ continues to pray in heaven. If it were fitting for Him to intercede for His own who were then in the *cosmos* world, it is fitting that He shall pray for those who are now in the *cosmos* world. In this prayer His solicitude for all who are in the *cosmos* world is most apparent, so, also, His dependence upon the Father to keep them from the evil one. As before indicated, the request of the Son in behalf of the safekeeping of those who are saved, can be refused by the Father only on the supposition that Christ's prayer might not be answered; or that it is beyond the power of Infinity, even though the Father is released from all moral restraint by the death of Christ for sin. The latter position—that to preserve the believer is beyond the power of God even when the sin question is eliminated—Arminians have not hesitated to assume. Nevertheless, the Savior ceases not to intercede in behalf of those He has saved and to the end that they may be preserved forever.

Romans 8:34. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

In this Scripture it is declared that there is no condemnation for the child of God because of the truth, among others already considered, that the Savior "maketh intercession for us." On the divine side of the problem of

the eternal security of the Christian, there is evidently a definite dependence upon the prayer of the Son of God.

Luke 22:31–34. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death. And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me."

While this is the record of Christ's prayer for but one man and that man the one who was to deny his Lord, it is reasonable to assume that Christ sustains this same solicitude and care over each individual believer. Doubtless He could say to every believer many times in the day, "I have prayed for thee." The petition which Christ presented for Peter was secured. He prayed that Peter's faith should not fail, and it did not fail, though through all this experience Peter manifested the traits of a believer who is out of communion with his Lord. There is no intimation that Peter became unsaved, or that he was saved a second time. The doctrine respecting the believer's restoration to fellowship with God— confused by Arminians with salvation—is that which Peter illustrates. And finally,

Hebrews 7:23–25. "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

No more direct and unqualified declaration respecting the eternal security of the believer than this is recorded in the New Testament, and that security is here made to depend wholly on the intercession of Christ; that is, the believer is said to be secure in the most absolute sense because Christ prays for him—else language ceases to be a dependable medium for the conveying of thought.

In His priesthood over believers, Christ differs widely from the priests of the old order and in the one particular especially: that as they were subject to death and by death their ministry was interrupted, Christ's priesthood is interminable. He hath an immutable, or unchangeable, priesthood, and that corresponds to the equally important truth that He liveth forever. "Wherefore?" Because He liveth forever and, on that account, His ministry

as Priest has no end. He is able to save the Christian—some say "to completeness" and others say "evermore" or "eternally" (εἰς τὸ παντελές will sustain both conceptions; for that which is saved unto completeness is saved without end—all those that come unto God by Him; that is, those that trust in the Savior). This certitude is based on the enduring Savior's interminable ability as Priest to bring to pass eternal security. The assertion is unqualified and the unequivocal divine guarantee is made to depend directly and only, so far as this passage is concerned, upon the prevailing power of Christ's intercession. Such is efficacious power and the infinite reality of it cannot be comprehended by the mind of man; and to deny its supreme potency, as all do who disbelieve in the absolute security of the child of God, is to enter the sphere of unwarranted assumption.

The intercession of Christ, it is well to observe, is more than the mere exercise of prayer. Christ is a Shepherd and Bishop to those whom He saves. He guides His own away from the pitfalls and snares of Satan. The Christian could never know in this life what he owes to the interceding Shepherd who sustains him every hour of his life. David caught the same assuring confidence concerning his own relation to Jehovah when he said, "The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Ps. 23:1). David did not testify merely that he had not wanted anything up to that moment, but he boldly declares that his future is as certain as the Shepherdhood of Jehovah could make it.

Returning for the moment to the one text (Rom. 8:34) into which all four reasons for the believer's security which depend on God the Son are compressed, it may be restated that, by His substitutionary death, Christ provides the Father with righteous freedom to undertake eternal blessedness for those who believe. By His resurrection Christ provides the Christian with imperishable resurrection life. By His advocacy He meets the condemning effect of the believer's every sin as that sin is seen by God in heaven. And by His intercession He engages the infinite power of God—including His own Shepherdhood—in behalf of those who believe. Every step in this incomprehensible service of the Savior is in itself wholly sufficient to achieve the end in view; yet every step is challenged and disowned by Arminian rationalism.

What the Savior undertakes—especially as Advocate and Intercessor—is at His own appointment. He saves and keeps simply because of the truth

that His salvation is by its very nature eternal. It follows, then, that He should never be implored to advocate or intercede, though unceasing thanksgiving should ascend to Him for these accomplishments.

III. Responsibilities Belonging to God the Holy Spirit

Much, indeed, is directly undertaken by the Holy Spirit to the end that the child of God shall be safe forever. Under the present divine arrangement, He is the Executor of very much that the Godhead undertakes; however, as in the case of the Father and the Son, four distinctive achievements are wrought by the Third Person and these demand recognition.

1. The Holy Spirit Regenerates. The widespread Arminian emphasis upon human merit has tended to obscure one of the primary realities of a true Christian, which reality is secured, not by merit, but by divine grace, in answer to saving belief in Christ. That reality is that the believer is regenerated and thus is introduced into a new estate, a new existence, a new relationship which is well defined as a new creation. In 2 Corinthians 5:17 it is written: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." The Apostle likewise declares that "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:10). This passage reveals the truth that, as a result of the divine workmanship, the Christian is no less than a divine creation—a form of being which did not exist before. That new being is said to partake of the "divine nature," which implies that it is as enduring as the eternal God. Similarly, the same Apostle writes: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" (Gal. 6:15). Upon this specific aspect of the truth the Lord placed the greatest emphasis when speaking to Nicodemus. It is significant that, when declaring the necessity of the birth from above, Christ did not select a dissolute character, but He chose one who ranked highest in Judaism and whose character was beyond reproach. It was a personal message when He said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again," and the universally acknowledged mystery of it must not be suffered to detract from either the

reality or the necessity of that divine regeneration. In the instance of human generation, a being originates who did not exist before and who will go on forever. Likewise, in spiritual regeneration a being originates which was not identified as such before and this being will go on forever. By what law of reasoning can it be assured that eternal existence belongs to a form of existence which outwardly seems to be temporal, and not to that form of existence which because of its source and essential character is not temporal but is eternal? An earthly parent imparts a nature to his child by human generation, and that nature is immutable. Thus, and to a degree which is far more exalted, the Holy Spirit forms a new creation which is immutable. An earthly father might disinherit and utterly abandon his son, but he cannot stop the son from resembling himself, and the reason is obvious.

The Arminian's difficulty is initial. To him salvation itself is no more than a state of mind, a good intention, a resolution, or an outward manner of life. Such passing or transient verities as these are far removed from that inviolable, divine creation which Christ pressed upon Nicodemus and that which is presented in every New Testament reference to this theme. It may be safely asserted that regeneration, as presented in the Scriptures, is an enduring actuality and the one who questions the eternal continuation of the child of God, questions the process (and its result) by which he becomes a child of God. When God is declared to be the Father of all who believe, reference is not made to a faint moral resemblance which a good life might suggest; it is a reference to legitimate Fatherhood and legitimate sonship grounded on an actual regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

2. The Holy Spirit Indwells. Closely akin to the truth respecting the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit is the fact that He indwells every true child of God. Besides, there is a distinct and extended testimony of the Scriptures to the specific truth of the Spirit's indwelling. The more complete induction bearing on this theme will appear under Pneumatology. Out of a formidable list of passages bearing on this particular theme, one declares specifically that the Spirit who indwells abides forever. This passage records the words of Christ and reports His prayer respecting the coming of the Holy Spirit into the world. These are the words of the Savior, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot

receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" (John 14:16–17). Thus the assurance is given that the Holy Spirit indwells the believer and that His presence is abiding. He may be grieved; but He will not be grieved away. He may be quenched—which carries the thought of resisting—but He cannot be extinguished. He never leaves the Christian, else the word of Christ is untrue and His prayer is unanswered. The Apostle writes, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). This great declaration is not a warning to the believer that he might lose the Spirit and be unsaved again; it is a direct statement to the effect that, if the Spirit is not present in the heart, that one has never been saved. The Apostle John points out (1 John 2:27) that the Spirit is identified, among other characteristics of His presence within, as the One who *abides.* This determining Scripture reads: "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him."

Again, the Arminian position can be sustained only by a denial of the truth set forth in those notable Scriptures which not only aver that the Spirit indwells each believer, but that He abides forever.

3. The Holy Spirit Baptizes. Not many New Testament doctrines are more misunderstood than that of the Spirit's baptism; and few misunderstandings could be more misleading than this, for on the right apprehension of that which is involved in this divine undertaking the believer's discernment of his possessions and positions depends, and the knowledge of these constitutes the true incentive for a God-honoring daily life. The fuller meaning of this ministry of the Spirit and its importance as the foundation of other doctrines must be reserved for a later volume (VI). As a ground upon which the certainty of eternal security rests, the baptism of the Spirit should be recognized as that operation by which the individual believer is brought into organic union with Christ. By the Spirit's regeneration Christ is resident in the believer, and by the Spirit's baptism the believer is thus in Christ. This union is illustrated in the Word of God by various figures—notably the members of a body in their relation to the head. This union is also said to be a New Creation humanity in its relation

to the new and unfallen Last Adam, Christ Jesus. It would be enough to point out here that the glorious Body of Christ will not be marred or maimed because of amputated members, and that there will be no fall in the Last Adam; but the members of Christ's Body are constituted what they are on the sole basis of the truth that the merit of Christ is their standing, which merit is neither withdrawn nor does it fail in its potentiality. Likewise, the New Creation Headship guarantees the same perfect standing. Were it not for the fact that minds seem to be darkened on this point, it would be unnecessary to restate the obvious truth that God undertakes, along wholly different and adequate grounds, to govern in the matter of irregularities which appear in the Christian's life, and quite apart from holding over them the threat that an impossible separation from the New Creation Headship will follow should so much as one sin be committed. It would be simple, indeed, to devise a scheme by which sinless, unfallen human beings may reach heaven on the basis of their own worthiness; but God is undertaking to bring sinful, fallen beings into glory, and the plan He has devised, of necessity, can take no account either of human merit or demerit. Immeasurable grace is manifested in the provision of a righteous way by which fallen men may be translated from a ruined estate to a new creation; but, after one is translated, there is no passing back and forth from one estate to the other as changing merit or demerit might seem to require.

Let it be restated that, by that baptism which the Spirit accomplishes, the believer is vitally joined to the Lord. Being in Christ, he is a partaker of the righteousness of God which Christ is. He is thus perfected to that point which satisfies infinite holiness, and on that ground and on no other God declares him justified in His own sight. Though He may discipline the justified one, God, having justified, cannot consistently lay anything to the charge of His elect (Rom. 8:33).

To the Arminian, salvation is no more than an indefinite divine blessing upon a life that is worthy of it, which blessing endures as long as personal worthiness continues. To the Calvinist, salvation is a divine achievement which is unrelated to human merit, which secures the forgiveness of sin, the gift of eternal life, imputed righteousness, justification, acceptance and standing in Christ, and final conformity to Christ in eternal glory.

4. The Holy Spirit Seals. The last of the twelve reasons why the believer is secure, to be named in this connection, is that he is sealed by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit indwelling as an anointing is Himself the Seal. His presence in the Christian indicates a finished transaction, divine ownership, and eternal security. The believer is a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19); and, though woefully unrecognized and unappreciated by the best of men, that fact of indwelling is, apparently, a most distinguishing reality in the reckoning of God. It is an age-characterizing fact (Rom. 7:6; 2 Cor. 3:6). Three references to the Spirit's sealing are found in the New Testament. (1) *2 Corinthians 1:21–22:* "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." Every one of the four parts in this passage speaks of security, and the truth is asserted that the presence of the Spirit in the believer's heart is a foretaste of the knowledge-surpassing experience of divine blessing yet to be enjoyed in glory. The passage breathes no intimation of uncertainty either about present blessings or about a future consummation. (2) *Ephesians 1:13–14:* "in whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." More correctly the passage begins, "upon believing, ye were sealed," etc. (cf. R.V.). Here, again, the thought of the earnest, which the presence of the Spirit is, appears and it is made clear that the blessings which the present relation to the Spirit secures are but an indication of the glory yet to be. As the Spirit is an earnest of the future inheritance, He is also the "firstfruits" of it (Rom. 8:23). (3) *Ephesians 4:30:* "And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." This signal passage declares that the believer is sealed unto the day of redemption. The redemption to which reference is made is its final aspect when the body is changed so as to become like unto the body of Christ (Rom. 8:23), and the sealed one is complete forever—even conformed to the image of Christ in glory. Like every other declaration respecting security, this one presents no human condition, but is set forth as a work of God, and on a basis so righteous and so independent of human cooperation that no human responsibility could be included as a factor in this sublime outworking of grace through Christ.

In concluding this division of this treatment of the doctrine of security, it may be restated that of these twelve major reasons why the true believer is safe, any one of them alone would suffice to end all doubt and terminate all controversy for the individual who gives unprejudiced attention to the Word of God. These reasons cover an incomprehensible range of truth Arminianism does not enter; for that system, if consistent with itself, must deny every one of these twelve reasons, or else vitiate them by writing into them the human element which God, of necessity and for His own glory, has left out. Some among the Arminians may not comprehend this body of immeasurable truth; others may prefer to avoid assuming an attitude of bold rejection of these portions of the New Testament. At any rate and for whatever reason, the Arminian does not attempt even a feeble exposition of what are well classed as security passages.

Chapter XVII

The Consummating Scripture

As the Letter to the Romans is designed to give the plan and scope of salvation by and through the grace of God made possible through the death of Christ, it is to be expected that that Letter will present the essential truth that the one who is saved is safe for all eternity. This Epistle is divided into three parts, namely, (1) salvation, chapters 1–8; (2) dispensation, chapters 9–11; and (3) exhortation, chapters 12–16. The first section, on salvation, may be divided into three parts. Having declared the lost estate of man in its peculiar form in the present age, the Apostle sets forth: (1) salvation for the unregenerate person which is consummated in justification (3:21–5:21); (2) salvation for the believer from the power of sin, or unto sanctification (6:1–8:17); and (3) security for those who are saved (8:1–39). From this outline, it will be seen that the portion 8:1–17 serves a double purpose, as it appears in two of these divisions. The present thesis is concerned with the security portion (8:1–39), which is built on the entire salvation revelation and consummates it with an argument for security which is both clear and conclusive. This argument closes with the Apostle's confession of his own belief respecting the safety of those who are saved. In this respect, as in many others, Arminianism cannot claim to be Pauline. The student will recognize that, after having set forth the essential character of salvation in its two major aspects, the Apostle must answer the pertinent question whether such a salvation, which is unrelated to human merit, will endure.

This great chapter—second in significance only to John 17—opens with an all but incredible proclamation which serves as a primary statement, the truth of which is proved by seven major arguments and these occupy the text of the chapter. This amazing, unqualified, divine assertion which it has pleased God to record and to fortify with infallible proofs is as follows: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." The added words, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," found in the A.V., are not, as recognized by all devout scholars (see R.V.), a part of this text in its original form, but have been added, perhaps by those who could not suffer to stand a statement so clear and assuring. This

intended element of human worthiness is not only foreign to the original text, but is a contradiction of all the truth previously set forth in this Epistle and of that which follows. In like manner, this intrusion tends to disrupt every revelation respecting salvation by grace which is found in the New Testament. This added phrase—"who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit"—does belong properly in verse 4 where the believer's responsibility is in view. When challenged with the unqualified statement, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," the reader is faced with the question whether this is literally and irrevocably true. If it is true, it guarantees a state of blessedness as expanded as heaven itself and as extended as the eternity which it includes. What greater ground of peace could be presented than that a fallen being, cursed with sin and its ruin, should enter a sphere of relationship with God wherein there is no condemnation now, or in eternity to come. If the answer be made that the promise is for the present and not the future, it will be seen that the Apostle, when arguing in the following context concerning this wonderful primary statement, treats it in every instance as of eternal duration; that is, by his own interpretation it reaches on forever. Though some restatement be involved, attention must be called to the truth that this blessedness is not made, in this declaration, to depend upon human worthiness, but upon the fact that the one thus blessed is in Christ Jesus. It will be recalled that, on the righteous ground provided by Christ in the sweet savor aspect of His death, and on the ground of the fact that the believer is translated into the new Headship wherein he partakes of all that Christ is—even the righteousness of God—there remains no longer any vestige of the legal, merit system which would cast its shadow of doubt over the perfection of God's manifestation of His sovereign grace. Acceptance with God is sealed forever, and on a basis which is righteous in every respect to the end that God Himself is declared to be just, and not merely merciful, when He justifies eternally the ungodly who do no more than to "believe in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26; 4:5). It becomes, therefore, an uncomplicated accomplishment on the part of God. Arminians are wont to make no other reply to this revelation than that "It is too good to be true," and that they would like to believe it if they could. Nevertheless, this wonderful revelation is the very heart of the New Testament message respecting sovereign grace and these great declarations yield to no other interpretation. It is not a mere pity for

man’s wretchedness, which actuates God in so vast an undertaking; He proposes to exercise and demonstrate His attribute of grace as that which can be manifested in no other way. This entire body of truth relative to the believer’s position in Christ and through sovereign grace, lies back of the words, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” and the one who is bold enough to challenge the full measure of truthfulness which this text asserts is, by inexorable logic, compelled to deny every factor which enters into the doctrine of sovereign grace. The Arminian contention that the salvation of a sinner is a cooperative affair with some responsibility resting upon God and some upon the sinner—an important contention if the dignity of the sinner is to be preserved—is not only foreign to the divine revelation, but is a contradiction of the very principle which that revelation sets forth. Men are either perfectly lost in the first Adam, or perfectly saved in the Last Adam, and by so much there could be no middle ground or compromise; therefore all modifications of the doctrine of sovereign grace are ruled out forever. Passing from one Adam to the Other is no human undertaking. God alone can do such a thing, and the sinner’s relation to it could be no more than to believe on Him to do it in His own way, in and through Christ Jesus. In this no man may boast (Eph. 2:9).

Of supreme importance in the consideration of the eighth chapter of Romans are the indisputable facts that this is the divinely ordained book for the setting forth of the whole plan and scope of salvation by grace, and that the eighth chapter serves as the consummation of the doctrinal structure of this Epistle.

Since the opening statement of the eighth chapter of Romans is so unequivocal, the Apostle proceeds to offer seven proofs of its truthfulness. In approaching these, unavoidably some repetition of that line of argument already presented must be allowed.

I. Delivered from the Law

“For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law

might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (vss. 2–8).

In this context, the law stands as the representation of the merit system—that divine arrangement which, according to the New Testament, is held as the antipodes of God's plan of salvation by grace. Beyond the one truth that both systems are ordained of God for application in such ages as He may elect, they set up contrasts at every point. The fact that, under the new order, the law principle is done away as having nothing to contribute to the outworking of the principle of grace (cf. Rom. 11:6; 4:4–5; Gal. 5:4), should not create the impression that the law did not originate with God; that it is not holy, just, and good; or that it has not had His sanction. On this point the Apostle is most emphatic. When arguing the power of the law as designed by God, he said, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid" (Rom. 7:7); "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. … For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin" (Rom. 7:12, 14); "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator" (Gal. 3:19). Though holy, just, and good, the law undertook no more than to serve as a rule of life for people already rightly related to God by His covenants with them. However, as for its holy demands, it is in no way to be compared with that manner of life which is set before the Christian under grace. Over against this, the heaven-high system of conduct under grace, while demanding a supernatural manner of life (cf. John 13:34; 2 Cor. 10:3–5; Eph. 4:30), does provide divine enablement; that is, by the presence of the indwelling Spirit the believer is able to do that which these high standards demand. Therefore, this truth is to be observed that, while requiring far less, the law system failed; yet, while presenting that heaven-high requirement in daily life which belongs to the grace relationship, there is expectation that these standards will be realized.

It is well to contemplate the glorious truth that, so far as the believer's standing in Christ is concerned, the heavenly ideals are reached to infinite perfection. Only in the sphere of the believer's daily conflicts is the grace ideal at times unrealized. It is too often supposed that the outworking of grace is restricted to the Christian's walk and conversation, and the real triumph of grace—the perfecting of the child of God forever—is unrecognized. No matter how disproportionate these issues become under Arminian influence, it must be remembered that to walk worthy of the heavenly calling—though of great importance—is not to be compared for a moment with the heavenly calling itself. The believer may often fail in his conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil; but this should not blind one to those immeasurable, divine achievements which have already united the believer to Christ and thereby constituted him as perfect in the sight of God as his Savior. It is this faultless standing in Christ which conditions the believer's walk; never does the believer's walk condition his standing. Just here is where, more than elsewhere, the essential difference between Arminianism and Calvinism is demonstrated. The upholders of the Arminian system have never evinced ability to comprehend the truth regarding a perfect standing in Christ which is as enduring as the Son of God. To the Arminian, standing before God is just what a feeble believer makes it by his daily life. Under those conditions the Christian may fail and be lost again. For the moment it seems to be forgotten that every believer sustains an imperfect daily life and therefore, on that basis, all must be lost forever. The New Testament teaches that those who believe are saved from the merit system by having all its demands satisfied in Christ, and thus the believer endures forever. In the Arminian system God becomes a colossal failure, unable to realize His purposes in grace; in the Calvinistic system God never fails even to the slightest degree.

The all-important phrase in the context now under consideration (Rom. 8:2–4), so far as the present phase of truth is concerned, is, "for what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh." By these words the Apostle is accounting for the failure of the law system (cf. Rom. 9:30–32). He does not imply that the law was, or is, weak in itself; it was powerless because the flesh to which it was addressed and on which it depended for response, was too weak to comply with its commandments. It follows that, if God would bring perfected beings into glory out of the midst of this

weakness, He must adopt another and more efficacious plan than that which the merit system represents. The new plan adopted does, as seen in earlier chapters of Romans, secure a triumph of divine grace, even the justifying forever of the one who believes on Christ. Therefore, the discussion for the moment centers on the problem of the daily life of the justified one. This problem is greatly increased by the fact of "sin in the flesh," or the Adamic nature. This context asserts that the Adamic nature has been "condemned"—that is, *judged*—and to the end that the Holy Spirit may be free righteously to control that nature. The aim of all this divine provision concerning daily life is that "the law"—meaning the entire will of God for every moment of the believer's life—"might be fulfilled in us." The crucial word here is ἐν, which in this instance is furthest removed from the idea that the will of God is fulfilled *by* the believer. The contrast set up is between what the Spirit may do in the believer as compared to that which the believer, under a merit system, may do for God. However, that he may avail himself of the power of the Spirit in the daily-life problem, the Christian is told that he must "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The conclusion of the matter is that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" because of the fact that they are delivered from the law, or merit, system.

II. The Fact of the Presence of the Divine Nature

"But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (vss. 9–13).

Having pointed out that the flesh is opposed to God and that the walk of the flesh is in the way of spiritual death as the walk in the Spirit is in the way of life and peace, the Apostle declares that the Christian—with reference to position—is not in the flesh, though the flesh is in the Christian. The Christian is "in the Spirit." However, the Spirit is also in the Christian; for he states, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ [the

Holy Spirit], he is none of his." This indwelling reality is again asserted by the words, "if Christ be in you," and, "if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you." That indwelling One shall quicken the mortal body of the one in whom He dwells. This is not a reference to the present energizing of the body by the Spirit, but rather to the fact that the Spirit will quicken that body in resurrection from the dead. The presence of the indwelling Spirit guarantees the endurance of the believer—even his mortal body is under the divine covenant which assures its presence in glory. No Arminian uncertainty is admitted in this unalterable declaration. However, the Apostle does refer again to the believer's daily life and asserts anew the warning that to walk after the flesh is in the way of spiritual death, and to walk after the Spirit is in the way of life and peace. Having received the divine nature "There is therefore [with full consideration of an imperfect walk] now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."

III. The Christian a Son and Heir of God

"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together" (vss. 14–17).

It is certain that "the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" (2 Tim. 2:19); and it is impossible, unthinkable, and—what is more important—unscriptural, that God should lose one He has begotten into actual sonship. Some may "go out from us, but they are not of us" (1 John 2:19); the implication is that those "who are of us" never go out. God reserves the right to chasten an erring child, as He did the sons of David (cf. 2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:30–33), but the chastisement of the child of God has for its supreme purpose, "that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:31–32). "That which is born of God," the Apostle declares, endures; for "his seed remaineth in him" (1 John 3:9).

Likewise, to be a son of God is to be an heir of God, even "a joint-heir with Christ." Here all the riches of God are in view. Christ said "All things

that the Father hath are mine" (John 16:15). The purpose of a will being made out to specified heirs is that they may receive that benefit without fail. None would contend that there is danger that all that the Father bequeathed to Christ will not be delivered; nor should it be intimated that a "joint-heir" will fail of his portion. The revealed truth that God bequeaths His riches to His "joint-heirs with Christ" means that they are to receive this benefit, else God has failed. As Christ said, "I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am" (John 17:24), in like manner the Father has willed to His heirs all His riches in glory; and to claim that they will not receive their portion is to assume that God is defeated. There is a common sharing of interest between the Father and the Son. This is indicated by the words of Christ, "All mine are thine, and thine are mine" (John 17:10). It is thus demonstrated that, because of the truth that believers are sons and heirs of God, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."

IV. The Divine Purpose

"And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren" (vss. 28–29).

Nothing could be more fundamental or more determining in this universe than the purpose of God. Comparable to the above passage is Ephesians 1:4–12. In that context such decisive statements as the following are found: "chosen in him" (vs. 4); "having predestinated us" (vs. 5); "according to the good pleasure of his will" (vs. 5); "the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself" (vs. 9); "being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (vs. 11); the divine objective is said to be, "that we should be holy and without blame before him" (vs. 4); "to the praise of the glory of his grace" (vs. 6); "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him" (vs. 10); and, "that we should be to the praise of his glory" (vs. 12).

From these declarations, a devout person will rightfully conclude that back of all secondary causes which may be divinely arranged to co-operate in the realization of the purpose of God, there is a sovereign intention—that which actuated God in creation and continues to actuate Him in providence and preservation—and when man has divested himself of self-centered prejudice, and is moved by common reason, he will conclude that this universe belongs to God by absolute title and that He therefore has inherent rights and indisputable freedom to execute things after the counsel of His own will. In this recognition of divine authority it is also acknowledged that man is but a creature and that his highest destiny will be realized, not in opposition to God, but in complete conformity to God.

The text cited—Romans 8:28–29—states that there are those who are "called according to his purpose" (they are said to "love God" and this implies that He has revealed Himself to them), and that for them He is so undertaking that all things are working together for good in their behalf. It is the usual idea that the "all things" here mentioned are to be observed in the minute details of a believer's experience in life. Such divine care is an actuality and should be acknowledged; but the major issues which are itemized in this context lift the specific "all things" into the highest realms of divine achievement. The saved one has been foreknown, predestinated, called, justified, and glorified. Such a sequence of blessings is rightfully classed as that which is "good."

There is no real occasion for reopening at this point the discussion of the relation that exists between divine foreknowledge and divine predestination. The Arminian contends that God predestinates only what He foreknown; the Calvinist contends that God foreknows because He predestinates, that is, the Calvinist believes that nothing could be foreknown as certain unless God had made it certain by predestination or foreordination. Attempts to arrange these great divine operations into a sequence are doomed to fail, since they are not independent but interdependent actions of the divine will. God could neither foreknow what He had not predetermined, nor could He predetermine what He did not foreknow.

This portion of Scripture points out the truth that certain persons are called according to the purpose of God and are the objects of both His foreknowledge and predestination. Upon this foundation the context goes on to declare that those thus designated will reach the destiny divinely

purposed. God is causing everything to work together to that end. Should they fail to reach this end, on the human side the issue would be comparatively small; but on the divine side the issue would be as great as the failure of God the Creator. It will not do to conclude, as Arminians do, that God has left the whole matter of His sovereign purpose, as it applies to an elect company, to their own determination. He needs no alibi in case of failure, since there will be no failure. Pious men have never challenged Deity more violently than when they have implied that the realization of His sovereign purpose must be conditioned by secondary causes. God thus degraded and dishonored becomes, in the mind of men, no God at all. It still stands true, though all men stagger in unbelief (Rom. 4:20), that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."

V. The Execution of the Divine Purpose

"Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth" (vss. 30–33).

It is certain that, in the vast range of creation, God has manifold purposes and there will be no question raised about whether His will is done in other spheres. It is only within the restricted realm of certain human beings that doubt is engendered relative to the sovereignty of God; and it is significant that such doubt springs from men and not from God. His Word may be taken as the declaration of what He deems to be true, and He asserts His own sovereignty with no condition or qualification. After all, the opinions of men, who are steeped in self-exalting prejudice and afflicted with satanic independence of God, are of no actual value. The entire theme of predestination is outside the human horizon. In the verses cited above, the Holy Spirit, the divine Author, asserts that precisely what God purposes He brings to glorious fruition. By specific steps and by wholly adequate means God realizes what He purposes. Whom He predestinates, He calls; whom He calls, He justifies; and whom He justifies, He glorifies. These are among the things which "work together for good" to those who are the called

according to His purpose. Much has been written earlier regarding the divine call, which call not only invites with a gospel appeal, but inclines the mind and heart of the one called to accept divine grace. Here the human will—a secondary cause—is recognized. The will of man is guided by what he knows and what he desires. The divine method of reaching the will is by increasing man's knowledge and by stimulating his desires, while on the divine side of this method there remains not the shadow of possible failure. The end is as certain as any eternal reality in God. On the human side, man is conscious of doing only what he actually does: he chooses as an act of his own volition to receive the grace God offers in Christ Jesus. It is a problem to the mind of man how God can predetermine and realize the eternal salvation of a precise number which no human being has ever counted, and guarantee that not one will fail, and yet each one of that company is allowed the free exercise of his own will, and could, if he so determined, reject every offer of divine grace. By persuasion and enlightenment God realizes His purpose to the point of infinite completeness; yet no human will has been coerced, nor will one ever be. God's call is *efficacious*, for all who are called are justified and glorified.

All that enters into the problem of qualifying a sinner for heaven's holy associations is perfected in justification, it being the consummation of all that enters into salvation both as a dealing with demerit and as a provision of infinite merit before God—the very merit of Christ. As a divine undertaking, justification, which is secured without reference to any human cause (Rom. 3:24), incorporates, as essential to it, not only the value of the death and resurrection of Christ, but every step that enters into divine salvation by grace. Indeed, it is the very scope of that which justification incorporates that leads the Apostle to declare, as he does in verses 31 and 32, that God is "for us." This is a marvelous truth and His attitude of love is demonstrated by the fact that He did not spare the supreme gift of His Son, but delivered Him up for us all. Having given the supreme Gift, all else will easily and naturally be included. God gives unqualified assurance that He justifies all whom He predestinates and He bases that justification on the death and resurrection of Christ, which basis renders it at once a divine act altogether righteous in itself—even to the point of infinity. Little wonder that the Spirit's answer to His own question "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" is, "It is God that justifieth." That is, the very thing

which would serve as a charge against the believer has been so dealt with already, that there can be no charge recognized. From the standpoint of infinite holiness, it is no slight achievement for God to justify eternally an ungodly enemy who himself does no more than to believe in Jesus, and to do this in such a manner as to shield the One who justifies from every complication which mere leniency with sin and unworthiness would engender. This is not a human disagreement where one believer is charging another with evil; it is an issue of far greater proportions. It is God who is challenged to take account of the sin of His elect. The Arminian contends that God must judge and condemn the one He has saved if there is ought to charge against him. Over against this notion, which notion seems never to have comprehended the workings of divine grace, is the clear assertion that God has already justified the one who has given full proof of his election by believing on Christ, and this in spite of not just one evil alone being charged against him, but in spite of every sin—past, present, and future.

It remains true—regardless of human doubt, misunderstanding, and blindness—that the purpose of God for His elect is executed on a basis so righteous and reaching to such a degree of infinite perfection, that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."

VI. Christ's Own Achievement

"Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (vs. 34).

Since extended treatment of the four aspects of Christ's undertaking in behalf of the believer, as set forth in this verse, has been essayed in the previous chapter, the truth which the text presents need only be referred to here. By His substitutionary death, Christ has borne the condemnation of the sin of those to whom the value of His death has been applied in response to saving faith. Because of the value of His death having been applied, no condemnation can return upon that one. The resurrection of Christ has provided the gift of eternal, resurrection life that cannot die. The appearing of Christ as Advocate in the court of heaven in behalf of the sinning Christian guarantees that the very place where insecurity might find entrance the Lord Himself so advocates before the Father, by presenting the

fact of His own sufficient sacrifice for that sin, as to preserve the one who sins on a basis so indisputable that the Advocate wins the title, “Jesus Christ the righteous.” And, lastly, the Savior intercedes and by His intercession is able to save to completion all that come unto God by Himself (Heb. 7:25).

Any one of these four achievements of the Son of God is sufficient to answer the Arminian contention and, as set forth in the New Testament, they are intended to serve as a ground for the believer’s safekeeping for all eternity. It therefore follows that the primary declaration of the eighth chapter of Romans, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” is altogether true and is completely provided for by the Savior Himself.

VII. The Incompetency of Celestial and Mundane Things

“Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (vss. 35–39).

Thus far, arguments sustaining the doctrine of eternal security, as drawn from the Scriptures, have been based on those infinite resources which the Persons of the Godhead guarantee. This, the closing portion of Romans 8, approaches the fact of security from the negative side— setting aside that which other forces, both heavenly and mundane, effect. As for the first category, which enumerates mundane things (vs. 35), they are ordained for the believer’s experience in the world and over them, by divine enablement, he is to be victor. By the authority of God, the believer is to recognize the force of these things and to prevail in spite of them. As for the second category, which is of celestial realities (vss. 38–39), the Apostle can say, “I am persuaded” that these shall not “be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” This phrase, “I am persuaded,” is distinctive, being used but twice by the Apostle Paul, and but three times in the Sacred Text (A.V.); and in two of these instances—Romans 8:38; 2

Timothy 1:12—reference is made directly to the security of the child of God. In the present instance—Romans 8:38—he includes all believers; in the second—2 Timothy 1:12—he gives a personal testimony, and in these words: “For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.” It is no small distinction and encouragement to the one who believes that the true child of God is eternally safe, that he, in this particular, is in complete harmony with the great Apostle; especially is this true in the light of the fact that the Apostle’s statement is given by inspiration. On the other hand, it is no small discredit and delinquency on the part of the one who denies the doctrine of eternal security that he, in attempting to maintain his contention, must impugn the inspired testimony of the one who above all men has been selected of God to receive and to transmit this very gospel of divine grace. Regardless of avowed sincerity, Arminians are not Pauline in their essential theology. To them the doctrinal hesitations of one leading Arminian are more worthy of adoption and promotion than are the unqualified, inspired teachings of the Apostle Paul. This attitude of unbelief is exhibited by the Arminians in their treatment—usually a dire neglect—of all unqualified New Testament declarations on the truth respecting security, and none more commonly than their treatment of Christ’s words as recorded in John 10:28–29. In this context the Savior declares, “And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand.” It is the Arminian gloss or evasion to say that no power can “pluck” the believer out of the hand of Christ or of the Father, except the believer himself, who, it is asserted, is able, because of the sovereignty of the human will, to remove himself from that security. The Lord seemed to anticipate such evidence of distress on the part of those who would “wrest the Scriptures unto their own destruction,” and purposely inserted one phrase, namely, “and they shall never perish,” which Arminians fail to receive at its face value.

It is to be observed that of all things celestial and mundane which the Apostle enumerates as forces which are potent in their spheres, yet impotent to cast as much as a shadow of doubt over the great truth of the believer’s security, no mention is made of two subjects—the human will and human

sin—which are the points of danger according to Arminian theology. With no consideration of the scope of the argument of this great chapter, the Arminian may suppose, contrary to fact, that the two features—the will and sin—are omitted from these categories because the Apostle believed that they do have power to separate the Christian from Christ. It will be discovered, rather, that these two factors are omitted because of the truth that they have been accounted for in earlier portions of this context. The human will has been brought into harmony with the divine purpose by the effectual call (vs. 30), and the Son of God by His intercession guards the believer from pitfalls and by His advocacy preserves from condemnation in case of actual evil. So, also, the Christian's sin has been judged by Christ in His substitutionary death and thus, like the issue of the will, having been disposed of earlier in the argument of the chapter, these subjects are not included in this closing category.

It therefore stands that the unqualified assertion that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" is true, being sustained by at least seven major proofs, and the proof which concludes the seven is to the effect that all potent forces celestial or terrestrial are not able to separate the child of God from "the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord"—a love set eternally free to realize its every desire toward meritless sinners, and on the ground of the redemption which is in Christ.

Conclusion

It is here dogmatically asserted, and on the basis of proofs from the Word of God which have been presented in this volume, that there is no Scripture which, when rightly interpreted, will even intimate that a Christian might be lost; that there is no salvation now offered to the unsaved which is not eternal in its nature; that no soul once saved has ever been lost again; and that the New Testament declares in terms both multiplied and unqualified that the believer, though he may be subject to correction and chastisement, is eternally safe from all condemnation.

"Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:6).

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope

by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Pet. 1:3–5).

Chapter XVIII

Deliverance from the Reigning Power of Sin and Human Limitations

I. Deliverance from the Power of Sin

Continuing the contemplation of the seven aspects of salvation, this, the fifth, has to do with God's provisions for the believer's triumph in his daily conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil. Some anticipation of this general theme has been incorporated into earlier discussions which enter into this book, and the theme must reappear for a more exhaustive treatment both in Ecclesiology and in Pneumatology. Though practically unknown to courses and works dealing with Systematic Theology, that part of salvation which secures deliverance from the threefold source of evil—assigned to the present chapter— and that part of salvation which secures ability to rise to a God-honoring state of mind and heart and to the realization of every divinely appointed good work—assigned to the latter half of this same chapter—are requisite to any complete comprehension of all that God accomplishes in His sovereign purpose to "bring many sons unto glory." The problem of the daily life of the believer is vital from various points of consideration, and none more important than that which relates it to the security of the believer. The shallow appraisal which the Arminian system places on that which constitutes salvation leads its advocates to estimate a saved person, though forgiven the sins committed before he was saved, to be himself in no way changed into a new creation, indwelt by the Holy Spirit, or subject to new ideals by which he may live to the glory of God. Were these great provisions recognized and incorporated into that system, its promoters could evince a more comprehensive understanding of all that enters into the relation which the believer's daily life and conduct sustain to his perfect salvation and eternal security in Christ. It is well to remember that God foreknows every situation that will arise in any believer's life. No sin is a surprise to God, and yet He does not hesitate to save those He knows will not be perfect in their walk before Him. Foreseeing what will beset the Christian, He provides not only that he shall not be condemned

because of sin, but that he may claim supernatural power through the indwelling Spirit to defeat every foe. This provision of power means much as an undergirding to the doctrine of security, and as assurance that God does not condone sin, nor does He fail in any plan or purpose. The greatest importance must be assigned to the fact that God undertakes for the Christian in the sphere of his state, or daily life, as He undertakes for the Christian in the sphere of his standing, or perfect acceptance, forever in Christ.

Having secured for the believer a perfect union with Christ, a perfect standing, and a perfect acceptance in Christ, and on a ground of such infinite equity that God remains just when He justifies the ungodly, there remains only the problem of communion, fellowship, and a walk which is well-pleasing to God. As a son may be in fellowship or out of fellowship with his earthly father without affecting the immutable fact of sonship, in like manner the child of God may be in fellowship and communion or out of fellowship and communion with his heavenly Father without disturbing the immutable fact of a sonship relation to God. Sonship does not stand alone in the field of immutable realities which are brought into existence by the power of God and based on the merit of Christ. All these, based on the merit of Christ, are independent of the issues which enter into a believer's daily life, as important as that life may be in its own sphere. As before stated, any normal person might devise a plan by which sinlessly perfect individuals might go to heaven, and, in such a plan, there would be no need for Christ to die. It is a far different thing to get fallen men with all their sinfulness into heaven. Only God can devise such an arrangement. This He has done, and in that arrangement which God has devised He has provided a perfect sacrifice for sin and a perfect standing for the one who believes. Having accomplished all this to a degree that answers the demands of His own holiness, it becomes no vain assumption on His part when He declares the Christian to be saved and safe in Christ forever. The Calvinist recognizes this truth, believes it, and proclaims it with all due consideration of the wholly different and independent plan of God by which the believer may be enabled to walk worthy of his perfect standing in Christ. On the other hand, Arminians have always evinced a reprehensible blindness—not unlike that of unregenerate men—concerning these so vital distinctions. Arminianism's misleading error in the field of Soteriology is that it persists

in attempting to build the believer's standing upon his feeble and faltering daily life, rather than on the sufficient and immutable merit of Christ. The Arminian Soteriology becomes little more than a system of human conduct; for, though the idea of regeneration is incorporated, it is, in the Arminian idea of it, of no abiding value, being supported only by a supposed human virtue.

In attempting to present at this point the issues of the Christian's daily life, it is with the understanding that these issues, however weighty and consequential they are deemed to be, are divinely dealt with upon a separate basis which is wholly independent of that perfect arrangement by which the believer is both saved by Christ and eternally safe in Christ.

It is generally recognized that the Christian faces three opposing forces which are sources of evil—the *cosmos* world, the flesh, and the devil—and that, when he was in his unregenerate state, these forces were in no way arrayed against him; for he was then a part of the *cosmos* world, restricted in his being to the flesh, and under the dominion of Satan. Conscience and social ideals may have made their feeble demands upon him, but he knew little, if anything, of the unceasing conflict which besets the child of God. In other words, the believer in his problem of daily life, because of new foes and new standards of holy living which rightfully impose their claim upon him, is far less able to live the life set before him than he was able to live with more or less virtue in the sphere of the unregenerate man. It follows, then, that if the believer must sustain his salvation by a correct manner of life, as the Arminian contends, he, because of impossible heavenly demands and because of supernatural foes, is unconditionally defeated before ever he begins. The Arminian's preaching of his ideals has been tolerated only because of an inability, if not an unwillingness on his part, to face the stupendous issues involved. It sounds practical, simple, and it ministers to the inherent conceit of man, to propose a salvation which endures on the basis of human merit. In such a scheme there is little need of the sustaining grace of God. He may be called in to forgive wherein man has failed in his self-saving program. As water seeks its level, Arminianism, in its modern form, has departed from its original claim to orthodox truth and for the reason, among others, that the defenders of that system have never relied upon supernatural forces in the realization of their soteriological scheme.

Since the Christian's three foes—the world, the flesh, and the devil—have been considered at length in Volume II of this work and are yet to reappear on later pages, only a brief mention of these foes will be entered here. However, their true character must not be suppressed else the understanding of the true character of divine salvation from these foes, which salvation is the immediate objective in the present volume, will have no sufficient background of reality.

1. THE WORLD. Of the four Greek roots—αἰών, οἰκουμένη, γῆ, and κόσμος—which in the Authorized Version are translated *world*, only the last-named is set forth as in conflict with the believer. A study of the 187 uses of this word in the New Testament, as already pointed out, discloses the truth that the *cosmos* is a vast system and order over which Satan is the prince (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11), and into which all unregenerate humanity is federated with its educational and entertainment programs, its governments, its jealousies, its araments, and its warfare. Out of this *world* the believer when saved is rescued (Col. 1:13; John 15:19; 1 John 5:19), and from it he is to be preserved, though he, as a witness to it, must remain in it. Its standardization of human life to its own ideals, its allurements, its control of the necessities of life, the protection it affords in its governments, its ridicule of true piety, and its misconceptions constitute the *cosmos* a most complex, subtle, and formidable foe of the child of God. He can maintain his twofold relation to the *cosmos*—a dweller in it and a witness to it—only by supernatural power. The word of Christ, "In the world [*cosmos*] ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (*cosmos*—John 16:33), is freighted with deep meaning—too deep, indeed, for human comprehension. Since Christ by His death has overcome the *cosmos*, it is declared of the believer that he, too, has overcome the *cosmos*. In 1 John 5:4–5 it is written, "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Too often this passage has been taken as an exhortation to the Christian to overcome the *cosmos;* but, plainly, it is here declared that, having believed, the child of God has, by his new relation to Christ, overcome the *cosmos*. In a primary sense, the believer partakes of all that Christ is and of what He has done. It would be impossible to be in Christ

and not be outside the *cosmos*. Nevertheless, while all this is true with reference to position, yet the Christian must claim an experimental victory in his daily life over the appeal which the *cosmos* is ever making to him. Of surpassing import, however, is the truth that, in the reckoning of the Spirit on whom the believer must depend for his daily deliverance, the *cosmos* is judicially overcome already. The truth that Christ has overcome the *cosmos* and that the believer partakes of that reality from the moment he is saved is the sufficient legal ground upon which the believer may, by the Spirit, be preserved from the *cosmos* though remaining here as a witness to it.

2. The Flesh. When approaching this theme, distinction must be drawn between σῶμα and σάρξ. The former represents the physical body while the latter, though sometimes used of the physical body, represents a living reality which includes in it a fallen nature with all its inherent forces and relationships—a fallen nature which knows no eradication, but continues with the believer as long as he is in the world and which is overcome only by a ceaseless appropriation of the power of the indwelling Spirit. It is written that, if in dependence upon the Spirit the believer is walking, he will not fulfill the lust of the flesh (Gal. 5:16). Nevertheless, there must be a legal ground upon which the Holy Spirit may control the flesh with its Adamic nature. It is written that, to this end, Christ died as a judgment of the old nature (Rom. 6:1–10) and the flesh (Rom. 8:3). This judgment of the flesh by Christ did not put the flesh to death; it rather provided a legal, righteous ground upon which the Spirit of God serves as Deliverer. This, again, the truth that the believer may be saved from the reigning power of sin on the principle of faith, is emphasized. God is thus undertaking for the believer in his daily life, and none can doubt that God has a definite purpose to capacitate in the sphere of his walk that one He has saved with an eternal salvation. No manner of walk, however perfect, will even tend to preserve the child of God. He is secure by another provision altogether, namely, his place in the resurrected Christ. In the matter of a consistent life, which glorifies the One who saves him, the believer may claim all the supernatural power of the indwelling Spirit.

3. The Devil. The Christian’s conflict with Satan and his need of supernatural deliverance from that foe is widely published in the New

Testament. The student who is pursuing these pages in order, will have read many previous pages on this specific theme. That which calls for restatement in the present chapter is the twofold fact that Satan was judged by Christ in His death, and that there is deliverance from Satan's power which is made possible by the indwelling Spirit. That there is a conflict with Satan need not be argued. One passage out of many will serve to recognize this truth: "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:12, R.V.). The judgment of Satan is announced in various portions of the New Testament. It is written: "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:11); "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (Col. 2:14–15). Like a criminal who has been sentenced to die and awaits the day of his execution, so Satan is already judged and awaits the day of the administration of his sentence. The truth that there is complete deliverance from Satan's power is taught in the clearest terms: "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil" (Eph. 6:10–11); "Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4). This order of truth must not be overlooked, namely, that it is possible for the Holy Spirit to defend the believer and deliver him from Satan's power on the ground of the fact that Satan has been judged by Christ in His death. Though judged, Satan is a living, mighty power and is to be resisted by the believer's steadfast faith (1 Pet. 5:8–9).

Conclusion

Thus it is disclosed that with respect to every sin or disposition which is contrary to God, the believer is directed to find deliverance or salvation from it by the power of the indwelling Spirit, who acts in perfect freedom because of the specific judgments wrought by Christ on the cross against

the world, the flesh, and the devil. Such a deliverance is a form of salvation and takes its place in the entire saving work of God.

The truth respecting the consequence of the Christian's sin is yet again declared. It is to be noted that God anticipates sin in the believer. This fact does not make Him the author of it; it only reveals that His own plan does not contemplate and expect sinless perfection on the part of those whom He saves and keeps. The marvel never lessens in the mind of devout believers, that God's plan incorporates a way whereby imperfect saints are to be taken into heaven's glory. The divine anticipation of the Christian's sin is seen in the provision for it. It is written in 1 John 1:6–9 that the believer's sin may be cured, in its effect upon himself, by the confession of it to God. This is not another regeneration. The child of God is still in union, though not in communion, with God when he sins. The unsaved are saved by believing and the saved are forgiven and cleansed by confessing. In neither case is there any penal judgment laid on the one who has sinned. It could not be, since it has been laid upon the Substitute.

It therefore remains true that God not only provides a way whereby the believer may be kept from sinning, but He also provides a way whereby the believer may be preserved as His child and returned to fellowship with Himself when he has sinned.

II. Salvation from Human Limitations

To be delivered from evil to the end that God may be honored, who is the Savior of those who believe, is not the complete realization of the divine ideal. Added to such deliverance is the necessity for the child of God to become *empowered* unto every good work, such as is foreordained (Eph. 2:10), and such as becomes those who are saved and appointed to the high task of representing God in this *cosmos* world. As has been amplified thus far in the chapter, Christians are enjoined to avoid evil and, should it intrude, must be saved from it. As it is written: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a

peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:11–14). Salvation which is of God's grace is "not of works." It could never be brought into being by human works. It is a work of God; yet it is "unto good works," and these are possible only as one is created anew in Christ Jesus and provided with supernatural efficacy. The extensive body of truth which sets forth the Spirit's energizing ministry unto a God-honoring life and service will be traced but briefly at this point.

1. The Spirit Produces Christian Character. The *cosmos* world has its scheme of "character building." Too often this is not character at all, but only reputation. It is always the product of human effort and, naturally, results in human glory. Over against this is the divine plan for Christian character which consists in those realities which are wrought in the heart by the indwelling Spirit. Such a character is best described by nine words which represent the "fruit of the Spirit." "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith [faithfulness], meekness, temperance" (self-control— Gal. 5:22–23; cf. R.V.). These nine graces are not only declared to be the direct production of the Spirit in and through the believer, but they are held, in this context, to be over against, or in contrast to, the works of the flesh. These fleshly works are enumerated in verses 19–21. Every word in the list which represents the fruit of the Spirit indicates a divine characteristic which is generated directly by the indwelling Spirit. This exhibit of the Spirit is the normal experience of the child of God, and will be his portion unless impediments are allowed to assert themselves in the believer's way of life before God.

2. The Spirit Empowers Unto Christian Service. This aspect of the Spirit's work in the Christian introduces at once the doctrine of gifts energized by the Spirit. A gift in the New Testament sense of the word is something which the Spirit does, and uses the believer to do it. It is not at all a human effort aided by the Spirit. It is said to be a "manifestation of the Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:7). So, also, to every believer some gift is appointed; that is, he is appointed to a specific task and empowered to accomplish it. If this divine provision is not realized, it is due, again, to some want of adjustment. It is also said that there are diversities of gifts, though, in every instance, they are wrought by the selfsame Spirit. The important Scripture bearing on

this theme is as follows: “Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will” (1 Cor. 12:4–11; cf. Rom. 12:3–8; Eph. 4:11; 1 Pet. 4:10–11).

To these realities which are generated in the believer’s life by the Spirit —the fruit of the Spirit and gifts by the Spirit—may be added the revelation that the Spirit teaches the Word of God to the believer (John 16:12–15; 1 Cor. 2:9–3:1; 1 John 2:27); He inspires praise and thanksgiving (Eph. 5:19–20); He leads the child of God (Rom. 8:14; Gal. 5:18); He actuates what has been taken by faith (Rom. 8:16); and He makes intercession in and for the Christian (Rom. 8:26–27).

Conclusion

By this greatly restricted treatment of the Spirit’s work in empowering the child of God unto a holy character and service, which becomes the one who is perfected in Christ, it is again seen that God does undertake in the sphere of the believer’s daily life, and, apart from the notion that these exhibitions of the Spirit will add anything to the believer’s perfect standing in Christ, it is observable that it is the divine intent that the saved one shall be delivered from weakness and limitations, which dishonor God and cause the Christian to fail to adorn the doctrine which he professes.

Chapter XIX

THE BELIEVER PRESENTED FAULTLESS THE CONSUMMATING EXPERIENCE FOR THE SINNER WHOM GOD SAVES IS HIS PRESENTATION IN GLORY. OF THIS THE APOSTLE WRITES: "NOW UNTO HIM THAT IS ABLE TO KEEP YOU FROM FALLING, AND TO PRESENT YOU FAULTLESS BEFORE THE PRESENCE OF HIS GLORY WITH EXCEEDING JOY" (JUDE 1:24). IN THIS PASSAGE, THE WORD "FALLING" IS BETTER TRANSLATED "STUMBLING" (R.V.), AND IT SHOULD BE OBSERVED THAT THE "EXCEEDING JOY" IS THAT OF THE ONE WHO CONCEIVES, CONSTRUCTS, AND CONSUMMATES THE WHOLE UNDERTAKING. THE ENTIRE ENTERPRISE IS STRICTLY HIS OWN. SIMILARLY, WHEN WRITING TO THE CORINTHIAN BELIEVERS, THE APOSTLE PAUL DECLARED WHAT IS TRUE OF ALL BELIEVERS —THE BODY AND BRIDE OF CHRIST—"FOR I AM JEALOUS OVER YOU WITH GODLY JEALOUSY: FOR I HAVE ESPOUSED YOU TO ONE HUSBAND, THAT I MAY PRESENT *YOU AS* A CHASTE VIRGIN TO CHRIST" (2 COR. 11:2). HERE

AGAIN THE FORCE OF THE TEXT IS DISCOVERED WHEN THE ITALICIZED WORDS "YOU AS" ARE OMITTED; FOR THE APOSTLE DID NOT DESIRE MERELY TO PRESENT BELIEVERS *AS* A CHASTE VIRGIN, BUT HIS PURPOSE WAS RATHER TO PRESENT A CHASTE VIRGIN TO CHRIST. IN LIKE MANNER, IT WAS THE SUPREME DESIRE OF CHRIST IN HIS SACRIFICIAL DEATH, THAT HE MIGHT CLAIM A PERFECTED BRIDE. OF THIS IT IS REVEALED: "HUSBANDS, LOVE YOUR WIVES, EVEN AS CHRIST ALSO LOVED THE CHURCH, AND GAVE HIMSELF FOR IT; THAT HE MIGHT SANCTIFY AND CLEANSE IT WITH THE WASHING OF WATER BY THE WORD, THAT HE MIGHT PRESENT IT TO HIMSELF A GLORIOUS CHURCH, NOT HAVING SPOT, OR WRINKLE, OR ANY SUCH THING; BUT THAT IT SHOULD BE HOLY AND WITHOUT BLEMISH" (EPH. 5:25–27).

The truth that the believer will be presented faultless before the presence of God's glory is unfolded in the New Testament with magnificent detail. The changes to be wrought are incomprehensible; but, in all, they indicate that the transformation, so extended, is calculated to obliterate almost every vestige of those elements which together constitute humanity in its present existence. To be reconstructed until completely adapted to, and meet for, the celestial sphere, is an exalted distinction which is guaranteed by infinite

competency and sustained by sovereign intention. This is the portion of every believer, not varied according to degrees of human merit; for it is the standardized divine achievement in behalf of all who believe.

Some of the changes which enter into this immeasurable transformation, a portion of which is already incorporated into the believer’s present estate, are listed here: I. Heavenly Citizenship

The fact that heavenly citizenship begins in this life and at the moment one believes does not alter the abiding character of it, though so great a development from the present order to that which is to follow must ensue. Though that citizenship is now possessed with respect to the right and title, it is, nevertheless, unoccupied and therefore unexperienced. Immeasurable advantage and ascendency await tenure of that exalted estate.

II. A New Fraternity

This feature of coming felicity comprehends a vast field of eternal realities. It begins with the new birth into actual and legitimate sonship to God, which, in turn, engenders the whole compass of the family and household relationship. Not only sonship to God is wrought, but noble kinship to all the saints of all the ages, and, apparently, to all the unfallen heavenly hosts. These ties are perfectly established while in this world, yet the larger, joyous experience of them awaits the gathering together of all who are Christ’s with Him in glory.

III. A Standing Perfected Forever A perfect standing in Christ is not only begun in this life, but its incalculable value is to be demonstrated and experienced throughout eternity. Little can the human mind grasp the oncoming restfulness and blessedness of the consciousness that the standing is secured, and qualities instituted and divinely approved which are properly required in the sphere of infinite holiness and purity. As conceived by the poet Thomas Binney (1826): Eternal Light! Eternal Light!

How pure the soul must be,
When placed within Thy searching sight, It shrinks not, but, with calm delight, Can live, and look on Thee!
O! how shall I, whose native sphere Is dark, whose mind is dim, Before the Ineffable appear, And on my naked spirit bear That uncreated beam?

There is a way for man to rise To that sublime abode:— An offering and a sacrifice, A Holy Spirit's energies,
An Advocate with God:—
These, these prepare us for the sight Of Holiness above:
The sons of ignorance and night May dwell in the Eternal Light, Through the eternal Love!

IV. A Renewed Body

But little can be anticipated of the coming zest, satisfaction, and comfort of a renewed body which will be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21). A wide distinction is to be observed between the *possession* of eternal life and the experience of it which is yet to be. The present experience of human life in a death-doomed body is little to be compared to the experience of eternal life in a renewed body that corresponds to Christ's resurrection body—that which, to the point of infinity, is suited to the eternal needs of the Second Person of the Godhead. In describing this stupendous change, the Apostle declares (1 Cor. 15:42–57) that this body of corruption will put on incorruption, this body of mortality will put on immortality, this body of "dishonour" will put on glory, this body of weakness will put on inconceivable power, this body which is "natural"—adapted to the soul—will become a spiritual body—adapted to the spirit.

V. Freedom from the Sin Nature Again all human powers of anticipation are wholly inadequate. So embedded in the very structure of the present existence is the sin nature with all its unholy demands and its contrariness to the indwelling Spirit (Gal. 5:17), that no imagination can forecast the hour of release to describe it.

VI. To Be Like Christ

If the believer's destiny were not so clearly asserted, it could not be believed by any in this world. The testimony of the Scriptures, however, cannot be diminished: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28); "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. 15:49); "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1

John 3:2). Though these statements seem to reach far beyond the range of possible things, this exalted destiny comports with that which is required in the very purpose of God. It will be remembered that salvation is wrought to the end that the grace of God may be revealed. God's grace is infinite and therefore requires that the undertakings which measure that grace shall extend into infinite realms. Likewise, salvation is wrought to satisfy the infinite love of God, and, in the satisfying of that love, God must do His utmost for the objects of His affection—for whom He is free to act at all. Conformity to the image of Christ is the supreme reality in the universe, and divine love can be content with nothing less as the measure of its achievement. In general, the likeness to Christ includes all other features indicated in this listing of heavenly realities.

VII. To Share in Christ's Glory **Precisely what Christ comprehended when He prayed, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me" (John 17:24), finite minds could not know in this world. So, likewise, the title deed recorded in John 17:22, "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them," cannot be broken. Consequently, it is written: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor. 3:18); "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" (4:17); "It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power" (1 Cor. 15:43); "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4); "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings" (Heb. 2:10); "But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a**

while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you" (1 Pet. 5:10). Added to this is the glory which is the result of cosuffering with Christ—the reward for the burden the believer may experience for lost souls: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:18); "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him" (2 Tim. 2:12).

By all this it will be seen that the salvation of a soul, as purposed by God, contemplates the fruition of that purpose. Whom He predestinates, He glorifies, and "He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:6). Failure is impossible with God. Because of this, the New Testament writers are exceedingly bold in declaring the certainty of coming glory for everyone who believes. That no intimation of possible failure is mentioned, is due to the truth that the end is as certain as the ability of infinity to achieve it. Arminians are casting doubts upon God's supreme ability to bring to pass that which He has determined, and upon the truthfulness and dependable character of the words which record the divine purpose and competency; but such efforts to weaken the testimony of God respecting Himself cannot avail. Note the words of Balaam respecting Israel—the people of God's earthly election: "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good? Behold, I have received commandment to bless: and he hath blessed; and I cannot reverse it. He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel: the LORD his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them. God brought them out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn. Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel: according to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What hath God wrought!" (Num. 23:19–23). Of Jehovah's attitude toward this elect people it is said: "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). If it is possible that, because of sovereign election, God will never change His purpose toward the earthly people and see no "iniquity in Jacob" nor any "perverseness in Israel," if He will never repent regarding any gift or calling of that nation, is it deemed an impossibility that He is able to preserve the

Body and Bride of His Son for whom it is said that Christ died in a most specific sense (Eph. 5:25–27)?

Conclusion

In reviewing this extended thesis which has aimed to present the seven aspects of the saving work of God, it will be seen that salvation is of Jehovah, whether it be in the sphere of the finished work, the enlightening work, the saving work, the keeping work, or the presenting work. In every respect and in every step of its majestic progress it is a work of God alone —a work which is wrought in spite of the sin of those whom He saves and in spite of any hazard which the will of man might engender. God is sovereign over all and is both free and able to realize all that He has purposed to do.

As before observed, the salvation of a sinner is, so far as revelation discloses, the sole exercise of one of God's most conspicuous attributes, namely, His grace. Not only must salvation provide an adequate scope for the exercise of this attribute—measuring its amplitude completely— but it must satisfy God to an infinite degree. As for the amplitude, the divine undertaking begins with that which is perfectly lost. On this subject, humanity could have no worthy opinions. To them, at worst, man is in need of much divine consideration. They cannot approach in thought the unfathomable reality of the lost and doomed estate of man. Such words as are written down in Romans 3:9–19 are seldom accepted by men at their intended meaning. To be lost is to be utterly condemned of God, to be joined to Satan, and to be consigned along with Satan to the lake of fire. Such a judgment is not pronounced over some trivial failure of men. The very fact that the uttermost judgment must be meted out upon him discloses in unmistakable terms the depth of meaning which God assigns to man's lost estate. Over against this, salvation lifts the saved one to the heights of heaven—with reference to eternal abode —and transforms that one into the image of Christ. To have made any being like Christ is the most consequential undertaking in the universe. It represents the limit to which even infinity may go. It is this distance between the abysmal depths of the lost estate and conformity to Christ in heaven, which not only exercises the divine attribute of grace, but measures it completely. As for the divine

satisfaction, reason alone dictates that, since God cannot fail of any purpose, His measurements of His grace in the salvation of a soul will satisfy Him to infinity. So completely is the demonstration of grace set forth in each saved individual that, were but one saved thus by grace, that one would answer entirely the divine expectation and serve as a conclusive display before all intelligences of the exceeding, superabounding grace of God; not of works, lest any man should boast.

It were enough for God to disclose the fact that He intends to bring many sons into glory; but He is not satisfied with a limited revelation. He, rather, honors men by spreading before them for their wonder and delight the steps which He takes and the righteous ground upon which all that He undertakes is accomplished. It is in the sphere of eternal realities to be wrought by unrestrained, infinite ability; and the devout mind, having taken cognizance of these facts, may well hesitate to deny to God the authority, power, and the freedom through Christ, to do all His adorable and holy will. The prayer of the Apostle is in order: “That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come” (Eph. 1:17–21).

My hope is built on nothing less Than Jesus’ blood and righteousness; I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus’ Name.
On Christ, the solid Rock, I stand; All other ground is sinking sand.

The Terms of Salvation

Chapter XX

THE TERMS OF SALVATION

OUTSIDE THE DOCTRINES related to the Person and work of Christ, there is no truth more far-reaching in its implications and no fact more to be defended than that salvation in all its limitless magnitude is secured, so far as human responsibility is concerned, by believing on Christ as Savior. To this one requirement no other obligation may be added without violence to the Scriptures and total disruption of the essential doctrine of salvation by grace alone. Only ignorance or reprehensible inattention to the structure of a right Soteriology will attempt to intrude some form of human works with its supposed merit into that which, if done at all, must, by the very nature of the case, be wrought by God alone and on the principle of sovereign grace. But few, indeed, seem ever to comprehend the doctrine of sovereign grace, and it is charitable, at least, to revert to this fact as the explanation of the all-but-universal disposition to confuse the vital issues involved. It is the purpose of this section to demonstrate that the eternal glories which are wrought in sovereign grace are conditioned, on the human side, by faith alone. The practical bearing of this truth must of necessity make drastic claims upon the preacher and become a qualifying influence in the soul-winning methods which are employed. The student would do well to bring his message and his methods into complete agreement with the workings of divine grace, rather than to attempt to conform this unalterable truth to human ideals.

Salvation which is by faith begins with those mighty transformations which together constitute a Christian what he is; it guarantees the safekeeping of the Christian, and brings him home to heaven conformed to the image of Christ. The preacher or soul-winner who is able to trace through these limitless realities and to preserve them from being made to depend to any degree upon human responsibility other than saving faith in Christ, merits the high title of “a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine” (1 Tim. 4:6). A moment’s attention to the transforming divine undertakings which enter into salvation of the lost will bring one to the realization of the truth that every feature

involved presents a task which is superhuman, and, therefore, if to be accomplished at all, must be wrought by God alone. Such a discovery will prepare the mind for the reception of the truth, that the only relation man can sustain to this great undertaking is to depend utterly upon God to do it. That is the simplicity of faith. However, since moral issues are involved which have been divinely solved by Christ in His death, He has become the only qualified Savior, and saving faith is thus directed toward Him. "Whosoever believeth in him" shall not perish, but have everlasting life. But even when the supernatural character of salvation is recognized, it is possible to encumber the human responsibility with various complications, thus to render the whole grace undertaking ineffectual to a large degree. These assertions lead naturally to a detailed consideration of the more common features of human responsibility which are too often erroneously added to the one requirement of *faith* or *belief.*

I. Repent and Believe

Since repentance—conceived of as a separate act—is almost universally added to believing as a requirement on the human side for salvation, a consideration of the Biblical meaning of repentance is essential. This consideration may be traced as follows: (1) the meaning of the word, (2) the relation of repentance to believing, (3) the relation of repentance to covenant people, (4) the absence of the demand for repentance from salvation Scriptures, and (5) the significance of repentance in specific passages.

1. The Meaning of the Word. The word μετάνοια is in every instance translated *repentance.* The word means *a change of mind.* The common practice of reading into this word the thought of sorrow and heart-anguish is responsible for much confusion in the field of Soteriology. There is no reason why sorrow should not accompany repentance or lead on to repentance, but the sorrow, whatever it may be, is not repentance. In 2 Corinthians 7:10, it is said that "godly sorrow worketh repentance," that is, it leads on to repentance; but the sorrow is not to be mistaken for the change of mind which it may serve to produce. The son cited by Christ as reported in Matthew 21:28–29 who first said "I will not go," and afterward repented

and went, is a true example of the precise meaning of the word. The New Testament call to repentance is not an urge to self-condemnation, but is a call to a change of mind which promotes a change in the course being pursued. This definition of this word as it is used in the New Testament is fundamental. Little or no progress can be made in a right induction of the Word of God on this theme, unless the true and accurate meaning of the word is discovered and defended throughout.

2. The Relation of Repentance to Believing. Too often, when it is asserted—as it is here—that repentance is not to be added to belief as a separate requirement for salvation, it is assumed that by so much the claim has been set up that repentance is *not* necessary to salvation. Therefore, it is as dogmatically stated as language can declare, that repentance is essential to salvation and that none could be saved apart from repentance, but it is included in believing and could not be separated from it. The discussion is restricted at this point to the problem which the salvation of unregenerate persons develops; and it is safe to say that few errors have caused so much hindrance to the salvation of the lost than the practice of demanding of them an anguish of soul before faith in Christ can be exercised. Since such emotions cannot be produced at will, the way of salvation has thus been made impossible for all who do not experience the required anguish. This error results in another serious misdirection of the unsaved, namely, one in which they are encouraged to look inward at themselves and not away to Christ as Savior. Salvation is made to be conditioned on feelings and not on faith. Likewise, people are led by this error to measure the validity of their salvation by the intensity of anguish which preceded or accompanied it. It is in this manner that sorrow of heart becomes a most subtle form of meritorious work and to that extent a contradiction of grace. Underlying all this supposition that tears and anguish are necessary is the most serious notion that God is *not* propitious, but that He must be softened to pity by penitent grief. The Bible declares that God is propitious because of Christ's death for the very sin which causes human sorrow. There is no occasion to melt or temper the heart of God. His attitude toward sin and the sinner is a matter of revelation. To imply, as preachers have done so generally, that God must be mollified and lenified by human agony is a desperate form of unbelief. The unsaved have a gospel of good news to *believe*, which

certainly is not the mere notion that God must be coaxed into a saving attitude of mind; it is that Christ *has* died and grace is extended from one who is propitious to the point of infinity. The human heart is prone to imagine that there is some form of atonement for sin through being sorry for it. Whatever may be the place of sorrow for sin in the restoration of a Christian who has transgressed, it cannot be determined with too much emphasis that for the unsaved—Jew or Gentile—there is no occasion to propitiate God or to provide any form of satisfaction by misery or distress of soul. With glaring inconsistency, those who have preached that the unsaved must experience mental suffering before they can be saved, have completely failed to inform their hearers about how such required torture may be secured. It should be restated that, since genuine grief of mind cannot be produced at will and since many natures are void of depression of spirit, to demand that a self-produced affliction of mind shall precede salvation by faith becomes a form of fatalism and is responsible for having driven uncounted multitudes to despair. However, it is true that, from the Arminian point of view, no greater heresy could be advanced than this contention that the supposed merit of human suffering because of personal sins should be excluded from the terms on which a soul may be saved.

As before stated, repentance, which is a change of mind, is included in believing. No individual can turn to Christ from some other confidence without a change of mind, and that, it should be noted, is all the repentance a spiritually dead individual can ever effect. That change of mind is the work of the Spirit (Eph. 2:8). It will be considered, too, by those who are amenable to the Word of God, that the essential preparation of heart which the Holy Spirit accomplishes in the unsaved to prepare them for an intelligent and voluntary acceptance of Christ as Savior—as defined in John 16:8–11—is not a sorrow for sin. The unsaved who come under this divine influence are illuminated—given a clear understanding—concerning but *one* sin, namely, that “they believe not on me.”

To believe on Christ is one act, regardless of the manifold results which it secures. It is not turning from something to something; but rather turning to something from something. If this terminology seems a mere play on words, it will be discovered, by more careful investigation, that this is a vital distinction. To turn from evil may easily be a complete act in itself, since the action can be terminated at that point. To turn to Christ is a

solitary act, also, and the joining of these two separate acts corresponds to the notion that two acts—repentance and faith—are required for salvation. On the other hand, turning to Christ from all other confidences is one act, and in that one act repentance, which is a change of mind, is included. The Apostle stresses this distinction in accurate terms when he says to the Thessalonians, "Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God" (1 Thess. 1:9). This text provides no comfort for those who contend that people must first, in real contrition, turn from idols—which might terminate at that point—and afterwards, as a second and separate act, turn to God. The text recognizes but one act—"Ye turned to God from idols"—and that is an act of faith alone.

Those who stress repentance as a second requirement along with believing, inadvertently disclose that, in their conception, the problem of personal sin is all that enters into salvation. The sin nature must also be dealt with; yet that is not a legitimate subject of repentance. Salvation contemplates many vast issues and the adjustment of the issue of personal sin, though included, is but a small portion of the whole. Acts 26:18, sometimes drafted in proof of the idea that the unsaved must do various things in order to be saved, rather enumerates various things which are wrought for him in the saving power of God.

3. The Relation of Repentance to Covenant People. The term *covenant people* is broad in its application. It includes Israel, who are under Jehovah's unalterable covenants and yet are to be objects of another, new covenant (Jer. 31:31–34), and the Church, composed of all believers of the present age, who are also now the objects of that new covenant made in Christ's blood (Matt. 26:28; 1 Cor. 11:25). A covenant implies relationship because it secures a right relation to God in matters belonging within the bounds of the covenant. A covenant that is unconditional, as the above-named covenants are, is not affected by any human elements, nor is it changeable even by God Himself. However, the *fact* of a covenant and the experience of its blessings are two different things. It is possible to be under the provisions of an unconditional covenant and to fail for the time being to enjoy its blessings because of sin. When sin has cast a limitation upon the enjoyment of a covenant and the covenant, being unchangeable, still abides, the issue becomes, not the remaking of the covenant, but the one issue of

the sin which mars the relationship. It therefore follows that, for covenant people, there is a need of a divine dealing with the specific sin and a separate and unrelated repentance respecting it. This repentance is expressed by confession to God. Having confessed his sin, David did not pray for his salvation to be restored; he rather prayed for the restoration of "the joy" of his salvation (Ps. 51:12). In like manner, it is joy and fellowship which confession restores for the believer (1 John 1:3–9). When Christ came offering Himself to Israel as their Messiah and announcing their kingdom as at hand, He, with John and the apostles, called on that people to repent in preparation for the proffered kingdom. There was no appeal concerning salvation or the formation of covenants; it was restoration of the people by a change of mind which would lead them to forsake their sins (Matt. 10:6 ff.). The application of these appeals made to covenant Jews concerning their adjustments within their covenants to individual unregenerate Gentiles, who are "strangers from the covenants" (Eph. 2:12), is a serious error indeed. In like manner, a Christian may repent as a separate act (2 Cor. 7:8–10). The conclusion of the matter is that, while covenant people are appointed to national or personal adjustment to God by repentance as a separate act, there is no basis either in reason or revelation for the demand to be made that an unregenerate person in this age must add a covenant person's repentance to faith in order to be saved.

4. The Absence of the Demand for Repentance from Salvation Scriptures. Upwards of 115 New Testament passages condition salvation on *believing*, and fully 35 passages condition salvation on *faith*, which latter word in this use of it is an exact synonym of the former. These portions of Scripture, totaling about 150 in all, include practically all that the New Testament declares on the matter of the human responsibility in salvation; yet each one of these texts omits any reference to repentance as a separate act. This fact, easily verified, cannot but bear enormous weight with any candid mind. In like manner, the Gospel by John, which is written to present Christ as the object of faith unto eternal life, does not once employ the word *repentance*. Similarly, the Epistle to the Romans, which is the complete analysis of all that enters into the whole plan of salvation by grace, does not use the word *repentance* in connection with the saving of a soul, except in 2:4 where repentance is equivalent to salvation itself. When

the Apostle Paul and his companion, Silas, made reply to the jailer concerning what he should do to be saved, they said, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved” (Acts 16:31). This reply, it is evident, fails to recognize the necessity of repentance in addition to believing. From this overwhelming mass of irrefutable evidence, it is clear that the New Testament does not impose repentance upon the unsaved as a condition of salvation. The Gospel by John with its direct words from the lips of Christ, the Epistle to the Romans with its exhaustive treatment of the theme in question, the Apostle Paul, and the whole array of 150 New Testament passages which are the total of the divine instruction, are incomplete and misleading if repentance must be accorded a place separate from, and independent of, believing. No thoughtful person would attempt to defend such a notion against such odds, and those who have thus undertaken doubtless have done so without weighing the evidence or considering the untenable position which they assume.

5. The Significance of Repentance in Specific Passages. When entering upon this phase of this study, it is first necessary to eliminate all portions of the New Testament which introduce the word *repentance* in its relation to covenant people. There are, likewise, passages which employ the word *repentance* as a synonym of believing (cf. Acts 17:30; Rom. 2:4; 2 Tim. 2:25; 2 Pet. 3:9). Also, there are passages which refer to a change of mind (Acts 8:22; 11:18; Heb. 6:1, 6; 12:17; Rev. 9:20, etc.). Yet, again, consideration must be accorded three passages related to Israel which are often misapplied (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:31). There are references to John’s baptism, which was unto repentance, that are outside the Synoptics (Acts 13:24; 19:4).

Four passages deserve more extended consideration, namely:

Luke 24:47. “And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”

It will be seen that repentance is not in itself equivalent to believing or faith, though, being included in believing, is used here as a synonym of the word *believe*. Likewise, it is to be recognized that “remission of sins” is not all that is proffered in salvation, though the phrase may serve that purpose in this instance. Above all, the passage does not require human obligations

with respect to salvation. Repentance, which here represents believing, leads to remission of sin.

Acts 11:18. "When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

Again repentance, which is included in believing, serves as a synonym for the word *belief*. The Gentiles, as always, attain to spiritual life by faith, the all-important and essential change of mind. It is also true that the passage does not prescribe two things which are necessary to salvation (cf. vs. 17).

Acts 20:21. "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

First, though unrelated to the course of this argument, it is important to note that the Apostle here places Jews on the same level with Gentiles, and both are objects of divine grace. The Jew with his incomparable background or the Gentile with his heathen ignorance, each, must undergo a change of mind respecting God. Until they are aware of God's gracious purpose, there can be no reception of the idea of saving faith. It is quite possible to recognize God's purpose, as many do, and not receive Christ as Savior. In other words, repentance toward God could not itself constitute, in this case, the equivalent of "faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," though it may prepare for that faith. The introduction of the two Persons of the Godhead is significant, and that Christ is the sole object of faith is also most vital. Those who would insist that there are here two human obligations unto salvation are reminded again of the 150 portions in which such a twofold requirement is omitted.

Acts 26:20. "But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance."

Again, both Jews and Gentiles are addressed as on the same footing before God. Two obligations are named here, in order that spiritual results may be secured—those to "repent and turn to God." The passage would sustain the Arminian view if repentance were, as they assert, a sorrow for sin; but if the word is given its correct meaning, namely, *a change of mind*, there is no difficulty. The call is for a change of mind which turns to God.

This passage, also, has its equivalent in 1 Thessalonians 1:9, “Ye turned to God from idols.”

Conclusion

In the foregoing, an attempt has been made to demonstrate that the Biblical doctrine of repentance offers no objection to the truth that salvation is by grace through faith apart from every suggestion of human works or merit. It is asserted that repentance, which is a change of mind, enters of necessity into the very act of believing on Christ, since one cannot turn to Christ from other objects of confidence without that change of mind. Upwards of 150 texts—including all of the greatest gospel invitations—limit the human responsibility in salvation to believing or to faith. To this simple requirement nothing could be added if the glories of grace are to be preserved.

II. Believe and Confess Christ

The ambition to secure apparent results and the sincere desire to make decisions for Christ to be definite have prompted preachers in their general appeals to insist upon a public confession of Christ on the part of those who would be saved. To all practical purposes and in the majority of instances these confessions are, in the minds of the unsaved, coupled with saving faith and seem, as presented, to be of equal importance with that faith. This demand upon the unsaved is justified, if justified at all, upon two texts of Scripture which should have consideration:

1. Scripture Bearing on Confession of Christ. *Matthew 10:32.* “Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven.”

This verse, which occurs in the midst of Christ’s kingdom teachings and as a part of His instructions to His disciples whom He is sending forth with a restricted message to Israel (cf. vss. 5–7) and which was to be accompanied by stupendous miracles (cf. vs. 8) such as were never committed to preachers in the present age, applies, primarily, to these disciples themselves in respect to their faithful delivery of this kingdom

proclamation, and could be extended in its appeal only to the Israelites to whom they were sent. The carelessness which assumes that this Scripture presents a condition of salvation for a Jew or Gentile in the present age is deplorable indeed.

Romans 10:9–10. "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

This message, falling as it does within the specific teachings which belong primarily to the way of salvation by grace, is worthy of more consideration. The force of the positive statement in verse 9, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved," is explained in verse 10: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." In the latter verse the true meaning and use of the word "confess" is suggested. Of this word in this same passage the late Dr. Arthur T. Pierson wrote: "That word means to speak out of a like nature to one another. I believe and receive the love of God. In receiving His love I receive His life, in receiving His life I receive His nature, and His nature in me naturally expresses itself according to His will. That is confession. Alexander Maclaren has said: 'Men do not light a candle and put it under a bushel, because the candle would either go out or burn the bushel.' You must have vent for life, light, and love, or how can they abide? And a confession of Christ Jesus as Lord is the answer of the new life of God received. In receiving love, you are born of God, and, being born of God, you cry, 'Abba, Father,' which is but the Aramaic word for 'Papa'—syllables which can be pronounced before there are any teeth, because they are made with the gums and lips—the first word of a new-born soul, born of God, knowing God, and out of a like nature with God speaking in the language of a child."

The two activities named in these verses are each expanded with respect to their meaning in the immediate context which follows. Of believing it is said: "For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek" (vss. 11–12). Salvation is promised to both Jew and Greek (though in his case a Gentile) on the one condition that they believe. Such, indeed, shall not be

ashamed. Of confession it is said: “For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (vss. 12–13). It cannot be unobserved that the confession of verses 9 and 10 is declared to be a calling on the name of the Lord. In other words, this confession is that unavoidable acknowledgment to God on the part of the one who is exercising saving faith, that he accepts Christ as his Savior. As Abraham *amened* the promise of God—not a mere unresponsive believing (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3), so the trusting soul responds to the promise which God proffers of salvation through Christ.

2. Two Conclusive Reasons. There are two convincing reasons why the Scripture under consideration does not present two human responsibilities in relation to salvation by grace.

a. To claim that a public confession of Christ as Savior is required in addition to believing on Christ, is to contend that 150 passages in which believing alone appears are incomplete and to that extent misleading. A certain type of mind, however, seems able to construct all its confidence on an erroneous interpretation of one passage and to be uninfluenced by the overwhelming body of Scripture which contradicts that interpretation.

b. To require a public confession of Christ as a prerequisite to salvation by grace is to discredit the salvation of an innumerable company who have been saved under circumstances which precluded any public action.

Conclusion

Confession of Christ is a Christian’s privilege and duty and may be undertaken at the moment one is saved, but it is not a condition of salvation by grace, else works of merit intrude where only the work of God reigns.

III. Believe and Be Baptized

In any discussion respecting the word βαπτίζω it must be recognized that this term is used in the New Testament to represent two different things—a real baptism by the Spirit of God by which the believer is joined in union to Christ and is in Christ, and a ritual baptism with water. John distinguished these when he said, “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but

he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11). Though this word sustains a primary and secondary meaning and these are closely related ideas, the fact that the same identical word is used for both real and ritual baptism suggests an affiliation between the two ideas with which this word is associated. In fact, Ephesians 4:5 declares that there is but one baptism. The contemplation of these facts respecting this word is essential to a right understanding of the theme under discussion. The question naturally arises when it is asserted that one must believe and be baptized, whether a real or a ritual baptism is in view. There are two passages demanding attention:

Mark 16:15–16. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

A strange inattention to the evidence which serves as proof that reference is made in this text to real baptism by the Spirit, has characterized the interpretation of the passage. This evidence should at least be weighed for all that it is. Should it prove upon examination that reference is made to real baptism by the Spirit, which baptism is essential to salvation, the difficulty of a supposed regenerating baptism is immediately dismissed. Dr. James W. Dale, in his *Christic and Patristic Baptism* (pp. 392–94), has discussed this vital issue in an extended argument. He writes:

> All, so far as I am aware, who interpret the language of the Evangelist as indicating a ritual baptism, do so without having examined the question— "May not this be the *real* baptism by the Holy Spirit and not *ritual* baptism with water?" This vital issue has been assumed without investigation, and determined against the real baptism of the Scriptures, without a hearing. Such assumption is neither grounded in necessity, nor in the warrant of Scripture; whether regarded in its general teaching or in that of this particular passage. That there is no necessity for limiting the baptism of this passage to a rite is obvious, because the Scriptures furnish us with a real baptism by the Spirit, as well as with its symbol ritual baptism, from which to choose. There is no scriptural warrant in the general teaching of the Bible for identifying a *rite* with salvation; nor can such warrant be assumed in this particular passage (which does identify *baptism* and salvation), because there is no evidence on the face of the passage to show, that the baptism is ritual with water, rather than real by the Spirit. These points must be universally admitted: 1. The passage does not declare a ritual baptism by express statement; 2. It contains no statement which involves a ritual baptism as a necessary inference; 3. The Scriptures present a real and a ritual baptism, by the one or the other of which to meet the exigencies of any elliptically stated baptism; 4. That baptism which meets, in its scripturally defined nature and power, the requirements of any particular

passage, must be the baptism designed by such passage. We reject ritual baptism from all direct connection with this passage, in general, because, the passage treats of salvation and its conditions (belief and baptism). All out of the Papal church admit, that ritual baptism has not the same breadth with belief as a condition of salvation, and are, therefore, compelled to introduce exceptions for which no provision is made in the terms of this passage. We accept the real baptism by the Holy Spirit as the sole baptism directly contemplated by this passage, in general, because, it meets in the most absolute and unlimited manner *as a condition of salvation* the obvious requirement on the face of the passage, having the same breadth with belief, and universally present in every case of salvation. We accept this view in particular: Because it makes the use of "baptized" harmonious with the associate terms, "believeth" and "saved." The use of these terms, as well as "baptized," is elliptical. "Believe" has in the New Testament a double usage; the one limited to the action of the intellect, as, "the devils believe and tremble"; the other embraces and controls the affections of the heart, as, "with the heart we believe unto righteousness." It is the higher form of "belief" that is universally recognized as belonging to this passage. "Saved," also, is used in the New Testament, with a double application; as of the body, "all hope that we should be saved was taken away"; and of the soul, "He shall save his people from their sins." Again it is this higher salvation that is accepted without question. So, "baptized" is used in a lower and a higher meaning; applied in the one case to the body, as "I baptized you with water"; and in the other case applied to the soul, as "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." By what just reasoning, now, can "believeth," and "saved," be taken in the highest sense, and "baptized," in the same sentence and in the same construction, be brought down to the lowest? We object to such diversity of interpretation as unnatural and without any just support. The only tenable supply of the ellipsis must be, "He that believeth" (with the heart upon Christ), "and is baptized" (by the Holy Ghost into Christ) "shall be saved" (by the redemption of Christ). The construction allows and the case requires, that a relation of dependence and unity subsist between "believeth" and "baptized." There is evidently some *vinculum* binding these words and the ideas which they represent, together. MIDDLETON (Greek article, *in loco*) says: "In the *Complutens.* edit. the second participle has the article, which would materially alter the sense. It would imply, that he who believeth as well as he who is baptized, shall be saved; whereas the reading of the MSS. insists on the fulfilment of both conditions in every individual." This is true; but it is not all the truth. This faith and this baptism must not only not be disjoined by being assigned to different persons, but they must not be disjoined by being assigned to different spheres, the one spiritual and the other physical; and being conjoined, in like spiritual nature, and meeting together in the same person, the whole truth requires, that they shall be recognized not as two distinct things existing harmoniously together, but as bearing to each other the intimate and essential relation of cause and effect, that is to say, the baptism is a consequence proceeding from the belief.

Believing has the influence over the soul, through the power of God in accordance with His promise in the gospel, of bringing the one who believes into the estate of salvation with all its values which are received from Christ. The new relation to Christ of being in Him is wrought by the Holy Spirit's baptism, and it could not be absent in the case of any true salvation. On the other hand, all who have been saved have been saved

quite apart from ritual baptism. The form of speech which this text presents is common in the Bible, namely, that of passing from the main subject to one of the features belonging to that subject, as, “Thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak” (Luke 1:20). The word *dumb* is amplified by the words *not able to speak.* In the text in question, the word *believeth* is amplified by the words *and is baptized,* and with reference to real baptism which is an integral part of salvation.

Acts 2:38. “Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.”

A very general impression obtains among informed students of the Sacred Text that the translation of this passage is injured by the rendering of two prepositions ἐπί and εἰς by the words *in* and *for.* That ἐπί is better translated *upon,* and εἰς is better rendered *into* would hardly be contested. To this may be added the demand of some worthy scholars that the word *believing* should be supplied, which would give the following rendering: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you, [believing] upon the name of Jesus Christ into the remission of sins.” By so much the passage harmonizes with all other Scripture, which, from the interpreter’s standpoint, is imperative (2 Pet. 1:20); and the remission of sins—here equivalent to personal salvation—is made to depend not upon repentance or baptism.

Dr. J. W. Dale is convinced that it is real baptism by the Spirit which is referred to here and also in verse 41. He proposes that the same arguments which he advanced to prove that Mark 16:15–16 refers to real baptism by the Spirit serve as valid evidence in Acts 2:38, 41. He feels a particular relief that there is no need, according to this interpretation, of defending the idea that 3,000 people were baptized by ritual baptism in what could have been but slightly more than half a day and as a surprise necessity for which preparations could not have been made either by the candidates or administrators, whereas, Dr. Dale contends, to reckon this baptism to have been real and that which unavoidably does enter into the salvation of every soul and does not follow after as a mere testimony, is to encounter no insuperable difficulty whatever. Most of all, he points out, by this interpretation this passage is rescued from the misinterpretation which exalts ritual baptism to the point of being all but essential to salvation.

It is significant that the Apostle Peter follows this exhortation contained in Acts 2:38 with a promise respecting the reception of the Holy Spirit. In the disproportionate emphasis which has been placed on ritual baptism— doubtless stimulated by disagreement on its mode— the great undertaking of the Spirit in real baptism which conditions the believer's standing before God and engenders the true motive for Christian character and service, has been slighted to the point that many apparently are unaware of its existence. Such a situation is not without precedent. At Ephesus the Apostle Paul found certain men who were resting their confidence in "John's baptism," who confessed "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost" (Acts 19:1–3). In other words, the student would do well to note that the truth regarding the baptism with the Spirit is itself more important than the Christian public, led by sectarian teachers, supposes it to be.

Conclusion

The above examination of two passages, on which the idea of baptismal regeneration is made to rest, has sought to demonstrate that ritual baptism, however administered, is not a condition which is to be added to believing as a necessary step in salvation.

IV. Believe and Surrender to God

On account of its subtlety due to its pious character, no confusing intrusion into the doctrine that salvation is conditioned alone upon believing is more effective than the added demand that the unsaved must dedicate themselves to do God's will in their daily life, as well as to believe upon Christ. The desirability of a dedication to God on the part of every believer is obvious, and is so stressed in the Sacred Text that many sincere people who are inattentive to doctrine are easily led to suppose that this same dedication, which is *voluntary* in the case of the believer, is *imperative* in the case of the unsaved. This aspect of this general theme may be approached under three considerations of it: (1) the incapacity of the unsaved, (2) what is involved, and (3) the preacher's responsibility.

1. The Incapacity of the Unsaved. The Arminian notion that through the reception of a so-called common grace anyone is competent to accept Christ as Savior if he will, is a mild assumption compared with the idea that the unregenerate person, with no common or uncommon grace proffered, is able to dedicate his life to God. Much has been written on previous pages regarding the overwhelming testimony of the Bible to the utter inability and spiritual death of the unsaved. They are shut up to the one message that Christ is their Savior; and they cannot accept Him, the Word of God declares, unless illuminated to that end by the Holy Spirit. Saving faith is not a possession of all men but is imparted specifically to those who do believe (Eph. 2:8). As all this is true, it follows that to impose a need to surrender the life to God as an added condition of salvation is most unreasonable. God's call to the unsaved is never said to be unto the Lordship of Christ; it is unto His saving grace. With the reception of the divine nature through the regenerating work of the Spirit, a new understanding and a new capacity to respond to the authority of Christ are gained. Those attending upon these issues in practical ways are aware that a self-dedication taxes the limit of ability even of the most devout believer. The error of imposing Christ's Lordship upon the unsaved is disastrous even though they are not able intelligently to resent it or to remind the preacher of the fact that he, in calling upon them to dedicate their lives, is demanding of them what they have no ability to produce. A destructive heresy is abroad under the name The Oxford Movement, which specializes in this blasting error, except that the promoters of the Movement omit altogether the idea of believing on Christ for salvation and promote exclusively the obligation to surrender to God. They substitute consecration for conversion, faithfulness for faith, and beauty of daily life for believing unto eternal life. As is easily seen, the plan of this movement is to ignore the need of Christ's death as the ground of regeneration and forgiveness, and to promote the wretched heresy that it matters nothing what one believes respecting the Saviorhood of Christ if only the daily life is dedicated to God's service. A pseudo self-dedication to God is a rare bit of religion with which the unsaved may conjure. The tragedy is that out of such a delusion those who embrace it are likely never to be delivered by a true faith in Christ as Savior. No more complete example could be found today of "the blind leading the blind" than what this Movement presents.

2. What is Involved. The most subtle, self-satisfying form of works of merit is, after all, found to be an engaging feature in this practice of applying to unbelievers the Lordship of Christ. What more could God expect than that the creatures of His hand should by supposed surrender be attempting to be obedient to Him? In such idealism the darkened mind of the unsaved, no doubt, sees dimly some possible advantage in submitting their lives to the guidance of a Supreme Being—of whom they really know nothing. Such notions are only human adjustments to God and resemble in no way the terms of divine adjustment, which first condemns man and rejects all his supposed merit, and then offers a perfect and eternal salvation to the helpless sinner on no other terms than that he believe on Christ as his Savior.

If the real issue in self-dedication to God is stated in its legitimate though extreme form, the possibility of martyrdom is first in evidence. One who is faithful unto God is enjoined to be faithful unto death (Rev. 2:10). Such, indeed, is a glorious challenge to the devout believer and millions have accepted the challenge and suffered a martyr's death; but would any zealous advocate of the idea that the Lordship of Christ must be applied to the unsaved as a condition of salvation, dare to propose to the unsaved that they must not only believe on Christ but be willing to die a martyr's death? The very proposal of such a question serves only to demonstrate the unwisdom and disregard for revealed truth which this error exhibits.

The unregenerate person, because of his condition in spiritual death, has no ability to desire the things of God (1 Cor. 2:14), or to anticipate what his outlook on life will be after he is saved. It is therefore an error of the first magnitude to divert that feeble ability of the unsaved to exercise a God-given faith for salvation into the unknown and complex spheres of self-dedication, which dedication is the Christian's greatest problem.

3. The Preacher's Responsibility. It is the preacher's responsibility, not only to preserve his message to the unsaved from being distorted by issues other than that of simple faith in Christ, but, when speaking to Christians in the presence of the unsaved regarding the issues of Christian character, conduct, and service, to declare plainly that the truth presented has no application to those who are unsaved. Such a reminder, oft repeated, will not only preserve the unregenerate individuals who are present from

the deadly supposition that God is seeking to improve their manner of life rather than to accomplish the salvation of their souls, but will also create in their minds the so important impression that they are, in the sight of God, hopelessly condemned apart from Christ as Savior. God alone can deal with a situation wherein a large percentage of the members of the church are unsaved, and yet are habitually addressed as though they were saved and on no other basis than that they belong to the church. It is surprising, indeed, that any unsaved person ever gains any right impression respecting his actual relation to God, when he is allowed to believe that he is included in all the appeals which are made to Christians regarding their daily life. If the importance of attention to this wide difference between the saved and the unsaved is not appreciated and respected by the preacher, the fault is nearly unpardonable since the results may easily hinder the salvation of many souls. Next to sound doctrine itself, no more important obligation rests on the preacher than that of preaching the Lordship of Christ to Christians exclusively, and the Saviorhood of Christ to those who are unsaved.

Conclusion

A suggestion born of this theme is that in all gospel preaching every reference to the life to be lived beyond regeneration should be avoided as far as possible. To attend to this is not a deception nor a withholding of the truth from those to whom it applies. It is the simple adjustment to the limitation and actual condition of those to whom the gospel is addressed. To such among the unsaved who, because of the weakness and inability which they observe in themselves, are fearful lest they would not “hold out” as Christians, it is desirable to remind them that, in the new relation to Christ which will exist after they receive Him, new abilities will be possessed by which they can live to the glory of God. Such proffered assurance is far removed from the practice of introducing obligations which are exclusively Christian in character and as something to which they must consent in order to be saved. Multitudes of unsaved people have been diverted from the one question of their acceptance of Christ as Savior to other questions regarding amusements and unchristian ways of living. As an unsaved person has no motive or spiritual light by which to face such problems, that person can only be bewildered by these issues. His problem is not one of giving up

what in his unsaved state seems normal to him; it is a problem of receiving the Savior with all His salvation.

V. Believe and Confess Sin or Make Restitution

But a moment need be devoted to this error which prevails among certain groups of zealous people. The Scripture employed by advocates of this error is that which applies only to Christians. The passage reads: “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (1 John 1:9). This declaration, as has been seen, is addressed to believers who have sinned and presents the ground on which such may be restored to fellowship with God. The notion that restitution must be made before one can be saved is based on the God-dishonoring theory that salvation is only for good people, and that the sinner must divest himself of that which is evil before he can be saved. In other words, God is not propitious respecting sin; He is propitious toward those only who have prepared themselves for His presence and fellowship. Over against this, the truth is ignored that the unregenerate person cannot improve his fallen condition and, if he could, he would be bringing merit to God where merit is wholly excluded to the end that grace may abound and be magnified through all eternity. The preacher must ever be on his guard to discourage the tendency of the natural man to move along lines of reformation rather than regeneration. Those who are serious regarding their lost estate are best helped by that body of truth which declares that God, through Christ, must save and will save from all sin; that He must and will deal with the very nature which sins; and that He must and will rescue men from their estate under sin. There are various ways by which the natural man proposes to be saved and yet retain his dignity and supposed worthiness, and one of these is the contention that sin must be confessed and restitution made as a human requirement in salvation. It is God who justifies the ungodly (Rom. 4:5); it is while men are “enemies, sinners, and without strength” that Christ died for them (Rom. 5:6–10); and all their unworthiness is accounted for by Christ in His death. There is a duty belonging only to Christians—to set things right after they are saved—and there should be no neglect of that responsibility. It therefore remains true

that those who are saved are saved on the one condition of believing upon Christ.

VI. Believe and Implore God to Save

None of the errors being considered seems more reasonable than this, and none strikes a more deadly blow at the foundation of divine grace. The error includes the claim that the sinner must "seek the Lord," or that he must plead with God to be merciful. These two conceptions, though nearly identical, should be considered separately.

1. "Seek Ye the Lord." This phrase, quoted from Isaiah 55:6, represents Jehovah's invitation to His covenant people, Israel, who have wandered from their place of rightful blessings under His covenants, to return to Him. It was appointed to that people to "seek the LORD while he may be found" and to "call upon him while he is near"; but the gospel of the grace of God in the present age declares to Jew and Gentile alike that "there is none that seeketh after God" (Rom. 3:11), and that "the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10). This declaration that in this age there are none who seek the Lord, accords with the testimony of the New Testament relative to the incapacity of those who are lost to turn to God. Apart from the new birth, the unsaved "cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3), their minds are blinded by Satan (2 Cor. 4:3–4), and they can exercise faith toward God only as they are enabled to do so by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:8). In the light of these revelations, there is little ground for the hope that the unsaved will "seek the Lord," and, what is far more essential to the right understanding of the way of salvation by grace, the unsaved are not asked to seek the Lord. If this is true, the unsaved should never be placed in the position of those who must discover God or prevail upon Him to be gracious.

2. Believe and Pray. The question which arises at this point is one of whether God is propitious. If He is propitious, there remains no occasion for the unsaved to try to find Him, to wait until He is on "the giving hand," or to implore Him to save. He is propitious to an infinite degree and the problem confronting the mind of man is one of adjustment to that revelation. The transforming effect of the truth that God is propitious

penetrates every phase of Soteriology. His flood tide of blessing—all that is impelled by infinite love—awaits, not the imploring, prevailing appeal that might move one to be gracious, but rather it awaits the simple willingness on the part of men to *receive* what He has already provided and is free to bestow in and through His Son, the Savior.

Attention has been called in an earlier discussion to the fact that salvation begins in the heart of God and is precisely what His infinite love demands and ordains. Its whole scope and extent is the reflection of that immeasurable love. It embraces all that infinity can produce. The sinner's plight is serious indeed and the benefits he receives in saving grace cannot be estimated; but all this together is secondary compared with the satisfaction which God's great love demands. As before stated, but two obstacles could hinder the satisfaction of divine love—the sin of the creature He loves and the will of that creature. As the Creator of all things, even these obstacles take their place in the divine decree which ordained all things that exist. Nevertheless, He has, as the only One who could do it, met by the sacrifice of His Son the obstacle which sin imposed, and He, too, secures the glad cooperation of the human will. The effect of the death of His Son is to render God righteously free to act for those whom He loves, and that freedom for love to act is propitiation. Therefore, it must be again asserted that God is propitious. It is infinite love that now invites the sinner to eternal glories, and it is infinite love that awaits the sinner's response to that invitation.

With this marvelous revelation in view, there is no place left for the idea that the sinner must "seek the Lord," or that the sinner must plead with God to be merciful and kind. No burden rests on the unsaved to persuade God to be good; the challenge of the gospel is for the unsaved to believe that God is good. Since those great truths are revealed only in the Word of God, the unsaved are enjoined to believe God's Word, and the Scriptures hold a large share in the divine undertaking of bringing men to salvation (John 3:5). It is common, however, for some who, with great passion of soul, attempt to preach the gospel, so to fail in the apprehension of the divine propitiation that they imply that salvation is secured by entreating God, and by so much the value of Christ's mediation in behalf of the sinner is nullified.

The example of the prayer of the publican is usually cited as the best of reasons for urging the unsaved to plead with God for His mercy and

salvation. What, it is asked, could be more appropriate than that the unsaved should pray as did the publican, “God be merciful to me a sinner” (Luke 18:13)? The appeal on the part of the publican is assumed to be the norm for all sinners, though, in reality, it contradicts the very truth of the gospel of divine grace. The incident must be examined carefully. It is essential to note that the publican—a Jew of the Old Testament order and praying in the temple according to the requirements of a Jew in the temple—did not use the word *merciful*— which word is properly associated with the idea of kindness, bigheartedness, leniency, and generosity. According to the original text, which in the Authorized Version is too freely translated, the publican said, “God be propitiated to me the sinner.” The word ἱλάσκομαι, which means “to make propitiation,” appears in the text. There is a wide difference between the word *merciful* with all its implications and the word *propitiation.* By the use of the word *merciful* the impression is conveyed that the publican pleaded with God to be magnanimous. By the use of the word *propitiation*—if comprehended at all—the impression is conveyed that the publican asked God to cover his sins in such a way as to dispose of them, yet, at the same time, to do this in a way that would protect His own holiness from complicity with his sins. If the publican did as Jews were accustomed to do in his day when they went into the temple to pray, he left a sacrifice at the altar. It is probable that he could see the smoke of that sacrifice ascending as he prayed. What he prayed was strictly proper for a Jew of his time to pray under those circumstances. However, his prayer would be most unfitting on this side of the cross of Christ. With reference to the word *merciful*, it was not in the publican’s prayer nor would it be a proper word for a penitent to use, on either side of the cross. God cannot be merciful to sin in the sense that He treats it lightly, whether it be in one age or another. But with reference to the word *propitiation* and its implications, that word was justified in the age before Christ died and when sin was covered by sacrifices which the sinner provided. It was suitable for the publican, having provided his own sacrifice, to ask that his sacrifice be accepted and himself absolved. However, on this side of the cross when Christ has died and secured propitiation and it is established perfectly forever, nothing could be more an outraging of that priceless truth upon which the gospel rests than to implore God to be propitious. Such prayers may be enjoined through ignorance, but the wrong is immeasurable. When

this prayer is made, even for God to be propitious, there is a direct assumption expressed that God is *not* propitious, and to that extent the petitioner is asking God to do something more effective than the thing He has done in giving His Son as a sacrifice for sin. A moment's consideration would disclose the immeasurable wrong that is committed when God is asked to be propitious, when, at the infinite cost of the death of His Son, He is propitious. The truth that God is propitious constitutes the very heart of the gospel of divine grace, and the one who does not recognize this and sees no impropriety in the use of the publican's prayer today has yet to comprehend what is the first principle in the plan of salvation through Christ. Men are not saved by asking God to be good, or merciful, or propitious; they are saved when they believe God has been good and merciful enough to provide a propitiating Savior. The sinner is saved, not because he prevails on God to withhold from him the blow of judgment that is due him for his sin, but because he believes that that blow has fallen on his Substitute. If it is thought that all this is but a mere theological distinction and that after all God is love and the sinner will be treated in love, consideration should be given to the fact that it was for the very purpose of providing a righteous ground for salvation of sinners that the Son of God became incarnate, that He died, and that He arose from the dead. To imply that all this—and there is no salvation apart from it—is only a theological speculation, is to reject the whole plan of salvation through a Savior and to assume to stand before God, who is Consuming Fire, without shelter, shield, or surety.

In consummating this section on the human terms which condition the salvation of a soul, it may be restated:

a. Every feature of man's salvation from the divine election in past ages and on through successive steps—the sacrifice of the Savior, the enlightenment by the Spirit, the immediate saving work of God in its manifold achievements, the keeping work of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, the delivering work of the Spirit, the empowering work of the Spirit, and the final perfecting and presenting in glory—is all a work so supernatural that God alone can effect it, and, therefore, the only relation which man can sustain to it is to trust God to do it. Such a dependence is not only reasonable, but is all and only that which God requires on the human side for the eternal salvation of a soul. That human trust

acknowledges that, according to revelation, God can deal righteously with sinners on the ground of the death of His Son for them. The sinner thus trusts in the Saviorhood of Christ.

b. It has been asserted that the primary divine purpose in saving a soul is the satisfying of infinite divine love for that soul and the exercise of the attribute of sovereign grace. Should the slightest human work of merit be allowed to intrude into this great divine undertaking, the purpose of manifesting divine grace would be shattered. It therefore follows that, of necessity, men are saved by believing apart from every form of human worthiness.

c. In the preceding pages it is also pointed out that the New Testament declares directly and without complication in at least 150 passages that men are saved upon the sole principle of faith; and, in this connection, it has been demonstrated that it is not a matter of believing and repenting, of believing and confessing Christ, of believing and being baptized, of believing and surrender to God, of believing and confessing sin, or of believing and pleading with God for salvation, but it is believing alone. Such belief is apart from works (Rom. 4:5), it is a committal of one's self to Christ (2 Tim. 1:12), and it is a definite turning—an act of the will—to God from every other confidence (1 Thess. 1:9).

"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

Epilogue

MUCH HAS BEEN required and much has been undertaken in this analysis of that which enters into the provision, plan, and purpose of the triune God for the salvation of fallen men. The entire Word of God makes its contribution to this vast theme; yet it has pleased God to compress into one terse saying the whole divine revelation respecting Soteriology. This saying is the message of the most familiar text in the Bible and is universally recognized as transcendent by people of every nation and tongue to whom the Word of God has gone. Such a universal appraisement of one Biblical utterance becomes decisive evidence that this Scripture answers more completely and perfectly than any other the deepest needs and desires of the human heart.

It is written:

> For God so loved the world,
> That he gave his only begotten Son,
> That whosoever believeth in him
> Should not perish,
> But have everlasting life.

It will be observed that every major feature of Soteriology is present in this incomparable text and that it is properly marshaled as a proof text in behalf of each of these doctrines.

(a) "God so loved the world." At once and with sublime propriety the whole enterprise of saving men is declared to arise in the love of God. Indeed, it is the ruined *cosmos* world which He loves; but this truth only enhances the lofty, yet gracious, character of that love. This is not a love for an elect company alone—as though the title, *The Cosmos World*, could ever be applied to the elect company who are saved out of it and whom the *cosmos* hates (John 15:18)—but it is a love for the *cosmos* which *hates*, which is *lost*, and which *needs* to be saved (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9). What, indeed, would be the present wretchedness and the future despair of all men were it not for the supreme revelation that "God is love"?

(b) "That he gave his only begotten Son." Here in seven words is found the "unspeakable gift" of the Father, the immeasurable sacrifice of the Son through the eternal Spirit, and the boundless benefit to the sinner.

Compressed into this phrase is the whole story of the substitutionary death—both with regard to merit and demerit—and all other achievements of the Savior in His sacrifice upon the cross. The phrase embraces His humiliation, His humanity, His death, His resurrection, and His eternal identification with the human family; so, also, it speaks of all the benefits He became to a lost world and to the redeemed.

(c) "That whosoever believeth in him." By this significant declaration, it is implied that not all will believe and that there is an elect company in view. It is likewise asserted that salvation is through Christ alone, and that it is secured, on the human side, by faith alone uncomplicated by any works of merit.

(d) "Should not perish." The estate of the lost is implied and there is no slight importance to be assigned to the fact that this implication, with all its assurance of eternal woe, fell from the lips of the Son of God into whose hand all future judgment is committed.

(e) "But have everlasting life." Here, as above, the character and the eternal extent of salvation are disclosed, and that eternal life, like every feature of divine grace, is a gift from God.

Thus it is revealed that in this incomparable text is enfolded at least nine of the great doctrines of Soteriology, namely, infinite love, infinite sacrifice for sinners, sovereign election, sovereign grace, unlimited redemption, salvation a work of God, salvation from perdition, eternal security, and salvation by grace through faith alone.

O Christ, what burdens bowed Thy head!
Our load was laid on Thee;
Thou stoodest in the sinner's stead,
Didst bear all ill for me.
A Victim led, Thy blood was shed;
Now there's no load for me.
Death and the curse were in our cup—
O Christ, 'twas full for Thee;
But Thou hast drained the last dark drop—
'Tis empty now for me.
That bitter cup—love drank it up;
Now blessings' draught for me.
Jehovah lifted up His rod—
O Christ, it fell on Thee!
Thou wast sore stricken of Thy God;
There's not one stroke for me.

Thy tears, Thy blood, beneath it flowed;
Thy bruising healeth me.
The tempest's awful voice was heard—
O Christ, it broke on Thee!
Thy open bosom was my ward,
It braved the storm for me.
Thy form was scarred, Thy visage marred;
Now cloudless peace for me.
Jehovah bade His sword awake—
O Christ, it woke gainst Thee!
Thy blood the flaming blade must slake;
Thy heart its sheath must be—
All for my sake, my peace to make;
Now sleeps that sword for me.
For me, Lord Jesus, Thou hast died,
And I have died in Thee;
Thou'rt risen: my bands are all untied,
And now Thou liv'st in me.
When purified, made white, and tried,
Thy GLORY then for me!

Volume Four

Ecclesiology • Eschatology

Table of Contents

Ecclesiology

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION TO ECCLESIOLOGY I. The Creatures of God Viewed Dispensationally 1. The Angels 2. The Gentiles
3. The Jews
4. The Christians

II. SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE VIEWED DISPENSATIONALLY 1. An Acceptable Standing on the Part of Man before God a. Divine Grace upon Israel
b. Divine Grace upon Christians
2. A Divinely Specified Manner of Life
3. A Divinely Appointed Service
4. A Righteous Ground Whereon God May Graciously Forgive and Cleanse the Erring 5. A Clear Revelation of the Responsibility on the Human Side upon Which Divine Forgiveness and Cleansing May Be Secured 6. An Effective Basis upon Which God May Be Worshiped and Petitioned in Prayer 7. A Future Hope
a. The Future of This Life
b. Intermediate State
c. Resurrection
d. Eternal Life
e. The Covenanted Davidic Kingdom

III. THE CHURCH SPECIFICALLY CONSIDERED 1. Two Independent and Widely Different Purposes in the Incarnation 2. Christ Revealed Two Distinct Lines of Truth 3. In His Death and Resurrection the Same Two Widely Different Objectives Are Discernible 4. Events Predicted for the Close of the Present Age 5. Distinctions between Israel and the Church in the Coming Kingdom The Church as an Organism

Chapter II. General Features of the Doctrine concerning the Church I. The Meaning of the Word *Church* II. The Fact of a New Divine Undertaking

III. Various Terms Employed

IV. The First use of the Word *Church* V. The Church the Present Divine Purpose

VI. Four Reasons Why the Church Began at Pentecost VII. The church in type and Prophecy

Chapter III. Contrasts brtween Israel and the Church I. The Extent of biblical Revelation

II. The Divine Purpose

III. The Seed of Abraham

IV. Birth

V. Headship

VI. Covenants

VII. Nationality

VIII. Divine Dealing

IX. Dispensations

X. Ministry

XI. The Death of christ

XII. The Father

XIII. Chris

XIV. The Holy Spirit

XV. A Governing Principle

XVI. Divine Enablement

XVII. Two Farewell Discourses

XVIII. The Promise of Christ's Return

XIX. Position

XX. Christ's Earthly Reign

XXI. Priesthood

XXII. Marriage

XXIII. Judgments

XXIV. Position in Eternity

Conclusion

Chapter IV. Seven Figures Used of the Church in Her Relation to Christ (I–V) I. The Shepherd and the Sheep

II. The Vine and the Branches

III. The Cornerstone and the Stones of the Building IV. The High Priest and the Kingdom of Priests 1. The Service of Sacrifice 2. The Service of Worship

3. The Service of Intercession

V. The Head and the Body with Its Many Members 1. The Church a Self-Developing Body 2. The Members Are Appointed to Specific Service 3. The Body Is One

Chapter V. Seven Figures Used of the Church in Her Relation to Christ (VI): The Last Adam and the New Creation I. The Resurrected Christ

1. The Resurrection of Christ Is Subject to Indisputable Proofs a. The Truthfulness of Christ Himself
   b. The Empty Tomb
   c. The Experience of Christ's Followers
   d. The Fact of the Church
   e. The Eye-Witnesses
   f. The Direct Assertion of the Bible
   g. The Resurrection and the Divine Program
2. The Resurrection of Christ Is Reasonable
3. Prophecy Respecting the Resurrection
4. Seven Reasons for the Resurrection
   a. Because of Who Christ Is
   b. To Fulfill Prophecy
   c. To Become a Bestower of Life
   d. To Impart Power
   e. To Be Head to His Body, the Church
   f. Resurrection and Justification
   g. Christ the Pattern or First-Fruits
5. Three Standards of Power
6. It Was an Actual Resurrection
7. The Resurrection of Christ Is unto a New Order II. The Believer's Position in Christ 1. The Resurrected Christ 2.

The New Humanity

III. Two Creations Require two Commemoration Days 1. The Biblical Testimony Regarding the Jewish Sabbath a. The Period from Adam to Moses

b. The Period from Moses to Christ
c. The Period Represented by the Gospels
d. The Period Represented by the Acts and the Epistles (1) The Sabbath in the Book of the Acts
(2) The Sabbath in the Epistles
e. The Sabbath in Prophecy
(1) The Cessation of the Sabbath
(2) The Re-establishment of the Sabbath
f. The Exact Day
2. The Biblical Testimony concerning the Lord's Day a. The Mosaic System Has Ceased
b. A New Day Is Divinely Appointed under Grace c. A New Day Is Indicated by Important Events d. The New Day Typifies the New Creation
e. The New Day Is Typical of Unmerited Grace
f. The New Day Began to Be Observed with the Resurrection of Christ g. The New Day Has Been Blessed of God

IV. The Final Transformation 1. Release from the Sin Nature 2. The Actual Occupation of Heavenly Citizenship 3. The Possession of a Transformed Body

Conclusion

Chapter VI. Seven Figures Used of the Church in Her Relation to Christ (VII): The Bridegroom and the Bride I. Contrasted With Israel

II. A Delineation of Christ's Knowledge-Surpassing Love III. An Assurance of the Consort's Authority

IV. A Revelation of the Bride's Position Above all Created Beings V. A Surety of Infinite Glory

VI. The Bride types

1. Eve 2. Rebekah
a. The Father Undertakes in Behalf of His Son b. The Father Sends the Trusted Servant

c. Election Is Seen in the Particular One Chosen d. Rebekah's Faith
e. The Foretaste of Isaac's Riches
f. The journey
g. The Union

VII. The Meaning of this Figure Conclusion

The Organized Church

Chapter VII. The Organized Church I. The Church a Local Assembly

1. The Church and Her Doctrine 2. The Church and Her Service
3. The Church and Her Organization
4. The Church and Her Ordinances
5. The Church and Her Order

II. A Group of Local Churches III. The Visible Church without Reference to Locality The Believer's Rule of Life

Chapter VIII. Rules of Life in the Old Testament Period I. The Pre-Mosaic Economy

II. The Mossaic Economy

1. The Relation the Mosaic Law Sustained to the Time of Its Reign
a. The Law Began Its Reign at Mount Sinai
b. The Reign of Law Was Terminated with the Death of Christ
2. The Application of the Law

Chapter IX. The Future Kingdom Economy Chapter X. The Present Grace Economy

I. Three Specific Features

1. The Independent and Uncomplicated Character of Grace Teachings 2. Their Exalted Requirements
3. The Divine Enablement

II. The Grace Relationships 1. Relationship to the Persons of the Godhead 2. Relation to the Cosmos World System

a. To Satan and His Emissaries
b. To the World System
c. To Human Governments
d. To the Unsaved as Individuals

3. Relationship to the Body of Christ

a. A Christian’s Relation to Other Christians in General b. A Christian’s Relation to Those Who Are in Authority in the Assembly of Believers c. The Relation of Christian Husbands and Wives d. The Relation of Christian Parents and Children e. The Relation of Christian Masters and Servants f. A Christian’s Obligation to an Erring Brother g. A Christian’s Obligation to a Weak Brother CHAPTER XI. CONTRASTS BETWEEN LAW AND GRACE I. Independent, Sufficient, and Complete Systems of Divine Rule in the Earth 1. The Teachings of the Law of Moses 2. The Teachings of Grace

3. The Teachings of the Kingdom

a. The Similarity and Dissimilarity between the Teachings of the Law of Moses and the Teachings of Grace b. The Similarity and Dissimilarity between the Teachings of the Law of Moses and the Teachings of the Kingdom (1) They Are Similar Because They Are Based on a Covenant of Works (2) They Are Similar because of Elements Which Are Common to Both (3) They Are Dissimilar because of Certain Points in Which They Differ c. The Similarity and Dissimilarity between the Teachings of Grace and the Laws of the Kingdom (1) The Beatitudes

(2) The Similitudes of the Righteous in the Kingdom (3) Christ Interprets the Law in Its Relation to the Kingdom (4) Mere Externalism Rebuked

(5) Prayer for the Kingdom, and in the Kingdom (6) The Law Governing Riches in the Kingdom

(7) The Father’s Care over the Children of the Kingdom (8) Warning Against Judgment of Others

(9) Warning Against False Prophets

(10) Three Determining Statements concern ing the Kingdom II. THE SEQUENCE OF THE DIVINE BLESSING AND THE HUMAN OBLIGATION III. Different Degrees of Difficulty and Different Degrees of Divine Enablement Chapter XII. The Law Systems and Judaism Done Away

I. The Actual written Instructions of Both the Teachings of the Law of Moses and the Kingdom are Done away 1. The Passing of the Law of Moses Is the Explicit Teaching of the New Testament Scriptures 2. The Error of Commingling the Law of the Kingdom with the Teachings of Grace a. The Two Systems Cannot Coexist
b. Not Necessary to Combine Them

II. The Law Covenant of works is done away III. The Law Principle of Dependence on the energy of the Flesh is done away IV. Judaism is done away

Conclusion

Eschatology

Chapter XIII. Introduction to Eschatology General Features of Eschatology

Chapter XIV. A Brief Survey of the History of Chiliasm I. The Period Represented by the Old Testament II. The Messianic Kingdom Offered to Israel at the First Advent III. The Kingdom Rejected and Postponed

IV. Chiliastic Beliefs held by the early Church V. The Chiliastic Expectation Continued Until the Roman Apostasy VI. Chiliasm began to be Restored in the Reformation VII. Chiliasm since the Reformation

1. The Theory of Whitby 2. Antimillennialism
3. Premillennialism

Chapter XV. The biblical Conception of Prophecy I. The Prophet

II. The Prophet's Message

III. The Prophet's Power

IV. The Selection of Prophets

V. The Fulfillment of Prophecy

VI. The History of Prophecy

1. Four Prophets Who Serve as Milestones a. Abraham
b. Moses
c. Daniel
d. Christ
2. John the Baptist
3. False Prophets

4. The Classification of Old Testament Written Prophecies The Major Highways of Prophecy

CHAPTER XVI. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE LORD JESUS CHRIST I. Prophet

II. PRIEST

III. KING

IV. THE SEED

V. THE TWO ADVENTS

1. The First Advent 2. The Second Advent

CHAPTER XVII. PROPHECY CONCERNING ISRAEL'S COVENANTS I. The Four Major Covenants

1. The Covenant Made with Abraham 2. The Covenant Given through Moses
3. The Covenant Made with David
4. The New Covenant Yet to Be Made in the Messianic Kingdom

II. SEVEN FEATURES 1. A Nation Forever 2. A Land Forever

a. The Nation "Plucked from Off" the Land for Its Unfaithfulness b. A Future Repentance of Israel
c. The Return of Messiah
d. Israel's Restoration to the Land
e. Israel's Conversion as a Nation
f. Judgment on Israel's Oppressors
g. The Nation Will Be Blessed Then

3. A King Forever
4. A Throne Forever
5. A Kingdom Forever
6. A New Covenant
7. Abiding Blessings

CHAPTER XVIII. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE GENTILES Chapter XIX. Prophecy concerning Satan, Evil, and the Man of Sin I. Satan

II. EVIL

III. THE MAN OF SIN

CHAPTER XX. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE COURSE AND END OF APOSTATE CHRISTENDOM CHAPTER XXI. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE GREAT TRIBULATION I. THE DOCTRINE IN GENERAL

II. THE CHURCH AND THE TRIBULATION

1. The Nature of the Tribulation 2. The Nature of the Church

3. Must the Last Generation of the Church Suffer Especially?
4. The Testimony of the Scriptures
a. The Imminent Return of Christ
b. The Anticipation of the Element of Time
c. The Dispensational feature
d. The Major Scripture
e. The Twenty-Four Elders
f. The Restrainer Removed

CHAPTER XXII. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE CHURCH I. The Last Days for the Church

II. THE RESURRCTION OF THE BODIES OF THE SAINTS III. THE TRANSLATION OF LIVING SAINTS

IV. THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST

V. THE MARRIAGE OF THE LAMB

VI. THE RETURN OF THE CHURCH WITH CHRIST

VII. THE REIGN OF THE CHRCH WITH CHRIST

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XXIII. MAJOR THEMES OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY I. PROPHECY RESPECTING THE GENTILES
1. The First Gentile Prediction 2. The judgments upon Nations Adjacent to Israel 3. The Times of the Gentiles
4. The Succession of Monarchies
5. The Judgment of Gentile Nations
6. Gentile Nations and the Lake of Fire
7. Gentile Nations and the Kingdom

II. PROPHECY RESPECTING ISRAEL'S EARLY HISTORY III. Prophecy Respecting the Nation Israel

IV. PROPPECY RESPECTING THE DISPERSIONS AND THE REGATHERINGS OF ISRAEL V. PROPHECY RESPECTING THE ADVENT OF MESSIAH

VI. PROPHECY RESPECTING THE GREAT TRIBULATION VII. PROPHECY RESPECTING THE DAY OF JEHOVAH AND THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XXIV. MAJOR THEMES OF NEW TESTAMENT PROPHECY I. THE NEW AGE

II. THE NEW DIVINE PURPOSE

III. THE NATION ISRAEL

IV. THE GENTILES

V. THE GREAT TRIBULATION

VI. Satan and the Forces of Evil

VII. The Second Coming of Christ

VIII. The Messianic Kingdom

IX. The Eternal State

Conclusion

Chapter XXV. Predicted Events in Their Order

I. Noah's Prediction Respecting his Sons

II. Israel's Bondage in Egypt

III. The Future of Jacob's Sons

IV. Israel in the Land

V. Israel's Captivies

VI. Judgments to Fall Upon Surrounding Nations VII. A Partial Restoration

VIII. The Coming and Ministry of John the Baptist IX. The Birth of Christ

X. The Offices of Christ

1. Prophet 2. Priest
3. King

XI. The Ministries of Christ XII. The Death of Chrish

XIII. The Burial of Christ

XIV. The Resurrection of Christ

XV. The Ascension of Christ

XVI. The Present Age

XVII. The Day of Pentecost

XVIII. The Church

XIX. The Destruction of Jerusalem

XX. The Last Days for the Church

XXI. The First Resurrection

XXII. The Rapture of Living Saints

XXIII. The Church in Heaven

XXIV. The Believer's Rewards

XXV. The Marriage of the Lamb

XXVI. The Great Tribulation Per Se

XXVII. The Appearing of the Man of Sin

XXVIII. Israel's Final Sufferings

XXIX. The Destruction of Ecclesiastical Babylon XXX. The Battle of Armageddon

XXXI. The Destruction of Political and Commercial Babylon XXXII. The Day of the Lord Per Se

XXXIII. The Second Coming of Christ Per Se

XXXIV. Satan Bound and Confined

XXXV. The Regathering and Judgment of Sorrowing Israel XXXVI. The Judgment of the Nations

XXXVII. Human Life in the Earthly Kingdom

XXXVIII. The Loosing of Satan and the Last Revolt XXXIX. The Doom of Satan

XL. The Passing of the Present Earth and Heaven XLI. The Great White Throne Judgment

XLII. The Destiny of the Wicked

XLIII. The Creation of a New Heaven and a New Earth XLIV. The Destiny of the Saved

XLV. The Day of God

XLVI. Conclusion

Chapter XXVI. The Judgments

I. The Divine Judgments Through the Cross

1. The Judgment of the Sin of the World 2. The Judgment of the Believer's Sin Nature
3. The Judgment of Satan through the Cross

II. The Self-Judgment of the Believer and the Chastening Judgments of God III. The Judgment of the Believer's Works

IV. The Judgment of Israel

V. The Judgment of the Nations

VI. The Judgment of Angels

VII. The Judgment of the Great White Throne

Conclusion

CHAPTER XXVII. THE ETERNAL STATE

I. THE INTERMEDIATE STATE

1. Two Important Words of Location 2. The Doctrine of Sleep
3. An Intermediate Body

II. THE CREATURES OF GOD WHO ENTER THE ETERNAL STATE 1. Unfallen Angels 2. Fallen Angels

3. Saved Gentiles
4. Unsaved Gentiles
5. Gentiles of the Kingdom
6. Gentiles Debarred from the Kingdom
7. Jews in the Kingdom
8. Jews Excluded from the Kingdom
9. Jews Saved by Entry into the Church
10. Jews Condemned for Rejecting the Gospel
11. The Unsaved as a Whole
12. The Christians

III. VARIOUS SPHERES OF EXISTENCE IV. Theories Relating to a Future State

1. Death as Cessation of Existence 2. Transmigration of the Soul
3. Conditional Immortality
4. Universalism
5. Restitutionism or Reconciliationism
6. Rome's Purgatory
7. Nirvana

V. THE NEW EARTH VI. The Doctrine of Hell

VII. THE DOCTRINE OF HEAVEN

1. The Informed Witnesses a. Christ
   b. Paul
   c. John
2. The Future Estate of the Redeemed
3. Heaven the Suitable Abode of God and His People 4. Some Essential Features of Heaven
   a. An Abundant Life
   b. Rest

c. Knowledge
d. Holiness
e. Service
f. Worship
g. Glory

5. The Third Heaven

VIII. CONCLUSION Ecclesiology

Chapter I

Introduction to Ecclesiology

THIS, THE SIXTH major division of Systematic Theology, contemplates the New Testament doctrine of the Church. Because of the permitted intrusion of compromises with the pagan world and the attending overlordship of ecclesiasticism which came in the third and fourth centuries, things which have continued to some extent to the present hour, an extended introduction which essays to clarify a number of distinctions is in order. In this preliminary word some features to which reference is made only in part are to be considered more completely in the following main thesis of Ecclesiology.

Two separate, dissimilar, and unmistakable revelations were given to the Apostle Paul, namely: (1) that, through the death and resurrection of Christ, a perfect and eternal salvation into a heavenly state is provided for, and offered to, both Jew and Gentile alike and on the sole condition of saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Of this revelation the Apostle writes: “But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Gal. 1:11–12). The importance of this revealed gospel is reflected in the warnings respecting judgment that must fall upon those who misstate this gospel. Such warnings should occasion consternation in the minds of all who venture forth as preachers of the gospel. It is written: “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed” (Gal. 1:8–9). The unique and incomparable character of the gospel is directly declared by the Apostle when he says by inspiration that it is a specific revelation, and is implied in the warnings which demand the preservation of its purity by those who proclaim it. This gospel of divine grace was lost to view during the dark centuries in which the corruption of Rome was unrestrained. It was given to Martin Luther, with his colleagues, to restore

the main features of this gospel and these features have been the cherished possessions of Protestants from Reformation days. (2) Just as definitely and as supernaturally a second revelation was given to the Apostle Paul and this disclosure concerns the divine purpose in the present age. It is the substance of Ecclesiology. He writes: “For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ) which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel” (Eph. 3:1–6). On this passage Dr. C. I. Scofield publishes the following note: “That the Gentiles were to be *saved* was no mystery (Rom. 9:24–33; 10:19–21). The mystery ‘hid in God’ was the divine purpose to make of Jew and Gentile a wholly new thing—‘the church, which is his [Christ’s] body,’ formed by the baptism with the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:12–13) and in which the earthly distinction of Jew and Gentile disappears (Eph. 2:14–15; Col. 3:10–11). The revelation of this mystery, which was foretold but not explained by Christ (Matt. 16:18), was committed to Paul. In his writings alone we find the doctrine, position, walk, and destiny of the church” (*The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1252).

A Scriptural conception of the truth respecting the Church demands the background of an accurate understanding of important distinctions concerning God’s creatures, and concerning God’s times and seasons, as well as a right understanding of the precise character of the Church itself.

I. The Creatures of God Viewed Dispensationally

The Bible is God’s one and only Book. In it He discloses facts of eternity as well as of time, of heaven and hell as well as of earth, of Himself as well as of His creatures, and of His purposes in all creation. The reader of the Scriptures should be prepared to discover revelation which at times deals with other beings and their destiny quite apart from himself. The Bible presents the origin, present estate, and destiny of four major classes of rational beings in the universe, namely, the angels, the Gentiles, the Jews,

and the Christians. Nothing could be more germane to true Biblical interpretation than the observance of this fact, that these divisions of rational beings continue what they are throughout their history. The revealed divine program for each of these groups will here be traced in brief.

1. The Angels. The angels are created beings (Ps. 148:2–5; Col. 1:16); their abode is in heaven (Matt. 24:36); their activity is both on earth and in heaven (Ps. 103:20; Luke 15:10; Heb. 1:14); and their destiny is in the celestial city (Heb. 12:22; Rev. 21:12). They remain angels throughout their existence. They neither propagate nor do they die. There is no reason for confusing the angels with any other creatures in God's universe. Even though they fall, as in the case of Satan and the demons, they are still classed as angels (Matt. 25:41).

2. The Gentiles. As for their racial stock, the Gentiles had their origin in Adam and their federal headship is in him. They have partaken of the fall, and, though they are the subjects of prophecy which predicts that they will yet share, as a subordinate people, with Israel in her coming kingdom glory (Isa. 2:4; 60:3, 5, 12; 62:2; Acts 15:17), they, with respect to their estate in the period from Adam to Christ, are under a fivefold indictment, namely, "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12). With the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Spirit, the door of gospel privilege was opened unto the Gentiles (Acts 10:45; 11:17–18; 13:47–48), and out of them God is now calling an elect company (Acts 15:14). Their new proffered blessings in this age do not consist in being permitted to share in Israel's earthly covenants, which even Israel is not now enjoying; but rather, through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, they are privileged to be partakers of a heavenly citizenship and glory. It is revealed that the mass of Gentiles will not in this age enter by faith into these heavenly riches. Therefore, this people, designated as "the nations," go on, and at the end of their stewardship as earth-rulers, which is the termination of "the times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24; cf. Dan. 2:36–44), they of that generation will, at the end of the tribulation period (cf. Matt. 24:8–31 with 25:31–46), be called

upon to stand before the Messiah King, seated on the throne of His glory (Matt. 25:31–32) here on the earth. At that time, some who are found on the left and who are designated “the goats” will be dismissed into “everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels,” but those who are found on His right, who are designated as “sheep,” will be ushered into “the kingdom” prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:31–46). The basis of this judgment and its disposition of each of these groups, who together represent the sum total of that generation of the Gentile nations, will be meritorious to the last degree. The “sheep” enter the kingdom and the “goats” the lake of fire on the sole issue of their treatment of a third group whom Christ designates “my brethren.” This context does not bear out the interpretation that this is a description of a last and final judgment when all saved people of all the ages are ushered into heaven; for the saved, each and every one, when departing this world are immediately present with the Lord in heaven (Acts 7:55–56; 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23); and who, according to such an interpretation, would answer to “my brethren”? The scene is at the close of the great tribulation (Matt. 24:21) after the removal of the Church from the earth, and at a time when nations will be divided over the Semitic question. The issue is one regarding what nations will be chosen to enter Israel’s Messianic kingdom on the earth. The destiny of the Gentiles is further revealed when it is declared concerning the city which, after the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, comes down from God out of heaven (Rev. 3:12; 21:2, 10), that “the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. … And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it” (Rev. 21:24–26). The term “the nations of them which are saved” could not refer to the Church for her destiny is not earthly, neither is she ever termed “the nations,” nor does she include the kings of the earth in her number. In this same context, the city itself is said to be “the bride, the Lamb’s wife,” which is the Church (Rev. 21:2, 9–10). Thus it is disclosed that—in spite of the fact that a dispensation of world-rule is committed unto them, that in this age the gospel is preached unto them with its offers of heavenly glory, that in the coming age they share the blessings of the kingdom with Israel, and that they appear in the future ages—they remain Gentiles, in contradistinction to the one nation Israel, to the end of the

picture; and there is no defensible ground for diverting or misapplying this great body of Scripture bearing on the Gentiles.

3. The Jews. Whatever Abraham was nationally before he was called of God, it is certain that God set him apart and through him secured a race so distinct in its individuality, that from the time of the Exodus to the end of the record of their history they are held as antipodal of all other nations combined. Whatever Abraham's distinctive physical characteristics acteristics may have been, it is certain that his spiritual characteristics were far removed from those of the idolatrous heathen among whom he was reared, and the race which sprang from him through Isaac and Jacob has ever been unique both with regard to spiritual values and physical appearance.

Following the first eleven chapters of Genesis wherein the first third of human history is recorded and which concern a period when there was but one division of the human family on the earth, the record enters upon the second third of human history, which period extends from Abraham to Christ. In a usual edition of the Bible totaling 1,351 pages, 1,132 bear almost exclusively upon this second period, and concern the physical seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. During this extended period there are two divisions of humanity on the earth, but the Gentile is then considered only in the light of his relation to Israel. Israel is set apart as an elect nation. Her specific divine favors are enumerated thus: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen" (Rom. 9:4–5). Out of the covenants Jehovah has made with Israel, five eternal features are dominant—a national entity (Jer. 31:36), a land in perpetuity (Gen. 13:15), a throne (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:36), a king (Jer. 33:21), and a kingdom (Dan. 7:14). Though Jehovah reserves the right to chasten even to the extent of scattering His people through all the nations, their land being trodden down of Gentiles and their throne vacant for a time, yet His eternal purposes cannot fail. This people are to be regathered and the land will be possessed forever (Deut. 30:1–6; Jer. 23:5–8; Ezek. 37:21–25). Their rightful King, the Son of David, will occupy the Davidic throne *forever* (Ps. 89:34–37; Isa. 9:6–7; Jer. 33:17;

Luke 1:31–33; Rev. 11:15). Each of the two major passages on the virgin birth of Christ—one in the Old Testament (Isa. 7:14 with 9:6–7) and one in the New Testament (Luke 1:31–33)—record the prediction, in addition to the virgin birth, that Christ will occupy the Davidic throne forever.

According to very much prophecy, the anticipated Messiah would come as a resistless Lion and as a sacrificial Lamb. Peter testifies to the perplexity of the prophets over this seeming paradox (1 Pet. 1:10–11). Isaiah blends the events connected with the two advents into one vast, all-inclusive expectation (Isa. 61:1–5); and even the angel Gabriel was not permitted to disclose the fact of two advents separated by the present age, but refers to the events of both advents as though they belonged to one uninterrupted program (Luke 1:31–33). However, to David were given two important revelations, namely, (a) that God's eternal Son would die a sacrificial death (Ps. 22:1–21; 69:20–21), and (b) that He would occupy David's throne forever (2 Sam. 7:16–29; Ps. 89:34–37). David reasoned that if God's Son was to occupy the throne forever He must first die and be raised again from the dead and thus be free to reign forever. This conclusion on the part of David was one of the most vital features of Peter's Pentecostal sermon (Acts 2:25–36), in which he is proving that the Lord Jesus is, in spite of His death, the eternal Messiah to Israel. Thus it was disclosed that the Son of David would first die and then be raised again, that the Davidic promise of an eternal occupant of David's throne might be fulfilled. However, it was as definitely predicted that Christ would at His first advent offer Himself to Israel as their King, not in the role of a resistless conquering monarch, as He will yet come (Rev. 19:15–16), but "meek" and "lowly" (Zech. 9:9; cf. Matt. 21:5). Yet in spite of prediction that Christ would make a precross offer of Himself to Israel as their King, coming in "lowly guise," antidispensationalists refer to the belief which dispensationalists hold—that Christ offered the kingdom to Israel and that it was rejected and postponed—as a theory characterized by intricacies and impossible. They state that this theory seriously minimizes the value and centrality of the cross in Bible revelation. These men are Calvinists, yet they are disturbed over the seeming conflict between divine sovereignty and human will. If the ground of their objection to the "postponement theory" stands, then there was no assurance that there would be a Jewish nation until Abraham made his decision to obey God; there was no certainty that Christ would be born until

Mary gave her consent; there was no assurance that Christ would die until Pilate so ordered. In the light of two determining facts, namely, that Jehovah's Lamb was in the redeeming purpose slain from the foundation of the world and that had Adam *not* sinned there could have been no need of a redeemer, why did Jehovah tell Adam *not* to sin? And what would have become of the redemptive purpose had Adam obeyed God? These objections to the so-called postponement theory do not take into consideration the fact of the divinely purposed test involved and the necessary postponement resulting from the failure under testing, the failure itself being anticipated. These are evidently very serious problems for some Calvinists to face. If it be claimed that the birth and death of Christ were predicted and therefore made sure, it is equally true that the precross offer of the earthly Messianic kingdom to Israel by her Messiah in the days of His "lowly guise" was also made sure by *prediction*. It is equally made sure by prediction that Christ would be crucified, which was Israel's official rejection of their King (Ps. 118:22–24 with 1 Pet. 2:6–8; Matt. 21:42–45; Luke 19:14, 27; Acts 4:10–12), be raised from the dead (Ps. 16:8–10), and ultimately sit on David's earthly throne and reign over the house of Jacob forever (Isa. 9:6–7; Matt. 2:6; Luke 1:31–33). The prophet declared of Christ that He would be "despised and rejected of men," and John states, "He came unto his own, but his own [Israel] received him not" (John 1:11). The truth set forth in this last passage is of utmost importance. The "rejection" on the part of the nation Israel was not the personal rejection of a crucified and risen Savior as He is now rejected when the gospel is refused. It was a nation to whom a Messiah King was promised, rejecting their King. They did not say, "We will not believe on this Savior for the saving of our souls"; but they did say in effect, "We will not have this man to reign over us." This distinction is important since it determines the precise character of their sin.

Two years after their departure from Egypt, God offered to Israel an entrance into their land at Kadesh-barnea. They rejected the offer. God knew they would reject it, yet it was a bona fide offer He made to them. Yea, it was in the divine counsel that they would reject, become guilty of that specific sin, and, as a punishment, be returned to thirtyeight more years of wilderness experience. After that, they were taken into the land by His sovereign hand without a question concerning their own wishes. Since He

had worked in their hearts to do His good pleasure, they went in with songs of rejoicing. This history is allegorical, if not typical. The two years of wilderness experience preceding the offer at Kadesh are typical of the six hundred years Israel had been out of their kingdom when Christ came. The rejection of the divine offer at Kadesh is typical of the rejection of Christ. A possible entrance into the land at Kadesh was a bona fide offer to Israel made by Jehovah in the full knowledge that they would reject it, and in spite of the fact that His eternal purpose required them to reject the offer and return to thirtyeight more years of trial. Had the salvation of the world hung on the added years of trial after Kadesh, hesitating Calvinists would shrink back from admitting that the Kadesh offer was ever made, or, if made, was genuine. All would be branded as a theory characterized by intricacies and impossible. The added thirty-eight years are typical of Israel's present condition as a people yet deprived of their land and the blessings of their covenants. The entrance of Israel into the land by sovereign power is typical of the final restoration of that nation to their inheritance which Jehovah covenanted to them as an everlasting possession (Gen. 13:14–17). That Israel will yet be regathered into her own land is the burden of about twenty Old Testament predictions beginning with Deuteronomy 30:3. The death of Christ is neither incidental, accidental, nor fortuitous. It is the central truth of the Bible and the central fact of the universe. It was also in the purpose of God that Christ's death should be accomplished by Israel as their act of rejecting their King. It is also true that they did not and could not reject what was not first offered to them. In the present unforeseen age—which is bounded by the two advents of Christ and properly termed intercalary, in the sense that it is unforeseen in the divine program for the Jews as reflected in the prophecies concerning them and not accounted for in the Gentile program of successive monarchies symbolized by the colossal image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream—the Jews, like the Gentiles, are, as individuals, shut up to the message of the gospel of saving grace through faith in Christ. The agelong Jewish advantage because of divine election is, for an age, set aside and the Apostle declares, "There is no difference." They are as individuals alike "under sin" (Rom. 3:9), and as individuals alike in that God is rich in mercy to all that call upon Him (Rom. 10:12). This is a new message to Gentiles and equally new to Jews. The divine favor proffered to Gentiles does not consist in offering them a

share in the national blessings of Israel, nor does it provide a way whereby the Jew may realize the specific features of his national covenants. Though present salvation is into the kingdom of God (John 3:3), no earthly kingdom is now being offered to any people. Colossians 1:13 is no exception. Should the present king of Great Britain marry a woman of another nation he would bring her into his kingdom, not as a subject, but as a consort. The present divine purpose is the outcalling from both Jews and Gentiles of that company who are the Bride of Christ, who are, therefore, each and every one to partake of His standing, being in Him, to be like Him, and to reign with Him on the earth (Rev. 20:4, 6; 22:5). To the nation Israel Christ is Messiah, Emmanuel, and King; to the Church He is Head, Bridegroom, and Lord, the last designation connoting His sovereign authority over the Church. These statements, admittedly dogmatic, are easily verified.

At the end of this age, Israel must pass through the great tribulation, which is specifically characterized as “the time of Jacob’s trouble” (Jer. 30:4–7; Dan. 12:1; Matt. 24:21); and, before entering her kingdom, she must come before her King in judgment. Of this event Ezekiel writes: “I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered. … And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me” (Ezek. 20:34–38. The entire context should be considered,33–44. Cf., also, Isa. 1:24–26; Ps. 50:1–7; Mal. 3:2–5; 4:1–2). Israel’s judgments are likewise described by Christ in Matthew 24:15—25:30. That this Scripture refers to Israel is certain from the fact that the Church does not come into judgment (John 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 8:1, R.V., 38–39), and that the description of the judgment of the nations does not begin until verse 31. It therefore follows that Israel’s judgments are in view in the passage in question. The incomparable tribulation is ended by the glorious return of Christ to the earth (Ps. 2:1–9; Isa. 63:1–6; Matt. 24:27–31; 2 Thess. 2:3–12; Rev. 19:11–21); Israel’s judgments, according to the context of Matthew 24:30—25:30, follow the glorious appearing of Christ; and the judgment of the nations occurs when He is seated on the throne of His glory (Matt. 25:31–32).

The Day of Jehovah, which extended period occupies so large a part of Old Testament prophecy, begins with the judgments of Jehovah in the earth, above mentioned, and continues on including the return of Christ to the

earth and all the millennial glory for Israel and the Gentiles. Zechariah 14:1–21 predicts the beginning of that long period, while 2 Peter 3:4–15 (note, in this connection, Peter declares “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day”) and Revelation 20:7–15 describe the end of that period. The whole extended “day” is characterized by the presence of Christ reigning on the earth with His Bride, by Satan being bound and in the abyss, and by the realization on Israel’s part of all the glory and blessedness promised that people in Jehovah’s covenants with them. More space than this introduction may claim would be required to quote even the major prophecies bearing on this theme (cf. Ps. 45:8–17; 72:1–20; Isa. 11:1–12:6; 54:1–55:13; 60:1–66:24; Jer. 23:5–8; 31:1–40; 33:1–26; Ezek. 34:11–31; 36:16–38; 37:1–14; 40:1–48:35; Dan. 2:44–45; 7:13–14; Zech. 14:1–21; Mal. 4:1–6). These promises are all of an earthly glory and concern a land which Jehovah has given as an everlasting possession to His elect people, Israel, to whom He said, “I have loved thee with an everlasting love” (Jer. 31:3). Little consideration, indeed, is given to the confusion or inconsistencies which arise when, under a spiritualizing method of interpretation, these blessings which are adddressed to the elect nation and related to their land and King are applied to an elect heavenly people called out from all nations to whom no land has ever been given, and who are not now or at any future time said to be subjects of the King. There is no scholarly reason for applying the Scriptures which bear upon the past, the present, or the future of Israel to any other people than that nation of whom these Scriptures speak. The real unity of the Bible is preserved only by those who observe with care the divine program for Gentiles, for Jews, and for Christians in their individual and unchanging continuity.

4. The Christians. The current and last third of human history, extending from the first advent of Christ to the present hour, is characterized by three widely different classes of people dwelling together on the earth. As in the preceding age, all divine purpose centered about the Jew, and the Gentile was in evidence only as he was related to Israel, so in this age the divine purpose centers in the new group which is present, and the Jew and the Gentile are seen only as those to whom the gospel is to be preached alike and from whom this new elect company is being called out by a spiritual birth of each individual who believes to the saving of his soul.

The Scriptures addressed specifically to this company are: the Gospel by John—especially the Upper Room Discourse—the Acts, and the Epistles. The Synoptic Gospels, though on the surface presenting a simple narrative, are, nevertheless, a field for careful, discriminating study on the part of the true expositor. In these Gospels Christ is seen as loyal to and vindicating the Mosaic Law under which He lived; He also anticipates the kingdom age in connection with the offer of Himself as Israel's King; and, when His rejection is indicated, He announces His death and resurrection and the expectation concerning a heavenly people (Matt. 16:18) for whom He gave Himself in redeeming love (Eph. 5:25–27). An extensive body of Scripture declares directly or indirectly that the present age is unforeseen and intercalary in its character and in it a new humanity appears on the earth with an incomparable new headship in the resurrected Christ, which company is being formed by the regenerating power of the Spirit. It is likewise revealed that there is now "no difference" between Jews and Gentiles generally, either with respect to their need of salvation (Rom. 3:9) or the specific message to be preached to them (Rom. 10:12). It is seen, also, that in this new body wherein Jews and Gentiles are united by a common salvation, the middle wall of partition—the agelong enmity between Jew and Gentile—is broken down, itself having been "slain" by Christ on the cross, thus making peace (Eph. 2:14–18). In fact, all former distinctions are lost, those thus saved having come upon new ground where there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but where Christ is all, and in all (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11). The New Testament also records that the individual Christian, being indwelt by Christ, now possesses eternal life and its hope of glory (Col. 1:27), and, being in Christ, is enriched with the perfect standing of Christ, since all that Christ is—even the righteousness of God—is imputed unto him. The Christian is thus already constituted a heavenly citizen (Phil. 3:20) and, being raised with Christ (Col. 3:1–3), and seated with Christ (Eph. 2:6), belongs to another sphere—so definitely, indeed, that Christ can say of the Christian, "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John 17:14, 16; cf. 15:18–19). It is likewise to be observed that, since this spiritual birth and heavenly position in Christ are supernatural, they are, of necessity, wrought by God alone, and that human cooperation is excluded, the only responsibility imposed on the human side being that of faith which trusts in the only One who is able to save. To this

heavenly people, who are the New Creation of God (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15), is committed, not in any corporate sense but only as individuals, a twofold responsibility, namely, (a) to adorn by a Christlike life the doctrine which they represent by the very nature of their salvation, and (b) to be His witnesses to the uttermost parts of the earth. It is similarly believed that the Scriptures which direct the Christian in his holy walk and service are adapted to the fact that he is not now striving to secure a standing with God, but is already "accepted in the beloved" (Eph. 1:6), and has attained unto every spiritual blessing (Eph. 1:3; Col. 2:10). It is evident that no human resource could enable any person to arise to the fulfillment of these heaven-high responsibilities and that God, anticipating the believer's inability to walk worthy of the calling wherewith he is called, has freely bestowed His empowering Spirit to indwell each and every one who is saved. Of this same heavenly company it is declared that they, when their elect number is complete, will be removed from this earth. The bodies of those that have died will be raised and living saints will be translated (1 Cor. 15:20–57; 1 Thess. 4:13–17). In glory, the individuals who comprise this company will be judged as regards their rewards for service (1 Cor. 3:9–15; 9:18–27; 2 Cor. 5:10–11), be married to Christ (Rev. 19:7–9), and then return *with* Him to share as His consort in His reign (Luke 12:35–36; Jude 1:14–15; Rev. 19:11–16). This New Creation people, like the angels, Israel, and the Gentiles, may be traced on into the eternity to come (Heb. 12:22–24; Rev. 21:1–22:5). But, it will be remembered, the Christian possesses no land (Ex. 20:12; Matt. 5:5); no house (Matt. 23:38; Acts 15:16), though of the household of God; no earthly capital or city (Isa. 2:1–4; Ps. 137:5–6); no earthly throne (Luke 1:31–33); no earthly kingdom (Acts 1:6–7); no king to whom he is subject (Matt. 2:2), though Christians may speak of Christ as "the King" (1 Tim. 1:17; 6:15); and no altar other than the cross of Christ (Heb. 13:10–14).

II. Scripture Doctrine Viewed Dispensationally

A true religion consists in a specific relationship, with its corresponding responsibilities, divinely set up between God and man. There is no revelation of any distinctive relation having been set up either between God and the angels or between God and the Gentiles which partakes of the

character of a true religion, but God has entered into relation with the Jew, which results in Judaism, or what the Apostle identifies as the religion of the Jews (Acts 26:5; Gal. 1:13; cf. James 1:26–27), and with the Christian, which results in Christianity, or what the New Testament writers designate as "the faith" (Jude 1:3) and "this way" (Acts 9:2; 22:4; cf. 18:26; 2 Pet. 2:2). Judaism and Christianity have much in common; each is ordained of God to serve a specific purpose. They incorporate similar features—God, man, righteousness, sin, redemption, salvation, human responsibility, and human destiny—but these similarities do not establish identity since the dissimilarities, to be enumerated partially later, far outnumber the similarities. There are remarkable points of likeness between the laws of Great Britain and the laws of the United States, but this fact does not constitute these two nations one.

A complete religious system provides at least seven distinctive features, all of which are present both in Judaism and in Christianity. These features are: (1) an acceptable standing on the part of man before God, (2) a manner of life consistent with that standing, (3) a divinely appointed service, (4) a righteous ground whereon God may graciously forgive and cleanse the erring, (5) a clear revelation of the responsibility on the human side upon which divine forgiveness and cleansing may be secured, (6) an effective basis upon which God may be worshiped and petitioned in prayer, and (7) a future hope.

1. An Acceptable Standing on the Part of Man Before God. Whatever may have been the divine method of dealing with individuals before the call of Abraham and the giving of the Law by Moses, it is evident that, with the call of Abraham and the giving of the Law and all that has followed, there are two widely different, standardized, divine provisions, whereby man, who is utterly fallen, might stand in the favor of God.

a. Divine Grace Upon Israel. Apart from the privilege accorded proselytes of joining the congregation of Israel—which seemed to bear little fruitage—entrance into the right to share in the covenants of blessing designed for the earthly people was and is by *physical* birth. It was no vain boast when the Apostle declared of himself that he was "of the stock of Israel" (Phil. 3:5), nor is there any uncertain generalization in the statement that Christ "was a minister of the circumcision … to confirm the promises made unto the

fathers" (Rom. 15:8). The national blessings of Israel are recorded thus: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came" (Rom. 9:4–5). Though they went down into Egypt a family, they came out a nation and Jehovah redeemed them as a nation unto Himself both by blood and by power. It was not an individual redemption since it was not restricted to that generation; but Israel remains a redeemed nation throughout all her history. On the human side, the Passover lamb saved the physical life of Israel's first-born. On the divine side, the lamb, as an anticipation of God's perfect Lamb, gave Jehovah freedom to redeem a nation forever. That Israel was already in Jehovah's favor is revealed in Exodus 8:23; 9:6, 26; 10:23. The redeemed nation became Jehovah's abiding treasure (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 4:32–40; Ps. 135:4). What Jehovah has covenanted to His elect nation is one thing, and what He covenants to individuals within that nation is quite another thing. The national entity has been and will be preserved forever according to covenant promise (Isa. 66:22; Jer. 31:35–37; Gen. 17:7–8). The individual Israelite, on the other hand, was subject to a prescribed and regulated conduct which carried with it a penalty of individual judgment for every failure (Deut. 28:58–62; Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 24:51; 25:12, 30). The national standing (but not necessarily the spiritual state) of each Israelite was secured by physical birth. Some of that nation did by faithfulness attain to more personal blessing than others of the nation (cf. Luke 2:25, 37), and some gloried in their tribal relationship (cf. Phil. 3:5); but these things added nothing to their rights within their covenants, which rights were secured to each and every one alike by physical birth.

b. Divine Grace Upon Christians. The heavenly people, whether taken individually from either Jewish or Gentile stock, attain immediately by faith unto a standing as perfect as that of Christ, which standing is secured by a *spiritual* birth and all the saving operations of God which accompany it. They are individually redeemed by the blood of Christ; born of the Spirit into a relationship in which God becomes their Father and they become His legitimate sons and heirs—even jointheirs with Christ. Through the regenerating work of the Spirit they have Christ begotten in them (Col. 1:

27), and receive the divine nature which is eternal life (Rom. 6:23). They are forgiven all trespasses to such a degree that they will never come into condemnation (Col. 2:13; John 3:18; Rom. 8:1, RV.), and justified forever (Rom. 3:21—5:11). They died in Christ's death (Rom. 6:1–10); they rose in Christ's resurrection (Col. 3:1–3); and they are seated with Christ in the heavenlies (Eph. 2:6). By the baptizing work of the Spirit they are "joined to the Lord" (Rom. 6:1–7; 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27) and, being thus in Christ, their standing before God is no less than the perfection of Christ in whom they are accepted (2 Cor. 5:21; Eph. 1:6). Being in Christ, they are one in each other in a mystic union which is both incomparable and incomprehensible—a unity like that within the blessed Trinity (John 17:21–23). They are already constituted citizens of heaven (Phil. 3:20). These blessings are not only as exalted and spiritual as heaven itself and eternal, but they are secured apart from all human merit at the instant one believes on Christ to the saving of the soul. Any Bible student can verify the assertion which is here made that not one of these distinctive characteristics of a Christian, and the list here presented could be greatly extended, is ever said to belong to Israel as such either as individuals or nationally; and almost none of these spiritual blessings are predicated of any individual before the death and resurrection of Christ. The Upper Room Discourse (John 13:1—17:26), though spoken before the death of Christ, is, nevertheless, a record in anticipation of all that would be after His death and even after Pentecost.

2. A Divinely Specified Manner of Life. Quite apart from the revealed will of God as recorded of earlier ages, the Bible sets forth at length three distinct and complete divine rulings which govern human action. None of these rulings are addressed to the angels or to the Gentiles as such. Two are addressed to Israel—one in the age that is past, known as the Mosaic Law, and the other the setting forth of the terms of admission into, and the required conduct in, the Messianic kingdom when that kingdom is set up in the earth. The third is addressed to Christians and provides divine direction in this age for the heavenly people who are already perfected, with respect to standing, in Christ Jesus. Since the Bible is God's one book for all the ages, it should be no more difficult to recognize its references to future ages than to recognize its reference to completed past ages. These three rules of

life do present widely different economies. This is evident both from their distinctive characteristics as set forth in the Word of God and from the very nature of the case. Concerning the nature of the case, it may be said that the divine administration in the earth could not be the same after the death of Christ, after His resurrection, after His ascension and the inauguration of His present ministry, after the advent of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, and after the ad interim disannulling of Judaism, as it was before those events. Nor could the divine administration be the same after the removal of the Church from the earth, after the regathering of Israel and the restoration of Judaism, after the judgment of the nations, after the binding of Satan, and after the seating of Christ at His second advent on David's throne to rule over the whole earth, as it is now before those events occur.

Since the faith of some cannot be extended to the point of visualizing unfulfilled prophecy into reality, it might be the part of wisdom to restrict this argument to the first group of events, namely, those which form a cleavage between the past age and the present age. Because of the fact that these events are now history (though at one time they were predictive prophecy) their reality is hardly disputed even by the unregenerate man. Nevertheless the second group of events, which separate the present age from the age to come, are the keys to the understanding of God's kingdom purposes in the earth, and without these keys the casual reader is left with little else to do other than to fall in with the Romish fiction of a world-conquering church under a supposed supremacy of an irresistible kingdom of God on the earth. No doubt will be raised by any intelligent Christian concerning the truth that it is within the range of divine power to transform society in this age, or at any other time. The question is really one of whether worldtransformation *is* the divine purpose for this age; and until the one who believes that this is the divine purpose has made a reasonable exposition and disposition in harmony with his views of the vast body of Scripture that discloses the confusion and wickedness with which this age is said to end, there is little to be gained by accusing those who believe God's present purposes to be the outcalling of the Church of "dishonoring the Spirit of God," or of "minimizing the value of the cross." Especially is such a charge without force when it is known that those so accused believe that all of God's triumph in this and every age will be only by virtue of that cross.

The Mosaic system was designed to govern Israel in the land and was an ad interim form of divine government between that gracious administration described in Exodus 19:4, and the coming of Christ (John 1:17; Rom. 4:9–16; Gal. 3:19–25). It was in three parts, namely, (a) "the commandments," which governed Israel's moral life (Ex. 20:1–17); (b) "the judgments," which governed Israel's civic life (Ex. 21:1–24:11); and (c) "the ordinances," which governed Israel's religious life (Ex. 24:12–31:18). These provisions were holy, just, and good (Rom. 7:12, 14), but they carried a penalty (Deut. 28:58–62) and, because they were not kept by Israel, they became a "ministration of death" (Rom. 7:10; 2 Cor. 3:7). The law was not of faith, but of works (Gal. 3:12). It was ordained unto life (Rom. 7:10), but because of the weakness of the flesh of those to whom it made its appeal (Rom. 8:3), there was, as a practical result, no law given which could give life (Gal. 3:21). The law did, however, serve as the παιδαγωγός, or child-conductor, to lead to Christ—both immediately, as Christ was foreshadowed in the sacrifices, and dispensationally, as described in Galatians 3:23–25. Though almost every intrinsic value contained in the law system is carried forward and incorporated into the present grace system, it still remains true that the law as an ad interim system did come to its end and a new divine economy superseded it. No more decisive language could be employed on this point than is used in John 1:17; Romans 6:14; 7:2–6; 10:4; 2 Corinthians 3:6–13; Galatians 3:23–25; 5:18. These Scriptures should not be slighted, as they too often are, by those who would impose the law system upon the heavenly people. It is useless to claim that it was the judgments and ordinances that were done away and that the commandments abide, since it is that which was "written and engraven in stones" which is said to have been "done away" and "abolished" (2 Cor. 3:11, 13). Nor is the situation relieved for those who claim that the law has ceased as a means of justification; for it was never that, nor could it be (Gal. 3:11).

The heavenly people, by the very exalted character of their salvation being "made" to stand in all the perfection of Christ (Rom. 3:22; 5:1; 8:1; 10:4; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:22; Eph. 1:6), have no burden laid upon them of establishing personal merit before God since they are perfected forever in Christ (Heb. 10:9–14); but they do have the new responsibility of "walking worthy" of their high calling (Rom. 12:1–2; Eph. 4:1–3; Col. 3:1–3). No system of merit, such as was the law, could possibly be applied to a people

who by riches of divine grace have attained to a perfect standing, even every spiritual blessing in Christ Jesus (Eph. 1:3; Col. 2:10). It is to be expected that the injunctions addressed to a perfected heavenly people will be as exalted as heaven itself; and they are (cf. John 13:34; Rom. 6:11–13; 2 Cor. 10:3–5; Gal. 5:16; Eph. 4:30; 5:18). Similarly, as these requirements are superhuman and yet the doing of them is most essential, God has provided that each individual thus saved shall be indwelt by the Holy Spirit to the end that he may, by dependence on the Spirit and by the power of the Spirit, live a supernatural, God-honoring life—not, indeed, *to be* accepted, but because he *is* accepted. Those who would intrude the Mosaic system of merit into this heaven-high divine administration of superabounding grace either have no conception of the character of that merit which the law required, or are lacking in the comprehension of the glories of divine grace.

The third administration which is contained in the Bible is that which is designed to govern the earthly people in relation to their coming earthly kingdom. It is explicit, also, with regard to the requirements that are to be imposed upon those who enter that kingdom. This body of Scripture is found in the Old Testament portions which anticipate the Messianic kingdom and in large portions of the Synoptic Gospels. The essential elements of a grace administration—faith as the sole basis of acceptance with God, unmerited acceptance through a perfect standing in Christ, the present possession of eternal life, an absolute security from all condemnation, and the enabling power of the indwelling Spirit—are not found in the kingdom administration. On the other hand, it is declared to be the fulfilling of "the law and the prophets" (Matt. 5:17–18; 7:12), and is seen to be an extension of the Mosaic Law into realms of merit-seeking which blast and wither as the Mosaic system could never do (Matt. 5:20–48). These kingdom injunctions, though suited to the conditions that will then obtain, could perfect no one as men in Christ are now perfected, nor are they adapted as a rule of life for those already complete in Christ Jesus.

These systems do set up conflicting and opposing principles; but since these difficulties appear only when an attempt is made to coalesce systems, elements, and principles which God has separated, the conflicts really do not exist at all outside these unwarranted unifying efforts; in fact they rather demonstrate the necessity of a due recognition of all God's different and distinct administrations. The true unity of the Scriptures is not discovered

when one blindly seeks to fuse these opposing principles into one system, but rather it is found when God's plain differentiations are observed. The dispensationalist does not create these differences as he is sometimes accused of doing. The conflicting principles, in the text of Scripture, are observable to all who penetrate deep enough to recognize the essential features of divine administration. Instead of creating the problems, the dispensationalist is the one who has a solution for them. If the ideals of an earthly people for long life in the land which God gave unto them (Ex. 20:12; Ps. 37:3, 11, 34; Matt. 5:5) do not articulate with the ideals of a heavenly people who in respect to the earth are "strangers and pilgrims" and who are enjoined to be looking for and loving the imminent appearing of Christ, the problem is easily solved by the one whose system of interpretation is proved rather than distressed by such distinctions. A plan of interpretation—which, in defense of an ideal unity of the Bible, contends for a single divine purpose, ignores drastic contradictions, and is sustained only by occasional or accidental similarities—is doomed to confusion when confronted with the many problems which such a system imposes on the text of Scripture, which problems are recognized by the dispensationalist only as he observes them in the system which creates them.

All Scripture is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16), but all Scripture is not of primary application to a particular person or class of persons which the Bible designates as such. All Scripture is not of the angels, nor is it of the Gentiles. In like manner, all Scripture is not addressed to the Jew, nor is it all addressed to the Christian. These are obvious truths and the dispensationalist's plan of interpretation is none other than an attempt to be consistent in following these distinctions in the primary application of Scripture as far as, and no further than, the Bible carries them. However, all Scripture is profitable, that is, it has its moral, spiritual, or secondary application. To illustrate this: Much valuable truth may be gained from the great body of Scripture bearing on the Jewish Sabbath; but if that body of Scripture has a primary application to the Church, then the Church has no Biblical ground for the observance of the first day of the week (which she certainly has) and she could offer no excuse for her disobedience, and her individual members, like all Sabbath breakers, should be stoned to death (Num. 15:32–36). In like manner, if all Scripture is of primary application

to believers of this age then they are in danger of hell fire (Matt. 5:29–30), of unspeakable plagues, diseases, and sicknesses, and by reason of these to become few in number (Deut. 28:58–62), and to have the blood of lost souls required at their hands (Ezek. 3:17–18). Moral and spiritual lessons are to be drawn from God's dealing with Israelites, quite apart from the necessity being imposed upon Christians to comply with all that a primary application of the Scriptures specifically addressed to Israel would demand. Of the believer of this age it is said that "he … shall not come into condemnation [judgment]" (John 5:24), and "there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). These latter promises are disannulled by diametrically opposite declarations if all Scripture applies primarily to the Christian. Arminianism is the legitimate expression of this confusion and the would-be Calvinist who ignores the plain distinctions of the Bible has no defense against Arminian claims.

3. A Divinely Appointed Service. Service for God is an essential of any true religion. In the case of Judaism, service consisted in the maintenance of the tabernacle and temple ritual, and all tithes and offerings went to the support of the priesthood and their ministry. In the case of Christianity, service faces outward with its commission to preach the gospel to every creature and includes the edification of the saints.

4. A Righteous Ground Whereon God May Graciously Forgive and Cleanse the Erring. Any religious economy which is to continue must provide a ground upon which God is righteously free to forgive and restore those who fail. Being possessed—as all are—of a fallen nature, there is no possibility of anyone continuing in right relation to God who is not ever and always being renewed and restored by the gracious power of God. In the case of Judaism, God forgave sin and renewed His fellowship with them on the ground of His own certainty that a sufficient sacrifice would be made in due time by His Lamb. In the case of the Christian, God is said to be propitious concerning "our sins" (1 John 2:2), and this because of the fact that His Son has already borne the penalty (1 Cor. 15:3), and because of the fact that Christ as Advocate now appears for us when we sin (1 John 2:1). No more comforting truth can come to the Christian's heart than the assurance that God is now propitious concerning "our sins."

5. A Clear Revelation of the Responsibility on the Human Side Upon Which Divine Forgiveness and Cleansing May Be Secured. This aspect of this theme offers opportunity for several misunderstandings. In a general way, it will be recognized by all that the requirement on the human side was, in the Old Testament, the offering of an animal sacrifice, while in the New Testament, following the death of Christ—which event terminated all sacrifices—divine forgiveness for the believer is conditioned on confession of sin, which confession is the outward expression of an inward repentance. All this is natural and reasonable. However, certain complications arise when these obvious facts are considered in their relation to other phases of truth.

It is important to observe that in the Old Testament ages no provisions were made, so far as Scripture records, for Gentile needs. We recognize that Abel, Noah, Job, and Melchizedek sacrificed offerings for sin, yet no form of doctrine is disclosed regarding these offerings. On the other hand, the Jews, being a covenant people, were, when injured by sin, given the sacrifices as a basis for divine forgiveness and as a way back into those blessings and relationships belonging to their covenants. It must be observed that the sacrifices never constituted a ground for the entrance into the covenants, which ground was already secured by their physical birth, nor was any sacrifice the ground of personal salvation. On the contrary, the sacrifices for Israel served to provide a ground for forgiveness and restoration of covenant people. The parallel in Christianity is the provision through the death of Christ whereby the Christian may be forgiven and cleansed. Judaism required an animal sacrifice; Christianity looks back to the sacrifice already wrought. The only parallel in Judaism of the present salvation of an unregenerate person is the fact that the Jew was physically *born* into his covenant relations. The personal salvation of a Jew in the old order is a theme which is yet to be considered.

6. An Effective Basis Upon Which God May Be Worshiped and Petitioned in Prayer. Under this heading it is to be observed that the basis of appeal on which the Old Testament saints prayed was that of their covenants. A study of the recorded prayers will disclose the fact that they pleaded with Jehovah to observe and do what He had promised He would do. The ground of prayer in the New Testament after the death, resurrection,

and ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Spirit, is such that the new approach to God is in the *name* of Christ. Being in Christ, the believer's prayer arises to the Father as though it were the voice of Christ, and it is granted for Christ's sake. That this is new is indicated by the word of Christ when He said, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name" (John 16:24). By this statement all previous forms and appeals are set aside and the new appeal is established which is as immeasurable as infinity itself. We read, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you" (John 16:23).

7. A Future Hope. Judaism has its eschatology reaching on into eternity with covenants and promises which are everlasting. On the other hand, Christianity has its eschatology which is different at every point. Some of these contrasts are:

a. The Future of This Life. In the case of Israel, the thing to be desired was long life "upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee," whereas the Christian's hope is the prospect of the imminent coming of Christ to take away His Church from the earth. This he is taught to wait for, and he is told that he should love Christ's appearing. He has no land, nor has he any promise of earthly things beyond his personal need. In those Scriptures which warn Israel of the future coming of her Messiah, that nation is told that they should *watch* for His coming since that coming will be unexpected (Matt. 24:36–51; 25:13). Over against this and for the same reason, the Christian is told to *wait* for his Lord from heaven (1 Thess. 1:9–10).

b. Intermediate State. One passage reporting the words of Christ is about all that Judaism reveals on the intermediate state. This is found in Luke 16:19–31. The rich man is in torment, while the beggar is in "Abraham's bosom." The latter is a strongly Jewish conception and in contrast to the revelation that when the Christian departs this life he goes to be "with Christ; which is far better" (Phil. 1:23; cf. 2 Cor. 5:8).

c. Resurrection. Judaism contemplated a resurrection for Israel. In Daniel 12:1–3 we read that, following the great tribulation, Daniel's people will be raised from the dead. Some are to be raised to everlasting life and some to everlasting contempt. Rewards are also promised, for those "that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to

righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." That this refers to Daniel's people is clearly indicated in the context. Martha, voicing the Jewish hope, declared that her brother would be raised again in the resurrection at the last day (John 11:24). And in Hebrews 6:1–2, where Judaism's features are named, the resurrection of the dead is included. The doctrine of resurrection for the Christian is in two parts: (a) He has already been raised and seated (Eph. 2:6), and, having partaken of the resurrection life of Christ and being positionally in the value of all Christ has done, is said to be already raised from the dead (Col. 3:1–3), and (b) should he die, the believer's body is yet to be raised, and this at the coming of Christ for His own (1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:16–17). The believers will also be rewarded for faithfulness in service.

d. Eternal Life. The Old Testament saints were in right and acceptable relation to God, but it could not be said that they were in the new federal headship of the resurrected Christ, nor that their lives were "hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:1–3). The Apostle writes: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed" (Gal. 3:23). As for the estate of the Jew in the old dispensation it may be observed: (a) They were born into covenant relations with God wherein there were no limitations imposed upon their faith in Him or upon their fellowship with Him. This fact was itself a demonstration of superabounding grace. (b) In case of failure to meet the moral and spiritual obligations resting upon them because of their covenant position, the sacrifices were provided as a righteous basis of restoration to their covenant privileges, which fact is another demonstration of immeasurable grace. (c) The individual Jew might so fail in his conduct and so neglect the sacrifices as, in the end, to be disowned of God and cast out (Gen. 17:14; Deut. 28:58–61; Ezek. 3:18; Matt. 10:32–33; 24:50–51; 25:11–12, 29–30). (d) The national salvation and forgiveness of Israel is yet a future expectation and is promised to occur when the Deliverer comes out of Sion (Rom. 11:26–27). Who can fail to recognize the eternal grace of God revealed in Isaiah 60:1—62:12 toward Israel in all ages to come? If any clarity is to be gained on the difference between Israel's privileges under the Mosaic system and the present privileges of the Church, distinction must be made between the law as a *rule of life* which none were able to keep perfectly, and

the law as a *system* which not only set forth the high and holy demands upon personal conduct, but also provided complete divine forgiveness through the sacrifices. The final standing of any Jew before God was not based on law observance alone, but contemplated that Jew in the light of the sacrifices he had presented in his own behalf. All consideration of the doctrine of eternal life, whether in one age or another, must distinguish between mere endless existence and the impartation of that life from God which is as eternal in every aspect of it as is the Author Himself. No human being can ever cease to exist; even death, which appears to terminate life, in due time will be dismissed forever (1 Cor. 15:26; Rev. 21:4). Quite apart from the indisputable fact of the endless character of human existence, is God's gracious bestowment of eternal life, which eternal life is a vital part of the eschatology of Judaism as it is a vital part of the soteriology of Christianity. A very clear and comprehensive body of Scripture bears on eternal life as related to Judaism. However, it is there contemplated as an *inheritance*. The doctrine as related to Judaism is found in well-identified passages: (a) Isaiah 55:3 (cf. Deut. 30:6), in which context the prophet is calling on a covenant people to enter fully into the blessings which Jehovah's covenants secure. In the midst of these is this promise that "your soul shall live." (b) Daniel 12:2, where the context, as seen above, relates to the resurrection of those who are of Judaism; some of these are to be raised to "everlasting life," and some to "everlasting contempt." The "life" is no more their possession in this present existence than is the "contempt." (c) Matthew 7:13–14, which passage is found in that portion of Scripture that defines the terms of admission into, and conditions life in, the earthly Messianic kingdom, which kingdom occupies a high place in the eschatology of Judaism. The passage imposes the most drastic human effort as essential if one would enter the narrow way that leads to life. The life is at the *end* of the path and its price is well defined by the word ἀγωνίζομαι (better translated *agonize*) as used by Luke (13:24), when this saying of Christ's is reported by him. (d) Luke 10:25–29, in which passage the lawyer asks how he may *inherit* eternal life and is told by Christ in the most absolute terms that eternal life for him is gained by the keeping of that contained in the Mosaic Law. (e) Luke 18:18–27, where it is likewise reported that a young ruler made the same inquiry, namely, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" and to this sincere man our Lord quoted the Mosaic

commandments; but when the young man declared that these things had been kept by him from his youth, Christ did not chide him for falsehood but took him on to the ground of complete surrender of all he was and all he had as the way into that state which Christ termed *perfect* (Matt. 19:21). (f) Matthew 18:8–9, which passage presents the alternative of entering life—a future experience—maimed or halt, or entering "everlasting fire" or "hell fire." That a Christian, already possessing eternal life and perfected as he is in Christ, could not enter heaven maimed or halt when his body is to be like Christ's glorious body, nor into hell fire after Christ has said that he shall not come into judgment and that he shall never perish, is obvious indeed. Over against this extended body of Scripture bearing on that particularized, yet future form of eternal life which, being a feature of Judaism, is related to the earthly kingdom, is another body of Scripture far more extensive which declares that eternal life for the Christian is an impartation from God and is the gift of God (John 10:28; Rom. 6:23); is a present possession (John 3:36; 5:24; 6:54; 20:31; 1 John 5:11–13); and is none other than Christ indwelling (Col. 1:27) and the imparted divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4). The receiving of eternal life will be for Israelites, as it is in the case of the Christian, a feature of salvation itself; and salvation for Israel is, in Romans 11:26–32, declared to be after the present age-purpose of the fulness of the Gentiles which is now accompanied by Israel's blindness (verse 25), and at the time when "there shall come out of Sion the Deliverer," who shall "turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "This," Jehovah says, "is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." Isaiah anticipates the same great moment of Israel's salvation when he predicts that a nation shall be born "at once." The Hebrew words "pa›am ›eḥāth" from which the words *at once* are translated mean, as a time measurement, *a stroke*, or *the beat of a foot*. On the other hand, the Christian is saved when he believes and that salvation is related only to the first advent of Christ.

e. The Covenanted Davidic Kingdom. This, the most extensive and important feature of the eschatology of Judaism, occupies so large a place in the discussion which this whole introduction presents, it need be no more than mentioned here. That form of interpretation which rides on occasional similarities and passes over vital differences is displayed by those who argue that the kingdom of heaven, as referred to in Matthew, must be the

same as the kingdom of God since some parables regarding the kingdom of heaven are reported in Mark and Luke under the designation, *the kingdom of God*. No attempt is made by these expositors to explain why the term *kingdom of heaven* is used by Matthew only, nor do they seem to recognize the fact that the real difference between that which these designations represent is to be discovered in connection with the instances where they are not and cannot be used interchangeably rather than in the instances where they are interchangeable. Certain features are common to both the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God, and in such instances the interchange of the terms is justified. Closer attention will reveal that the kingdom of heaven is always earthly while the kingdom of God is as wide as the universe and includes as much of earthly things as are germane to it. Likewise, the kingdom of heaven is entered by a righteousness exceeding the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 5:20), while the kingdom of God is entered by a new birth (John 3:1–16). So, again, the kingdom of heaven answers the hope of Israel and the Gentiles, while the kingdom of God answers the eternal and all-inclusive purpose of God. To be more explicit: Matthew 5:20 declares the condition upon which a Jew might hope to enter the kingdom of heaven. Matthew 8:12; 24:50–51; 25:28–30 indicate that children of the kingdom of heaven are to be cast out. Neither of these truths could apply to the kingdom of God. Again, the parables of the wheat and the tares, Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43, and the parable of the good and bad fish, Matthew 13:47–50, are spoken only of the kingdom of heaven. However, the parable of the leaven is predicated of both spheres of divine rule; leaven, representing evil doctrine rather than evil persons, may corrupt, as it does, the truth relative to both kingdoms. Such contrasts might be cited to great lengths, but the important objective has been gained if it has been made clear that there is an eschatology of Judaism and an eschatology of Christianity and each, though wholly different in details, reaches on into eternity. One of the great burdens of predictive prophecy is the anticipation of the glories of Israel in a transformed earth under the reign of David’s Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God. There is likewise much prediction which anticipates the glories of the redeemed in heaven.

III. The Church Specifically Considered

Ecclesiology, or the doctrine of the Church, is naturally subdivided into three parts: (1) the Pauline revelation of a new order or class of humanity, namely, a redeemed company taken from both Jews and Gentiles, and, together with the resurrected Christ, forming a New Creation which is His Body and His Bride; (2) the outward or visible church, the assembly of those in any place who gather in the name of Christ; and (3) the walk and service of those who are saved.

The first main division of Ecclesiology presents a body of truth of surpassing importance. Apart from the right understanding of this subject there can be no conception of the heavenly purpose of God in and through the Church in contrast to His earthly purpose in Israel, no conception of the divine purpose in the present age, no basis for a true evaluation of all those new realities and relationships which were made possible and established through the death and resurrection of Christ, no worthy comprehension of the present ministries of the Spirit of God, and no sufficient basis of appeal for the God-honoring life and service of the believer.

The true Church sustains a relation to the First Person of the Godhead, which is that He is *Father*, with all that this implies; a relation to the Second Person of the Godhead set forth in the following seven figures: the Shepherd and the sheep, the Vine and the branches, the Cornerstone and the stones of the building, the High Priest and the kingdom of priests, the Last Adam and the New Creation, the Head and the Body, the Bridegroom and the Bride; and a fourfold relation to the Third Person of the Godhead, for they are born of the Spirit, indwelt of the Spirit, baptized by the Spirit, and sealed by the Spirit. The extent of the body of truth related to the true Church may be indicated in the fact that the entire doctrine of the resurrection of Christ is properly introduced at this point, and that its entire scope of achievement is only a feature of one of the relationships which exists between Christ and the Church—the Last Adam and the New Creation—and that a major part of the doctrinal portion of the New Testament bears directly, or indirectly, upon the limitless theme of the New Creation in Christ Jesus. In addition to the relationships which the Church sustains to the triune God, there are other important relations to be considered, including her relation to the kingdom of God, to the kingdom of heaven, to the angels, to the world, to saints of other dispensations, to the nation Israel, to service, and to judgment.

The second division of Ecclesiology is concerned with its outward, organized or recognized assembly which, though one in the divine reckoning, has been divided and subdivided into many sectarian groups. The New Testament presents plain instructions relative to the visible church and her organization, with specific mention of those who are to exercise authority, and of her ordinances, her order, her gifts, and her ministries.

The third main division of Ecclesiology contemplates the daily life and service of those who are saved. In ascertaining by what rule the Christian should walk, recognition must be given to the three independent and complete governing systems presented in the Bible, cited above, which are designed each in turn to regulate human conduct: the first, given by Moses and addressed to Israel; the second, composed of the teachings of grace and addressed to the Church; the third, incorporating the rule of life which will obtain in the future Messianic kingdom on the earth. Not only is the believer of this age saved from the legal, meritorious responsibility which characterizes the first and third of these three systems, but he has been saved, likewise, from the burden of *inherent* law, which is none other than the normal, meritorious obligation which rests on every moral creature to be like his Creator. Christ having provided the saved one with every merit that infinite holiness can demand, no other obligation remains upon the saved one than to walk worthy of so high a calling. The perfect standing of the believer is assumed in all the hortatory portions of the New Testament Epistles and these injunctions are addressed only to the children of God under grace. A clear comprehension of this grace system, which alone directs Christian conduct, is most essential if the child of God is to be intelligent in his life and service for God. At this point the whole provision of God for a supernatural manner of life is introduced, being indicated as it is by the fact that these injunctions are, in the main, supernatural in their character.

This third subdivision of Ecclesiology concludes with the recognition of the believer’s positions and possessions in Christ, his associations, his life, his contacts and deeds, his warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil, his contests, and his witness.

Though of tremendous importance, the first and third of these divisions are practically never treated in works of Systematic Theology, while the second, if mentioned at all, is usually restricted to peculiar features of some

sect or branch of the visible church with specific reference to organization and ordinances.

The book of the Acts and the Epistles introduce the fact of a new classification of humanity termed the *Church*, which group is, also, properly designated as a part of the *New Creation* since each individual within the group has experienced the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). The two terms, the *Church* and the *New Creation*, are not synonymous. In the first instance a company of redeemed people is in view related to, but conceived of as separate from, Christ, as a body is related to, yet to be distinguished from, its head. In the second instance, reference is made to an organic unity which is formed by the baptism with the Spirit wherein the same identical company of redeemed ones is united to the resurrected Christ as its Federal Head, and these two elements—the redeemed and the resurrected Christ—combine to form the New Creation. No deeper truth could be uttered than is expressed in the words of Christ, "Ye in me [by the baptism of the Spirit], and I in you [by the Spirit's regeneration]." That this and all similar truth is wholly foreign to the Old Testament is obvious.

The works of Systematic Theology generally have recognized the redeemed people of this age, but only as a supposed sequence or continuation in the progress of the divine purpose in Israel. They refer to "the Old Testament Church" and to "the New Testament Church" as together constituting component parts of one divine project, thus failing to recognize those distinctions between Israel and the Church which, being so radical in character, serve to indicate the widest possible difference between them—difference in origin, difference in character and responsibility, and difference in destiny. There are at least twenty-four far-reaching distinctions yet to be observed between Israel and the Church, while there are about twelve major features common to both; but the obvious similarities do not set aside the differences. The fact that revelation concerning both Israel and the Church includes the truth about God, holiness, sin, and redemption by blood, does not eliminate a far greater body of truth in which it is disclosed that Israelites become such by a natural birth while Christians become such by a spiritual birth; that Israelites were appointed to live and serve under a meritorious, legal system, while Christians live and serve under a gracious system; that Israelites, as a nation, have their citizenship now and their

future destiny centered only in the earth, reaching on to the new earth which is yet to be, while Christians have their citizenship and future destiny centered only in heaven, extending on into the new heavens that are yet to be (for both earthly and heavenly blessings see Rev. 21:1–22:7; 2 Pet. 3:10–13; Heb. 1:10–12; Isa. 65:17; 66:22). Jehovah's fivefold covenant with Israel is everlasting in every respect—(1) a national entity (Jer. 31:36), (2) a land in perpetuity (Gen. 13:15), (3) a throne (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:36), (4) a King (Jer. 33:21), and (5) a kingdom (Dan. 7:14). These earthly promises are confirmed by the oath of Jehovah and extend *forever*, else language ceases to be a dependable medium for the expression of truth.

Thus, it is seen that the present dispensation only is characterized by the presence on earth of a third grouping of humanity—the Church. Not only did Christ anticipate this body of people (Matt. 16:18), but they appear along with Israel as (1) cosharers in the purpose of His incarnation, (2) as the subjects of His ministry, (3) as the objects of His death and resurrection, (4) as the beneficiaries of His second advent, and (5) as related to Him in His Kingdom reign. Of these aspects of truth, it may be observed:

1. Two Independent and Widely Different Purposes in the Incarnation. (a) On the Messianic side and in relation to His office as Israel's King, Christ was born of a virgin and came into this human relationship with indisputable kingly rights in order that He might fulfill the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7:8–18; Ps. 89:20–37; Jer. 33:21–22, 25–26). To the Virgin Mary the angel said "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:31–33); and as the rightful heir through human lineage, He will be the everlasting occupant of David's earthly throne, and reign over the house of Jacob forever (Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:33). (b) On the mediatorial and redemptive side and to fulfill the Abrahamic covenant, it is equally true that by the incarnation the Mediator between God and man is provided with all the inexhaustible blessings which the theanthropic Mediator secures; and through the virgin birth the Kinsman Redeemer is realized who, as typified

by Boaz, is qualified to redeem the lost estate and claim His heavenly Bride —the Church.

While these two widely different objectives obtain in the incarnation, the general facts concerning the incarnation are common to both. When contemplating either the heavenly purpose in the Church, or the earthly purpose in Israel, it should be observed that: (i) It was none other than the Second Person of the Godhead who came into this human relationship; (ii) to do this He emptied Himself, becoming obedient to His Father's will; (iii) He took a human body, soul, and spirit; and (iv) the union thus formed between the divine and human natures resulted in the incomparable theanthropic Person.

2. Christ Revealed Two Distinct Lines of Truth. In the one, He presented Himself as Israel's Messiah and called upon that nation for their long-predicted national repentance, in which He also declared the character of His earthly kingdom rule and Himself the fulfiller of the great Messianic purposes. At that time He said of Himself, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24). In sending out His disciples He commanded them saying, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:5–6). In the second, when Israel's rejection of Him became apparent, He began to speak of His departure and second advent, and of a hitherto unannounced age which should intervene in which the gospel should be preached in all the world to Jew and Gentile alike; and His disciples, whose message had before been restricted to Israel alone, were then commissioned to declare the glad tidings to every creature. A slight comparison of His farewell address to Israel—"hated of all nations" (Matt. 23:37–25:46)—with His farewell word to those who had believed on Him to the saving of their souls (John 13:1–17:26), will disclose the most evident distinctions between Israel and the Church. Such contrasts could be drawn from the Gospels almost indefinitely, and without these distinctions in mind only perplexity can characterize the one who reads with attention.

3. In His Death and Resurrection the Same Two Widely Different Objectives are Discernible. To Israel His death was a stumbling-block (1 Cor. 1:23), nor was His death any part of His office as King over Israel

—“Long live the king!”; yet, in His death, Israel had her share to the extent that He dealt finally with the sins committed aforetime, which sins had been only covered according to the provisions of the Old Testament atonement (Rom. 3:25). By His death the way was prepared for any individual Jew to be saved through faith in Him; and by His death a sufficient ground was secured whereon God will yet “take away” the sins of that nation at the time when “all Israel shall be saved” (Rom. 11:27). However, the nation Israel sustains no relation to the resurrection of Christ other than that which David foresaw, namely, that if Christ died He must be raised again from the dead in order that He might sit on David’s throne (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:25–31). Over against this, it is revealed that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it (Eph. 5:25–27), and that His resurrection is the beginning of the New Creation of God, which includes the many sons whom He is bringing into glory (Heb. 2:10). In that New Creation relationship, the believer is *in* the resurrected Christ and the resurrected Christ is *in* the believer. This twofold unity establishes an identity of relationship which surpasses all human understanding. It is even likened by Christ to the unity which exists between the Persons of the Godhead (John 17:21–23). By the baptism of the Spirit, wrought, as it is for everyone, when one believes (1 Cor. 12:13), the saved one is joined to the Lord (1 Cor. 6:17; Gal. 3:27), and by that union with the resurrected Christ is made a partaker of His resurrection life (Col. 1:27); is translated out of the power of the darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. 1:13); is crucified, dead, and buried with Christ, and is raised to walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:2–4; Col. 3:1); is now seated with Christ in the heavenlies (Eph. 2:6); is a citizen of heaven (Phil. 3:20); is forgiven all trespasses (Col. 2:13); is justified (Rom. 5:1); and blessed with every spiritual blessing (Eph. 1:3). This vast body of truth, which is but slightly indicated here, is not found in the Old Testament, nor are the Old Testament saints ever said to be thus related to the resurrected Christ. It is impossible for these great disclosures to be fitted into a theological system which does not distinguish the heavenly character of the Church in contrast to the earthly character of Israel. This failure on the part of these systems of theology to discern the character of the true Church, related wholly, as it is, to the resurrected Christ, accounts for the usual omission from these theological writings of any extended treatment of the doctrine of Christ’s resurrection and all related doctrines.

4. Events Predicted for the Close of the Present Age. The great events predicted for the close of the present age include the Day of Christ, when the Church will be taken to be forever with the Lord—some by resurrection and some by translation (1 Cor. 15:35–53; 1 Thess. 4:13–17)—and the Day of the Lord, when Israel will be regathered, judged, and privileged to experience the fulfillment of all her earthly covenants in the land which has been given to her by the oath of Jehovah, which oath cannot be broken (Deut. 30:3–5; 2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:34–37; Jer. 23:5–6; 31:35–37; 33:25–26).

5. Distinctions Between Israel and the Church in the Coming Kingdom. In the coming kingdom of Messiah the distinction between Israel and the Church is still more obvious. Israel, as a nation, is seen through prophetic vision to be on the earth as subjects of the kingdom and in her kingdom glory, while the Church is said to be coreigning with Christ (Rev. 20:6). As His Bride and Consort, it is the rightful place of the Church to share in His reign.

Two revelations were given to the Apostle Paul: (1) that of salvation to infinite perfection for individual Jew and Gentile alike through faith in Christ and on the ground of His death and resurrection (Gal. 1:11–12). That this salvation is an exercise of grace which far surpasses anything hitherto experienced in the Old Testament, is clearly revealed in 1 Peter 1:10–11, where it is stated, “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you.” And (2) that of the new divine purpose in the outcalling of the Church (Eph. 3:6). This new purpose is not merely that Gentiles are to be blessed. Old Testament prophecy had long predicted Gentile blessings. The purpose consists in the fact that a new body of humanity was to be formed from both Jews and Gentiles, a relationship in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile position retained, but where Christ is all, and in all (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3: 11).

With the same fundamental distinction in view, the Apostle makes separate enumeration of the Jew, the Gentile, and the Church of God (1 Cor. 10:32); and, again, in Ephesians 2:11, R.V., he refers to the Gentiles as the *Uncircumcision*, and the Jews as the *Circumcision made with hands*; but in Colossians 2:11 he refers to the *Circumcision made without hands*. The

latter designation indicates the supernatural standing and character of those who comprise the Body of Christ.

Though in its time established and imposed by Jehovah, Judaism did not merge into Christianity, nor does it now provide the slightest advantage to the individual Jew who would become a Christian. With reference to Christianity, Jews and Gentiles are now, alike, “under sin.” They need identically the same grace of God (Rom. 3:9), and that grace is offered to them on precisely the same terms (Rom. 10:12). Nicodemus, who was apparently a most perfect specimen of Judaism, was told by Christ that *he* must be born again, and the Apostle Paul prayed that the Israelites who had “a zeal for God” might be saved. They were at fault in that, after the new and limitless privileges in grace had come through Christ (John 1:17), they still clung to the old meritorious features of Judaism, “going about to establish their own righteousness” and not submitting themselves to the imputed righteousness of God (Rom. 10:1–3) .

The one who cannot recognize that the Church is a new, heavenly purpose of God, absolutely dissociated from both Jew and Gentile (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11), but sees the Church only as an ever increasing company of redeemed people gathered alike from all ages of human history, would perhaps do well to ponder the following questions: Why the rent veil? Why Pentecost? Why the distinctive message of the Epistles? Why the “better” things of the book of Hebrews? Why the Jewish branches broken off? Why the present headship and ministry of Christ in heaven? Why the present visitation to the Gentiles and not before? Why the present indwelling by the Spirit of all who believe? Why the baptism of the Spirit—unique in the New Testament? Why two companies of redeemed in the new Jerusalem? Why only earthly promises to Israel and only heavenly promises to the Church? Why should the divinely given rule of life be changed from law to grace? Why is Israel likened to the repudiated and yet to be restored wife of Jehovah, and the Church likened to the espoused Bride of Christ? Why the two objectives in the incarnation and resurrection? Why the new day—the Day of Christ—with its rapture and resurrection of believers and with its rewards for service and suffering—a day never once mentioned in the Old Testament? Why the “mysteries” of the New Testament, including the Body of Christ? Why the New Creation, comprising, as it does, all those who by the Spirit are joined to the Lord and are forever in Christ? How could there

be a Church, constructed as she is, until the death of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, the ascension of Christ, and the Day of Pentecost? How could the Church, in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, be any part of Israel in this or any other age?

Like the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, the doctrine of the true Church with her supernatural and exalted position and her heavenly destiny is largely omitted from theological writings only because these aspects of truth cannot be fitted into a Judaized system to which Systematic Theology has too often been committed. The stupendous spiritual loss of such an omission is only slightly reflected in the failure on the part of believers to understand their heavenly calling with its corresponding God-designed incentive to a holy life.

As indicated above, Ecclesiology divides properly into three sections: (1) the Church as an organism, (2) the organized Church, and (3) the believer's rule of life.

The Church as an Organism

Chapter II

General Features of the Doctrine Concerning the Church

This, the first main division of Ecclesiology, has in view the Church universal; that is, the Church which includes all who have believed on Christ to the saving of their souls since the Church began to be, and will include all who will yet believe before that incomparable company is removed from the earth. The vast majority of this glorious company have already reached heaven and are now with Christ their Savior. This important truth is sometimes forgotten in the stress of this life with its conflicts which bear down upon those of that number who are now in the world. That portion of the Church who have gone on to be with Christ is sometimes styled "the Church triumphant"; but they of that company are still to be identified as an indivisible part of a specific group who, being heavenly in character—whether actually in heaven or on earth—serve the highest divine purpose of all the ages.

Since the same word is used for a local assembly as for the true Church, distinction is here made between the organized church in the world and the organism. The latter is that whole company who have been saved and who are an organism because of being in Christ. The former is constituted when any group of believers in one locality assembles.

The clear recognition of that which, through divine grace, the Church is, of the supreme place she occupies as the Body of Christ, and of the glory and exaltation which awaits her as the Bride of the Lamb, is indispensable if a worthy perspective of God's plan and purpose is to be gained. The all but universal disregard on the part of theologians for the Pauline revelation respecting the Church has wrought confusion and damage to an immeasurable degree. Two factors serve as paramount causes of this deplorable neglect, namely, (a) the Reformation did not recover this truth as formerly it was held by the early church, and (b) the attitude of the theologians, being bound and confined within the limitations of Reformation truth, has been that of avoiding what to them seems new. No theology would be complete, even as viewed by the Reformers, that did not

exalt the first Pauline revelation of the gospel. However, it is as true, in the light of the Scriptures, that no theology is complete that does not recognize and elevate to its transcendent place the second Pauline revelation of the Church. The two disclosures are interdependent and therefore inseparable to a large degree. Together they form that larger body of truth which the Apostle termed "my gospel."

While there were occasional references to the Church universal in post-Reformation theological literature, it was not until the middle of the last century that this extensive and important body of teaching was wrought into a doctrinal declaration. It was given to J. N. Darby of England to achieve this distinctive ministry. From the teachings of Darby and his associates what is known as the Brethren movement sprang; and these highly trained men have produced an expository literature covering the entire Sacred Text which is not only orthodox and free from misconceptions and disproportionate emphasis, but essays to interpret faithfully the entire field of Biblical doctrine—that which theology confined to the Reformation has failed to do. At this same time, other men in America and foreign countries were awakening to the fact that the Bible presents a much larger range of doctrine than that released by the Reformers, and, as a result, a widespread Bible exposition movement has developed which incorporated all that the Reformation restored and very much more. There is, then, a division at the present time in the ranks of orthodox men. On the one hand, there are those who, being trained to recognize no more than that which entered into Reformation theology, are restricted in their doctrinal viewpoint and who look upon added truth as a departure from standard ideas and therefore dangerous. On the other hand, there are those who, though as jealous to preserve the purity of the divine revelation, are constructing an unabridged system of theology, and finding the way into the full-orbed harmony of truth and into the limitless field of Biblical doctrine.

The first main division of Ecclesiology, which contemplates the second Pauline revelation, is now to be subjected to a threefold treatment: (1) general features of the doctrine concerning the Church, (2) contrasts between Israel and the Church, and (3) seven figures used of the Church in her relation to Christ (Chapters IV–VI).

At the outset, there is need that the student shall, by special attention, come to realize that, as employed by the New Testament, the word *church*

may refer to no more than a gathering of people of one generation and with no guarantee that each one in that gathering is saved. On the other hand, the word *church* may mean the whole company of the redeemed of all generations between Pentecost and the rapture, and in that company there is not one who is unsaved. Dr. C. I. Scofield summarizes the character of the true Church thus: "The true church, composed of the whole number of regenerate persons from Pentecost to the first resurrection (1 Cor. 15:52), united together and to Christ by the baptism with the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:12, 13), is the body of Christ of which He is the Head (Eph. 1:22, 23). As such, it is a holy temple for the habitation of God through the Spirit (Eph. 2:21, 22); is 'one flesh' with Christ (Eph. 5:30, 31); and espoused to Him as a chaste virgin to one husband (2 Cor. 11:2–4)" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1304).

The general features of this doctrine to be noted are: (a) the meaning of the word *church*, (b) the fact of a new divine undertaking, (c) various terms employed, (d) the first use of the word *church*, (e) the Church the present divine purpose, (f) four reasons why the Church began at Pentecost, and (g) the Church in type and prophecy.

I. The Meaning of the Word *church*

Since so very much depends upon the meaning of the word *church*, expositors have felt the obligation to dwell upon it. In his extended analysis of this word, which traces it back to its heathen origin, Archbishop Trench, in his *New Testament Synonyms* (9th ed., pp. 1–7), writes as an introduction: "There are words whose history it is peculiarly interesting to watch, as they obtain a deeper meaning, and receive a new consecration in the Christian Church; words which the Church did not invent, but has assumed into its service, and employed in a far loftier sense than any to which the world has ever put them before. The very word by which the Church is named is itself an example—a more illustrious one could scarcely be found—of this progressive ennobling of a word. For we have ἐκκλησία in three distinct stages of meaning—the heathen, the Jewish, and the Christian. … This did not, like some other words, pass immediately and at a single step from the heathen world to the Christian Church: but here, as so often, the Septuagint

supplies the link of connexion, the point of transition, the word being there prepared for its highest meaning of all."

Commenting on Matthew 16:18, Dr. Marvin Vincent gives the following as bearing on this word:

> Church (ἐκκλησίαν), ἐκ *out*, καλέω, to *call* or *summon*. This is the first occurrence of this word in the New Testament, Originally *an assembly of citizens, regularly summoned*. So in New Testament, Acts 19:39. The Septuagint uses the word for the congregation of Israel, either as summoned for a definite purpose (1 Kings 8:65), or for the community of Israel collectively, regarded as a congregation (Gen. 28:3), where *assembly* is given for *multitude* in margin. In New Testament, of the congregation of Israel (Acts 7:38); but for this there is more commonly employed συναγωγή, of which *synagogue* is a transcription; σύν, *together*, ἄγω, *to bring* (Acts 13:43). In Christ's words to Peter the word ἐκκλησία acquires special emphasis from the opposition implied in it to the synagogue. The Christian community in the midst of Israel would be designated as ἐκκλησία, without being confounded with the συναγωγή, the Jewish community. … Both in Hebrew and in New Testament usage ἐκκλησία implies more than a collective or national unity; rather a community based on a special religious idea and established in a special way. In the New Testament the term is used also in the narrower sense of a single church, or a church confined to a particular place. So of the church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom. 16:5); the church at Corinth, the churches in Judea, the church at Jerusalem, etc.—*Word Studies in the New Testament*, I, 93

Whatever the use of the word *church* in the New Testament, one idea inheres, namely, a people segregated or called out from the mass into that which is a distinct group in itself. If no more is to be asserted than that a certain company is assembled in one place, they become a church. As elsewhere stated, the mob in the Ephesian theatre (Acts 19:32) is a church in the theatre. Likewise Israel in the wilderness (Acts 7:38); but there is no implication here that either Israel or the Ephesian mob share in the glories of that Church which is Christ's Body. The larger and more impressive truth is that when from Jews and Gentiles some are called into a heavenly body, the word *Church* is not only the proper word to be used, but is the word the New Testament employs. That its use is, under these circumstances, advanced to the highest possible purpose cannot be doubted. By divine calling, which is efficacious (Rom. 8:30), the Church as an elect company is being gathered. This achievement, it will yet be seen, is the supreme divine intent in this age. Probably no more illuminating passage will be found in the New Testament bearing on the outcalling of the Church than Acts 15:14: "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name." Since the gospel had leaped all Jewish

bounds, the Jerusalem church had met to consider the problem of what had become of the distinctive Jewish covenants and promises. The conclusion is clear: God is visiting Gentiles to take out of them (not, all of them) a people for His name. That Jews were already visited and were being saved was taken for granted (cf. Eph. 3:6).

II. The Fact of a New Divine Undertaking

To those accustomed to the religious order which has obtained for nineteen hundred years, the ability to visualize the transforming innovation which the launching of an utterly new and unforeseen divine project represents is essential. Up to that time Judaism had not only occupied the field, but had been engendered, promoted, and blessed of God. It was God's will for His people in the world. The beneficiaries of Judaism were as intrenched in their religious position and convictions and as much sustained by divine sanctions as are the most orthodox believers today. The new divine purpose had intentionally been unrevealed before its inauguration. It came, therefore, not only with great suddenness, but wholly without Old Testament revelation. The case would be nearly parallel if a new and unpredicted divine project were to be forced in at this time to supersede Christianity. The unyielding prejudice and violent resistance which arose in the Jewish mind was in direct ratio to the sincerity with which the individual Jew cherished his agelong privileges. Added to all this and calculated to make the new divine enterprise many-fold more difficult was its bold announcement that the despised Gentiles would be placed on equal footing with the Jew. Viewed only from the human standpoint, there was no possibility that a movement of such a character could be introduced at all. Naught but the mighty power of God could accomplish these ends. Among all those whose prejudice and resistance reached to the point of murder was Saul of Tarsus, who was apparently the most zealous of all his countrymen for the truth held by the Jews under divine authority; yet God wrought such a change in that one defiant Pharisee that he became the champion of the new cause. No more revolutionary word was ever spoken than what this man uttered when he said, "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek [Gentile]: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him" (Rom. 10:12; cf. 3:9).

Thus the first church council ever held came to the conclusion that a new divine purpose had been introduced and that, when that purpose was completed, God would take up the Jewish program again and carry it to its predicted consummation. The record of the decision of this notable conclave is given in Acts 15:13–18, which declares: “And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.” Christian love, engendered by the indwelling Spirit, had seized the hearts of those who had believed—both Jew and Gentile—and the agelong, middle wall of partition was broken down (Eph. 2:14); therefore, the new purpose of God was hailed by those who were saved and its message of knowledge-surpassing riches proclaimed to Jew and Gentile alike. How definitely the great Apostle Peter had been transformed is disclosed in his word to this same Jerusalem council, when he said that God in His dealing with the Gentiles had “put no difference between us [Jews] and them [Gentiles], purifying their hearts by faith” (Acts 15:9). In fact, the new, hitherto unrevealed purpose of God in the outcalling of a heavenly people from Jews and Gentiles is so divergent with respect to the divine purpose toward Israel, which purpose preceded it and will yet follow it, that the term *parenthetical*, commonly employed to describe the new age-purpose, is inaccurate. A parenthetical portion sustains some direct or indirect relation to that which goes before or that which follows; but the present age-purpose is not thus related and therefore is more properly termed an *intercalation*. The appropriateness of this word will be seen in the fact that, as an interpolation is formed by inserting a word or phrase into a context, so an intercalation is formed by introducing a day or a period of time into the calendar. The present age of the Church is an intercalation into the revealed calendar or program of God as that program was foreseen by the prophets of old. Such, indeed, is the precise character of the present age.

That two widely separated systems of interpretation of the Bible are impinged on the truthfulness or untruthfulness of the contention that this age is an intercalation, cannot be unobserved. If the divine objective in the Church is nothing new, being only the blossom of the Jewish bud or the second and last chapter of a continuous story, then all the efforts of the New Testament to declare the distinctive character of the heavenly purpose in the New Creation are in vain. On the other hand, if the divine objective is new, then all Scripture is harmonized and not one word God has spoken is without meaning. This is not to say that there are no types or predictions in the Old Testament which, with the added light of the present revelation, cannot be recognized as foreshadowings of the present divine purpose in the Church; nor is it implied by this distinction that there is not a continuity running through the entire Sacred Text. However, this age and its purpose were not seen by prophets of old (1 Pet. 1:10–11) .

III. Various Terms Employed

Like her Lord in whom she lives, in whom she stands, and in whom she is accepted, the Church is identified by many appellations and descriptive designations. The Lord Himself referred to them as “my church,” “my sheep,” “those whom thou hast given me” (cf. Eph. 5:25–27). They are known as “Christians, saints, believers, the elect, the body of Christ, brethren, his own, witnesses, ambassadors, strangers and pilgrims, the household of faith, the children of God,” etc. Every name, it will be seen, bears some intimation relative to the distinctive character of the heavenly company; but none is more doctrinally complete than the title *the church*. It would hardly seem necessary to state that what is generally known as church membership or church organization is not contemplated under the cognomen “the church.” It has been declared before that this designation includes only those who are saved, though it extends to every generation between Pentecost and the rapture. It is peculiarly advantageous for the student to become clear in his mind on this fact that the true Church is not to be confused with any mixed multitude that may make up the church memberships of earth. In this work the true Church is always indicated by the use of capital C, while reference to the organized church is by the use of small c.

Among all the designations applied to the true Church, the declaration that she is a New Creation is of high import. Not only does this title disclose the fundamental fact that this is a company newly created by the recreation of each individual within it, but it indicates that this new, heavenly humanity is related to Christ as a race is related to its natural head. This New Creation incorporates Christ along with all believers into its one identity. In this respect, the term *Church* is somewhat different in that, as a body may be contemplated apart from its head, so the Church may be contemplated as separate from, though closely identified with, Christ.

IV. The First Use of the Word Church

The rule will usually obtain that, if there is more than one meaning to a Biblical term, the first use of it in the Sacred Text will be that of its most important signification. This suggestion is sustained, at least, in the case of the word *church*. The term appears for the first time when spoken by Christ Himself and is recorded in Matthew 16:18: “I will build my church.” Each of these five words is freighted with doctrinal import. If the phrase is repeated five times emphasizing a different word each time, the contribution each word makes to the whole will be noted. When the stress falls on the word *I*, it is indicated that the whole enterprise belongs to and is undertaken by Christ alone. He it is who is calling out, saving, and perfecting this specific company. When the stress falls on the word *will*, the prophetic aspect is introduced and the reader is reminded that the Church did not exist at the moment Christ was speaking, but was to be realized in the future. This is a difficult aspect of truth for those who contend that the Church has existed throughout the period covered by the Old Testament, or any part of it. Naught but bondage to tradition—mostly of a Romish order—can account for such a contention. When the stress falls on the word *build*, an important truth is advanced respecting the manner in which the company will be completed. The word *build* suggests a slow, long-drawn-out process; and such it has proved to be. That the Church is *being builded* is a literal translation of Ephesians 2:20. So, again, in Hebrews 3:6, “whose house are we.” When the stress falls on the word *my*, the most blessed reality is proclaimed. This company is, above all else, “the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28); and, likewise, “Christ

also loved the church, and gave himself for it" (Eph. 5:25). Whatever may be the reaction of the individual heart respecting this ownership, the truth remains unalterable—the Church is the property of Christ, and He will yet present it unto Himself. There will be no contesting of His tenure and those who are within the Church, so far from being unwilling victims of arbitrary authority, will rejoice that they are His own and will be loving Him who first loved them. When the stress falls on the word *church*, there is set up at once the distinction which exists between this heavenly company and every other classification of human beings. For Jehovah to say to Israel, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love" (Jer. 31:3), does not complicate the truth that the Church is also loved to an infinite degree (John 13:1; Eph. 5:25).

V. The Church the Present Divine Purpose

The attentive reader is aware of the fact that the Old Testament closes without the realization of any of those immeasurable expectations which the prophets had presented. In like manner, it is seen that those expectations, though made possible by the first advent of the King, were, nevertheless, not then effected. The King was rejected and crucified; but out of the very rejection and crucifixion the door was opened for the securing of a bride for the Lamb. In due time, and as stipulated, every Old Testament expectation will be attained. However, it is most certain that the purpose of the present age is the out-gathering of the Church and not the time of Israel's blessings. Israel is still "broken off, hated, scattered, and peeled." God is not now dealing with a nation, but He is dealing with the individual. He is not restricted to Jews, but is including Gentiles in His gracious provisions; and He is offering a kingdom to no people whatsoever.

In Matthew 13 there is given by Christ Himself, and under seven parables, the characteristics of this age. In this Scripture this age is itself declared to be a mystery, or sacred secret (13:11), and the parables develop the truth that there are three major features present throughout this age, namely, (a) that which is acceptable—the wheat, the pearl, and the good fish; (b) that which represents blinded Israel (vss. 14–15), who are the treasure hid in the field—the field is the world—and (c) the presence of evil —the tares, evil birds, leaven, and bad fish. It should be observed that, in

the New Testament, each of these three factors is itself declared to be a mystery, or sacred secret: (a) the Church composed of Jews and Gentiles in one Body (Eph. 3:4–6), (b) Israel blinded until the Church is called out (Rom. 11:25; cf. Acts 15:13–18), and (c) the presence and character of evil in this age (2 Thess. 2:7). Israel's blindness as a mystery is said to continue *until* the Church is taken out of the world. Evil as a mystery also continues *until* the Restrainer is taken away—the departure of the Holy Spirit from His resident relation to the world and the removal of the Church which cannot be separated from Him (John 14:17). It thus follows that of these three factors which characterize this age, two of them—the delay for Israel through blindness, and the presence of evil—are timed, not to what might be their own purpose, but each must wait *until* the Church is called out and removed from the earth. It thus is demonstrated that the outcalling of the Church is the primary, divine objective in this dispensation.

But more conclusive still is the direct statement in Ephesians 2:7, which asserts that the major divine purpose is that in the ages to come God may make a full manifestation of the riches of His grace by means of the salvation which He now accomplishes in all who believe.

VI. Four Reasons Why the Church Began at Pentecost

Apparently for want of due consideration of all that enters into the case, some theologians have sustained the idea that those things which characterize the Old Testament revelation are carried forward without change into the New Testament. The necessity of observing dispensational distinctions arises in connection with the abrupt abandonment of existing features and the introduction of new features which mark the transition from one dispensation to the next. This line of demarcation is especially clear between the present age and that which preceded it, and between the present age and that which is to follow. Certain events which serve to produce these changes are properly styled *age-transforming*. Things cannot be the same in this age as they were in the past age, after the death of Christ has taken place, His resurrection, His ascension, and the advent of the Spirit on Pentecost. In like manner, things cannot be the same in the coming age as they are in this age, after there is brought about the second advent of Christ to reign on the earth, the binding of Satan, the removal of the

Church, and the restoration of Israel. Those who see no force in this declaration have hardly considered the measureless meaning of these age-transforming occurrences. In the light of these determining issues, it may be seen (a) that there could be no Church in the world—constituted as she is and distinctive in all her features—until Christ's death; for her relation to that death is not a mere anticipation, but is based wholly on His finished work and she must be purified by His precious blood. (b) There could be no Church until Christ arose from the dead to provide her with resurrection life. (c) There could be no Church until He had ascended up on high to become her Head; for she is a New Creation with a new federal headship in the resurrected Christ. He is, likewise, to her as the head is to the body. Nor could the Church survive for a moment were it not for His intercession and advocacy in heaven. (d) There could be no Church on earth until the advent of the Holy Spirit; for the most basic and fundamental reality respecting the Church is that she is a temple for the habitation of God through the Spirit. She is regenerated, baptized, and sealed by the Spirit. If it be contended that these conditions could have existed before Pentecost cost, it is easily proved that the Scriptures do not declare that these relationships obtained until *after* Pentecost (cf. John 14:17). A Church without the finished work on which to stand; a Church without resurrection position or life; a Church which is a new humanity, but lacking a federal head; and a Church without Pentecost and all that Pentecost contributes, is only a figment of theological fancy and wholly extraneous to the New Testament.

VII. The Church in Type and Prophecy

The statement, as usually made, that the Church is not in the Old Testament, is a declaration of the truth that she was not then in actual existence and that from any type or prediction no clear delineation of the Church could have been formed. As for the types, it is evident that every sacrifice of the old order was a foreshadowing of Christ's death in which death the Church sustains so large a part. The antitypical meaning of the Levitical offerings and at least four of the seven feasts of Jehovah converge on the Church. Some of the brides of the Old Testament are types of the Bride of Christ. Prophecy concerning the Church is largely within the New Testament. Of her, as has been said, Christ not only declared that He would

build her as His own, but that “the gates of hell” should not prevail against her. Those gates have prevailed constantly against the organized church which is in the world; but those gates have never prevailed against the Church which is His Body. Each member of that Church has been and ever will be preserved unto His heavenly kingdom.

As Archbishop Trench has written, the term *church* had its heathen, its Old Testament use—as employed by the LXX—and its New Testament meaning. It is to no purpose to attempt a demonstration, as some have sought to do, that the Church is defined by the use of the term in the Septuagint. The word is advanced in the New Testament to the highest degree of exaltation and honorable representation, and the revelations of the Church in the New Testament are without complication or confusion.

Chapter III

CONTRASTS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE CHURCH

THOUGH MUCH HAS ALREADY BEEN PRESENTED IN THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO ECCLESIOLOGY BEARING ON THE DISTINCTIONS WHICH OBTAIN BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE CHURCH, A PARTIAL SUMMARIZATION OF THIS INEXHAUSTIBLE FIELD OF INVESTIGATION IS INCLUDED AT THIS POINT. TWENTY-FOUR CONTRASTS ARE TO BE INDICATED IN BRIEFEST OUTLINE AND THIS WILL BE FOLLOWED BY A RECOGNITION OF THE SIMILARITIES WHICH ARE PRESENT BETWEEN THESE TWO IMPORTANT GROUPINGS OF HUMANITY.

I. The Extent of Bibilical Revelation With respect to primary application, Israel occupies nearly four-fifths of the text of the Bible, while the Church, with respect to primary application, occupies slightly more than one-fifth.

II. The Divine Purpose

Because of a strange inattention on the part of many, it needs to be stated that there are two major divine purposes, both quite apart from that which concerns either the angels or the Gentiles. The distinction between the purpose for Israel and the purpose for the Church is about as important as that which exists between the two Testaments. Every covenant, promise, and provision for Israel is earthly, and they continue as a nation with the

earth when it is created new. Every covenant or promise for the Church is for a heavenly reality, and she continues in heavenly citizenship when the heavens are recreated.

III. The Seed of Abraham

In view of the fact that Abraham is not only the progenitor of the nation of promise but is also the pattern of a Christian under grace, it is significant that there are two figures employed by Jehovah respecting Abraham's seed —the dust of the earth (Gen. 13:16), and the stars (Gen. 15:5; cf. Heb. 11:12). The extent of this Abrahamic covenant is expressed in Romans 4:16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all." Aside from Ishmael's line and the children of Keturah concerning whom there is no revealed divine purpose, the children of Jacob, or Israel, and without reference to Esau, are counted as the physical seed (cf. Gen. 22:2; Heb. 11:17) of Abraham; for with these God has made covenants respecting their earthly privilege. Contrariwise, the heavenly seed of Abraham are not progenerated by Abraham, but are generated by God on the efficacious principle of faith; and, because of the truth that this faith was exercised specifically by Abraham (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:1–3, 17–24), those of like faith are Abraham's spiritual seed. It is written, "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" (Gal. 3:9). A vital distinction is drawn by the Apostle between Israel after the flesh and that portion of Israel within Israel who are saved. Those who are saved are styled "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16), and the statement that "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Rom. 9:6) is a reference to the same distinction. The use of these passages to prove Israel and the Church to be the same is deplored in the light of the truth which these Scriptures declare.

IV. Birth

Israelites become what they are by physical birth. They are each one begotten of human parents and their inheritance is transmitted by human generation. Christians become what they are by spiritual birth. They are

begotten directly by God and are therefore His legitimate offspring. Their inheritance is immediate in that each is a child of God.

V. Headship

Abraham is the head of the Jewish race, and they are properly designated as “the seed of Abraham.” Though born of Gentile stock, Abraham was set apart by God to the high honor of being the progenitor of the elect earthly people. Over against this it may be said of Christians, though when magnifying the element of faith they are called “Abraham’s seed” (Gal. 3:29), God is their Father and by the Spirit they are joined to Christ and He, the resurrected Lord, is their new federal Head.

VI. Covenants

God has made unconditional covenants with His earthly people. He will yet make a new covenant with them when they enter their kingdom. That new covenant will govern their conduct and will supersede the Mosaic covenant of the Law (cf. Jer. 31:31–33; Deut. 30:8). This new covenant for Israel will be in four parts, but these four features are the present blessings of the Church. This heavenly people are sheltered under a new covenant made in His blood. It is individual in its application and everlasting. It guarantees every divine grace upon those who believe in Christ as Savior.

VII. Nationality

Israel belongs to the earth and to the world-system. Though above all nations in Jehovah’s reckoning, they are still in the world as one of its nations. Over against this and forming the strongest contrast is the fact that the Church is composed of all nations, including Israel, and sustains no citizenship here, but instead the believers are strangers and pilgrims.

VIII. Divine Dealing

The fact that, in the present age, Israelites, like Gentiles, are shut up to their individual responsibility respecting the claims of the gospel, doubtless misleads those who do not consider the wide range of human history which

the Bible covers. They fail to realize that the present divine arrangement is exceptional and that God has in other ages dealt with nations—especially Israel—as a whole. The present arrangement is restricted to the one age in which responsibility is altogether personal.

IX. Dispensations

The earthly people, though their estate may vary, are present in the earth in all ages from their beginning in Abraham on into eternity to come, while, as stated before, the Church is restricted to the present dispensation. The dispensation now operative itself is characterized by her presence in the world. It was introduced for her sake; and is therefore unrelated to that which goes before or that which follows.

X. Ministry

Israel was appointed to exercise an influence over the nations of the earth (cf. Ps. 67:1–7), and this she will yet do perfectly in the coming age; nevertheless there was no missionary undertaking and no gospel proclaimed. Israel maintained her self-centered worship. She faced inward toward the tabernacle or temple and all her benevolence was consumed on her own worship. However, immediately upon her formation, the Church is constituted a foreign missionary society. It is her obligation to face outward and to those of her company is given the task of evangelizing the people of the earth in each generation.

XI. The Death of Christ

That nation which demanded the death of Christ and who said by their officials, “His blood be on us, and on our children,” is guilty of that death; yet they will be saved as a nation on the ground of that sacrifice. On the other hand, a present and perfect salvation to the praise of God is the portion of the Church through the offering of the Lamb of God.

XII. The Father

To Israel God is known by His primary titles, but not as the Father of the individual Israelite. In distinction to this, the Christian is actually begotten of God and has every right to address Him as Father.

XIII. Christ

To Israel, Christ is Messiah, Immanuel, and King with all that those appellations imply. To the Church, Christ is Savior, Lord, Bridegroom, and Head.

XIV. The Holy Spirit

Only in exceptional instances and for unusual service did the Holy Spirit come upon an Israelite, and the Spirit withdrew as freely as He came, when the purpose was accomplished. The strongest contrast is to be seen here, in that the Christian is indwelt by the Spirit; in truth, he is not saved apart from this relation to the Spirit (Rom. 8:9).

XV. A Governing Principle

For fifteen centuries the Law of Moses was Israel's rule of daily life. It is written: "But the mercy of the LORD is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children; to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them" (Ps. 103:17–18). Unlike this, the members of Christ's Body, being wholly perfected in Him, are under the beseechings and directions which grace provides.

XVI. Divine Enablement

The law system provided no enabling power for its achievement. That system is declared to have failed because of the weakness of "the flesh" to which it was evidently addressed (Rom. 8:3). To the Church, however, as certainly as superhuman requirements are laid on her members, so certainly supernatural power is provided for every demand. It is on this account the Apostle could say "Sin shall not have dominion over you." The reason, of course, is that "ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Rom. 6:14).

XVII. Two Farewell Discourses Several days before His departure from the world, Christ addressed a farewell discourse to the nation Israel which contemplated her future and that in its relation to His return (Matt. 23:37–25:46). Quite removed from this and wholly different in all its features, Christ, the night before He was put to death, gave His parting message to the Christians. When these two addresses are contemplated side by side, it is seen that the widest distinctions are indicated between Israel and the Church.

XVIII. The Promise of Christ's Return As seen in His words specifically addressed to Israel, Christ returns to her as her King in power and great glory, at which time she will be gathered from every part of the earth by angelic ministration and into her own land (Deut. 30:1–8; Jer. 23:7–8; Matt. 24:31). Over against these great events promised to Israel is the return of Christ for His own Bride, when He takes her with Him into heaven's glory (John 14:1–3). The contrasts between these two situations may be drawn out to great lengths and with equally great profit.

XIX. Position

Isaiah declares, "But thou, Israel, art my servant" (Isa. 41:8). Though individuals in Israel attained to great usefulness, as did the prophets, priests, and kings, yet they never reached a higher distinction than that they were the *servants* of Jehovah. Contrariwise, the individuals who compose the Church are forever in Christ and are members in the family and household of God.

XX. Christ's Earthly Reign Those of the elect nation are appointed to be subjects of the King in His earthly kingdom (Ezek. 37:21–28), while those who comprise the Church are to reign with the King as His Consort in that kingdom (Rev. 20:6).

XXI. Priesthood

The nation Israel *had* a priesthood. The Church *is* a priesthood.

XXII. Marriage

As a nation, Israel is likened by Jehovah to His wife—a wife untrue and yet to be restored (Jer. 3:1, 14, 20; Ezek. 16:1–59; Hos. 2:1–23; Isa. 54:1–17; cf. Gal. 4:27). In marked distinction to this situation respecting Israel, is the revelation that the Church is to Christ as one espoused and to be married in heaven (2 Cor. 11:2; Rev. 19:7–9).

XXIII. Judgements

It is clearly predicted that Israel must come into judgment (Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 25:1–13); but it is as clearly declared that the Church will not come into judgment (John 5:24; Rom. 8:1, R.V.).

XXIV. Position in Eternity

In his enumeration of the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem the writer to the Hebrews asserts that there shall be those present who are identified as "the spirits of just men made perfect." Such can easily refer to the saints of the Old Testament who, while in this life, were styled *just men*. This designation occurs upwards of thirty times in the Old Testament and always with reference to those who were in right relation to God. In the same enumeration of the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem there is recognition also of the "church of the firstborn" (Heb. 12:22–24).

Conclusion

In concluding this extended series of contrasts between Israel and the Church, it should be observed that, in certain respects, there are similarities between these two groups of elect people. Each, in turn, has its own peculiar relation to God, to righteousness, to sin, to redemption, to salvation, to human responsibility, and to destiny. They are each witnesses to the Word of God; each may claim the same Shepherd; they have doctrines in common; the death of Christ avails in its own way for each;

they are alike loved with an everlasting love; and each, as determined by God, will be glorified.

Chapter IV

Seven Figures Used of the Church in Her Relation to Christ(I–V)

The true Church, though contemplated under many cognomens, is the central theme of that major portion of the New Testament which bears on the present age. She is the purpose of God in the present age and the supreme purpose of God in the universe. The current neglect of the extensive doctrine of the Church is not only blameworthy, but has led to a considerable array of baneful errors. Sectarianism, with its offense against every specific revelation respecting the one Body of Christ, is not the least of these sins. Had theological instruction of the past given even a small proportion of the recognition to this theme that rightfully belongs to it, Christendom might have been spared its present tragic appearance of being a camp of warring factions. Apparently, the only sacred thing which is honored at this time is the sect. Attacks are tolerated against the most basic and indispensable doctrines without resentment, but disloyalty to a sect is resented. The cure is not in mass movements; it lies in the personal responsibility of every believer to "keep the unity of the Spirit" (Eph. 4:3) by loving and fellowshiping with every other child of God. America alone knows at least three hundred sectarian distinctions, each of which is self-satisfied and promoting church loyalty, all of which, being interpreted, means sectarian fidelity and homage. True, Christ said, "Love one another, as I have loved you"; but this direction must be restricted in scope to include only those of the group to which one belongs. Over against this—though to many it seems not to exist—is the doctrine of the one Body of Christ, the one family and household of God. Happy, indeed, is the individual who can adjust his life and activities to this New Testament reality.

Very much truth concerning the Church is to be discovered in the three groupings of sevens in which she appears, namely, the seven parables of Matthew 13, the seven letters to the seven churches in Asia of Revelation 2 and 3, and the seven figures used of the Church in her relation to Christ.

The first two of these sevens deserve at least a brief consideration, while the third is the theme of this entire division of Ecclesiology.

(a) Without exact identification of her precise nature or her name, the seven parables of Matthew 13 present the specific group which comprises the Church according to the divine purpose in this age, and disclose the facts regarding two other facts and influences which were to be, and have been, both present and equidistant with the Church in this age. By a process of sowing of seed to many people, a residue of what is called *wheat* would be, and has been, secured; counterfeit and destructive seed would be, and has been, sown by Satan; a structure of profession which is out of all proportion to its small beginning and which harbors evil birds which catch away the seed would be, and has been, developed; leaven, the symbol of evil doctrine, would be, and has been, injected into the very company of the elect; Israel, likened to a treasure, would be, and has been, hidden in the field—the *cosmos* world—the Church, likened to a pearl of great cost for which Christ sold all that He might possess it, would be, and has been, secured through redemption; and the age will end by a division of the good and bad fish, as also by the separation of the wheat from the tares. In the end, the wheat will be gathered into His barn and the good fish into vessels. In concluding these parables, Christ said, “So shall it be at the end of the world [consummation of the age]: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth” (Matt. 13:49–50).

(b) In an extended and accurate exposition of the seven letters to the seven churches, as presented in his *Lectures on the Book of Revelation*, Dr. H. A. Ironside writes the following:

> Before we begin our study of “The Things which are,” let me give you this parable. Sometime ago, rummaging through an old castle, some people came across a very strange-looking old lock which secured a stout door. They shook the door and tried to open it, but to no avail. They tried one way and another to move the lock, but could not turn it. By and by somebody picked up a bunch of old keys from some rubbish on the floor and he said, “Maybe I can unlock it.” He tried one key and it made no impression. He tried another and it gave a little; another and it gave a little more; and so on, but none would open the lock. At last he came to a peculiar old key. He slipped it into the lock, gave a turn, and the lock was open. They said, “Undoubtedly this key was meant for this lock.”
>
> You will understand my parable if I draw your attention to the fact that, in the 20th verse of the 1st chapter, we are told that there was a mystery connected with the seven lampstandss. The seven lampstands are said to symbolize the seven churches of Asia, but there was a

> mystery connected with them. While some have tried one key and some have tried another (and there have been all kinds of efforts made to interpret this mystery), no solution was found until some devout students of Scripture weighing this portion said, “Might it not be that inasmuch as this section of the book presents ‘the things which are,’ God has been pleased to give us here a prophetic history of the church for the entire dispensation?” But would the key fit the lock? They compared the first part of the church’s history with the letter to Ephesus. Here it fitted perfectly. They went on and compared the letter to Smyrna with the second part of the church’s history, and the agreement was most marked. They went on right down to the end, and when they came to Laodicea they found that what is written to the church of Laodicea answers exactly to the condition of the professing church in the days in which we live, and they said: “There, the mystery is all clear. The lock has been opened; therefore we have the right key.”—Pp. 35–36

It is obvious that these seven letters were written to existing churches and that they applied in a specific manner to the believers to whom they were written. It is equally to be noted that these messages are addressed to all believers and to all churches of God everywhere and at any time. The phrase, “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches”—with which each letter ends—is proof of the universal application of these postascension messages from Christ. Yet, again, and even more vitally, and as Dr. Ironside points out, these letters anticipate—and so it has been fulfilled—the course of the history of the visible church in this age. While this body of truth belongs primarily to the division of Ecclesiology which contemplates the organized church in the world, the true Church, for the most part, is within this company and, therefore, what is declared of the one involves, to some extent, the other.

(c) The all-important revelation respecting the true Church is contained in the seven relationships which she sustains to Christ, which are: (a) the Shepherd and the sheep, (b) the Vine and the branches, (c) the Cornerstone and the stones of the building, (d) the High Priest and the kingdom of priests, (e) the Head and the Body with its many members, (f) the Last Adam and the New Creation, and (g) the Bridegroom and the Bride. Attention will now be given to these in order.

I. The Shepherd and the Sheep

The term *sheep* as applied in the Bible to men is broad in its significance. With complete propriety it is used of Israel, and of the nations that will yet stand on the right hand of the King, and later enter the kingdom prepared

for them (Matt. 25:34). The designation, then, in its larger scope, is of any people who are favored of God. However, the use of the word *sheep* in the figure under consideration is restricted to believers of the present dispensation. The utter helplessness of a sheep renders that animal an apt illustration of the Christian.

As the Gospel by John is written that the reader may believe that Jesus is the Christ and believing may have life through His name (John 20:31), it is essential to recognize, also, that, with the exception of chapters 13–17, the words of Christ contained in that Gospel were spoken to Jews. There is no implication here that the truth uttered belonged to Judaism; on the contrary, these extended portions demonstrate the truth that the gospel of God's grace is addressed to Jews as it is to Gentiles, and on the same terms of faith in the Savior. The people of Israel were the "sheep of his pasture" (Ps. 74:1; 79:13; 95:7; 100:3; Jer. 23:1). The divine undertaking which is portrayed in John 10, under the figure of the shepherd and the sheep, is, first, of the coming of the Savior, the Good Shepherd, who comes by the door, who is the Door, who gives His life for the sheep, who leads them out, and whom they intuitively follow. The sheep are not here said to be led into the fold, but rather they are led out of it to find salvation, liberty, and pasture (vs. 9). The reference is to those who through faith in Christ are led out of Judaism, Israel's fold; and these together with other sheep—Gentile believers which are not of the Jewish fold—will form one flock under the one Shepherd (the translation of ποίμνη in vs. 16 by the term *fold* is misleading: the word means *flock*, R.V.; cf. Matt. 26:31; Luke 2:8; 1 Cor. 9:7). The *flock* that was anticipated by Christ is the Church called out from both Jews and Gentiles.

Dr. A. C. Gaebelein writes clearly on this great theme:

> The teaching of this chapter is closely linked with the preceding event. It has become evident that the true sheep of Christ, belonging to His flock, would be cast out of the Jewish fold. The healed man cast out had become one of His sheep. Therefore He teaches now more fully concerning Himself as the Shepherd and about His sheep. The Old Testament speaks often of Israel as the sheep of Jehovah, and of Jehovah as the Shepherd (Ps. 80:1; 95:7; 23:1; Ezek. 34; Zech. 11:7–9; 13:7). The true Shepherd had come through the appointed door into the sheepfold, that is among Israel. He is the only One, and the porter (the Holy Spirit) opened to Him. He came and called His own sheep by name to lead them out. And the sheep hear His voice and follow Him. All is Jewish. He came, the true Shepherd, into the sheepfold to lead them out to become His flock. It was a parable He spoke in these opening verses, but they did not understand it. What follows is a fuller revelation of Himself as the good Shepherd, and the sheep who belong to His flock. Judaism was a fold out of which the

Shepherd leads His flock. He is the Door of the sheep. He is the means of getting into the flock, as a door is the means of getting into a house. Through Him all His sheep must enter by faith into the flock. There is no other door and no other way. He came into the fold by God's appointed way and He is God's appointed way. "I am the door, by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." A most blessed promise. He is the door. Any man, it does not matter who it is, any man may enter in by Him and then having entered in by Him, that is believed on Him, He promises salvation, liberty and food. These three things are bestowed upon all who believe on Him. Salvation is in Him and it is a present and a perfect salvation; liberty, freed from the bondage of the law which condemned the sinner, a perfect liberty; pasture, food, which He supplies; He Himself is the food, a perfect food. It is all found outside of the fold, the fold of Judaism, and in Christ. He came that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly. The abundant life He speaks of here is the life which comes from His death and resurrection. The good Shepherd had to give His life for the sheep. How different from the hireling, who fleeth and careth not for the sheep. The hirelings were the faithless shepherds (Ezek. 34:1–6). Again He said: "I lay down my life for the sheep." In verse 16 our Lord speaks of other sheep, which are not of this fold. These are the Gentiles. He leads out first from the Jewish fold His sheep; then there are the other sheep whom He will bring and who will hear His voice. The result will be one flock and one Shepherd. The Authorized Version is incorrect in using the word "fold." Judaism was a fold, the church is not. The ecclesiastical folds in which Christendom is divided have been brought about by the Judaizing of the church. The fold no longer exists. There is one flock as there is one Shepherd; one body, as there is one Lord. All who have heard His voice, believed on Him, entered in by Him, are members of the one flock.—*The Annotated Bible: Matthew—Acts*, pp. 213–15

To the same end, F. W. Grant's notes in his *Numerical Bible* are just as convincing:

He is come then to give life: as the Good Shepherd, by laying down His own: yet it is not so much doctrine that is here, as the insistence upon a love proved at whatever cost. The hireling cares but for his wages: the sheep are not his own, and he is not personally concerned about them: when the wolf appears, he leaves the sheep and flees; alas, no supposititious case, but what has been abundantly seen in history. The wolf in consequence, the open adversary, catches them and scatters them. The hireling acts in character: nothing better could be expected of him. On the contrary, between the Good Shepherd and His own exists a bond of the most tender intimacy. "I know My own, and they know Me; even as My Father knoweth Me, and I know My Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep." "The world knew Him not:" there was the strangeness resulting from contrasted natures. His sheep know Him: for they have received His life and nature, and have thus been brought into communion; and this is the same kind of knowledge as exists (however much more perfectly) between the Father and the Son. The love implied in it is manifested in this, that He lays down His life for the sheep. But His sheep as thus defined have no longer any relationship with the Jewish fold, still less can be limited to those who have such. Law could not give this gift of eternal life, nor have, therefore, any control over it. In the fold itself there had been those that were not His own; and there are sheep of His not of that fold at all, but Gentiles, far enough off, to be brought nigh and made to hear His voice. Then there shall be one *flock*,

one Shepherd. There is no *fold* any more: the fold was Jewish and legal, and is gone. In Christ is neither Jew nor Gentile.—*The Gospels*, pp. 548–49

The salient features which the figure of Christ as Shepherd and the Church as the flock contributes to the whole doctrine of the true Church are: (a) that Christ came by the door, which is the appointed way; (b) that He is a *true* shepherd, going before His sheep, and no other voice will they hear; (c) that He Himself is the door for the sheep—out from their former estate into His saving grace, and as a door of security, as well, which closes behind them (John 10:28–29); (d) that salvation, freedom from a merit obligation, and food for the new life are all provided by the Shepherd; (e) that all other shepherds are hirelings at best: none have given, nor could they give, their life for the sheep as the Good Shepherd has done; (f) that there is a communion of understanding within the family of God—the sheep know the Shepherd, as the Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father; and (g) that there is but one flock, for saving grace has brought every individual sheep, regardless of his former situation, into one and the same perfected position in Christ Jesus.

It should be noted, then, that through the God-provided Savior, there is life, liberty, and sustenance; that this Savior is efficacious because He laid down His life for the sheep; that there is a complete relationship established between the Shepherd and the sheep unto eternal ages; and that there is but one flock.

The entire doctrine of the Shepherdhood of Christ is properly introduced in this connection—His ceaseless intercession, His ceaseless advocacy, and His ceaseless impartation of Himself as spiritual food and spiritual vitality. “The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want.” If that great reality were true of David within the provisions of Judaism, how much more is it true of the believer under grace!

II. The Vine and the Branches

This figure, quite in contrast to that of the Shepherd and the sheep which was spoken to Israelites, is addressed to believers (John 15). It is the peculiar character of the Upper Room Discourse (John 13–17) that it looks on to conditions that would obtain after Christ’s death, after His resurrection, after His ascension, and after Pentecost. This discourse is,

more than any other portion of the Scriptures, the clearest and dearest message to believers in this dispensation. It therefore follows that this figure, falling, as it does, within the limits of this specific portion of the Scriptures, is directly applicable to Christians. They are not here said to have been led out of Judaism, nor is there any reference to their former estate. Though of real significance in its place, little importance is to be placed at this point on the truth that Israel was the vineyard of Jehovah (Isa. 5:1–7; Jer. 2:21; Hos. 10:1; Luke 20:9–16). There is little doubt that the phrase, "I am the true vine," is intended to be in contrast to the Israelitish vine. That vine was fruitless; but the True Vine must be fruitful and it will be. The Lord Himself will achieve this; but, from the human side, fruitfulness depends on abiding in Christ—a relationship which the believers as branches are appointed to maintain.

Discussion on the meaning of this figure has gone before in this work, and attention has been directed to the distinction which obtains between *union* with Christ and *communion* with Christ. It has been demonstrated that the purpose of this figure is to develop the underlying truth respecting *communion* with Christ, and that *union* with Christ is assumed—as evidenced by the words, "every branch in me" (vs. 2). At no time here or in any part of the New Testament is it ever declared that *union* with Christ is a human responsibility or accomplishment, nor is it implied that it might even be sustained by any human virtue or effort. To be in Christ is the highest of positions and is distinctly declared to be a result which is brought about by the baptism with the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13). Abiding in Christ means unbroken fellowship with Christ. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love" (John 15:10). Similarly, the Lord's own commandments are contained in His written Word. It therefore is said, "if ye abide in me, and my words abide in you" (vs. 7); thus, finding His will in His Word and doing that will, becomes the Christian's uncomplicated responsibility if he would abide in Christ. "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked" (1 John 2:6). Dr. C. I. Scofield's note on abiding in Christ is conclusive: "To abide in Christ is, on the one hand, to have no known sin unjudged and unconfessed, no interest into which He is not brought, no life which He cannot share. On the other hand, the abiding one takes all burdens to Him, and draws all wisdom, life and strength from

Him. It is not unceasing *consciousness* of these things, and of Him, but that nothing is allowed in the life which separates from Him" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 1136–37).

It may well be restated that the results of abiding in Christ, as indicated in John 15, are: pruning (vs. 2), prayer effectual (vs. 7), joy celestial (vs. 11), and fruit perpetual (vs. 16). No features of a true Christian life are more vital than these: growth and improvement through discipline, measureless efficacy in prayer, that joy which is due to an unbroken fellowship with Christ (cf. 1 John 1:3–4), and lasting fruit to the glory of God. Fruit is here seen to be the product of the Vine whose vitality is imparted to the branch. Apart from this flow nothing of real value can be wrought (vs. 5). Fruit is the product of the Holy Spirit (Gal. 5:22–23). The very purpose of union with Christ is that the believer may "bring forth fruit unto God" (Rom. 7:4). The fruitfulness of believers is a most important factor in the divine plan and purpose for this age. The Church is being called out by the testimony and ministry of the members in Christ's Body. It is the ministry of the saints that is now completing the Body. This truth is asserted by the Apostle thus: "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Eph. 4:12–16). In like manner, concerning the true Church, it is said of her when about to be presented to her Lord: "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready" (Rev. 19:7). It is no small feature of this achievement that the Bride "hath made herself ready."

The contribution which the figure of the Vine and its branches makes to the doctrine of the Church is particularly that, by the unbroken communion of the believer with His Lord, the enabling power of God rests upon him

both for his own priceless experience of joyous fellowship and for fruitfulness by prayer and testimony unto the completion of the Body of Christ. The vine and the branches partake of one common life. This is true also of Christ and the Church.

III. The Cornerstone and the Stones of the Building

Another wide distinction is indicated when it is declared that Israel had a temple (Ex. 25:8) and the Church is a temple (Eph. 2:21). The figure of a temple or building which is now God's habitation in the earth—a temple purified and holy through the merit of Christ—is presented in Ephesians 2:19–22: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Of this conception Christ spoke when He said, "Upon this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). In like manner, Peter, to whom Christ thus spoke concerning His purpose to build His Church, said, "Ye also, as lively [living] stones, are built [being built] up a spiritual house" (1 Pet. 2:5). Reference is made to "Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we" (Heb. 3:6); also it is said, "Ye are God's building" (1 Cor. 3:9).

The symbolization of Christ as a stone is to be seen in various particulars: (a) in relation to Gentiles, He is the Smiting Stone in their final judgment (Dan. 2:34); (b) to Israel, His coming as a Servant rather than as a King became a stumbling stone to them and a rock of offense (Isa. 8:14–15; 1 Cor. 1:23; 1 Pet. 2:8); (c) to the Church, Christ is the Foundation Stone (1 Cor. 3:11), and the Chief Cornerstone (Eph. 2:20–22; 1 Pet. 2:4–5). The exaltation of Christ as Chief Cornerstone was accomplished by His resurrection (He was not that before), and was accomplished in spite of the opposition to, and rejection of, the Stone by the "builders"—Israel. In Psalm 118:22–24, it is declared: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the LORD'S doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." Speaking of His resurrection, Peter asserts that

“this is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner” (Acts 4:11). Christ quotes the same Old Testament prediction and forecasts that the kingdom of God will be taken from Israel and given to a people bringing forth the fruits thereof. This prediction foresees the impending transition from the former divine purpose in Israel to the present divine purpose in the Church. Yet, further, He anticipates the fact that Israel would stumble over Himself as the “rock of offence,” and that the Gentiles will “be ground to powder” under the judgment of that same Smiting Stone. The passage reads, “Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder” (Matt. 21:42–44). Thus, as the Stone, Christ becomes the destruction of Gentile authority (cf. Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; Rev. 19:15), the Stumbling Stone to Israel, and the Foundation Stone and Chief Cornerstone to the Church.

A building is being constructed which has three specific distinctions, namely, (a) that each stone in the building is itself a living stone; that is, it partakes of the divine nature (1 Pet. 2:5); (b) its Chief Cornerstone, like its Foundation, is Christ (Eph. 2:20–22; 1 Cor. 3:11; 1 Pet. 2:6); and (c) the whole structure is itself “an habitation of God through the Spirit” (Eph. 2:22).

After reminding the Gentile believers in Ephesus (Eph. 2:19–20) that they are “no more strangers and foreigners,” as they were before said to be (cf. Eph. 2:12), the Apostle declares that they are now “fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God”—a blessing which, it should be observed, is as much higher than the commonwealth and covenant privileges of Israel as heaven is higher than the earth. Though once excluded from the earthly Jerusalem, the Gentiles are now come with a gracious welcome to the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22–24) , in which city the unregenerate Jew, with all his national preference and title to earthly Jerusalem, is an alien. The phrase, “fellowcitizens with the saints,” must be received in its restricted meaning as also the fact that this spiritual structure is built on “the foundation of the apostles and [New Testament]

prophets." God has had His saints in all dispensations, but they of the past ages have not formed any part of the Church. Saints are sanctified ones set apart unto God. That New Testament saints are advanced to a higher position of standing than the Old Testament saints (though not necessarily to more faith and piety), is revealed in Hebrews 10:10, where we read: "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." This sanctification, or Sainthood, could not be realized until Christ died and rose again, for it is characterized by position in Him, which position could be accorded only to those who are by the Spirit united to the risen Christ. It is true that all saints of all the ages will be gathered eventually before God in a new heaven and a new earth (Heb. 11:39–40; 12:22–24); but the Old Testament saints were no part of the New Creation in Christ, nor were they builded upon the foundation of the apostles and the New Testament prophets. In this Ephesian passage it is declared that the Church, like a building, is being built upon the foundation of the apostles and New Testament prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Cornerstone. It is in Him that all the building is being fitly framed together and is thus "growing" into an holy temple in the Lord. In Him the separate and various members are being builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. During the past dispensation the habitation of God was the tabernacle, and later the temple—the earthly sanctuary or holy place made with hands (cf. Heb. 8:2; 9:1–2, 24)—which, though held in antithesis to the heavenly sanctuary into which Christ has now entered, was, nevertheless, the type of the present spiritual habitation of God in a temple of living stones. However, at this point the Apostle is not dwelling on the truth which concerns the individual believer, but rather on that which has to do with the corporate Body of Christ; and his declaration is that the Church, as it is now being formed in the world, is being builded as an habitation of God through the Spirit. Let it be said again, Israel *had* a building in which God was pleased to dwell; the Church *is* a building in which God is pleased to dwell.

The contribution which is made to the doctrine of the Church by the figure of the Chief Cornerstone and the stones of the building is that of the interdependence of each saved person upon every other saved person, as a building is weakened and on its way to dissolution by the removal of one stone from the structure; the whole building is built on Christ and thus depends wholly on Christ; and, lastly and of paramount import, this

building, like each stone in the structure, is a temple of God through the Spirit. The fact of the indwelling Spirit is a characterizing feature of the Church which receives supreme emphasis in Scripture revelation.

IV. The High Priest and the Kingdom of Priests

The priesthood of Christ is typified by the Old Testament high priest, by Aaron, and by Melchizedek. This extended field of typology is set forth in its antitypical meaning in the letter to the Hebrews (cf. 5:1–10; 6:13—8:6). In His High Priestly service, Christ is over the hierarchy of priests which constitutes the Church and as the Appointer to, and Director of, their service. In His Aaronic ministry, Christ offered a sacrifice to God. That sacrifice was Himself, offered without spot. In this undertaking He was both Sacrificer and Sacrifice; but the Aaronic pattern could go no further than to be the Sacrificer. In His Melchizedek priesthood, He is King-Priest. Melchizedek was of Salem, which is *peace* (Isa. 11:6–9); he had no beginning or ending of days, no human parents; and he was a high priest by divine authority (Ps. 110:4).

The Christian is a king-priest unto God. His service as king is deferred until the coming age when he reigns with Christ (Rev. 20:6); but his priestly service is in force at the present time. There is a future aspect of the believer's priesthood as declared in Revelation 20:6, "But they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Israel was first appointed to a similar position (cf. Ex. 19:6); but in this they failed. The present king-priest position of the Church, being sustained by God, cannot fail.

In the Old Testament order the priesthood was a hierarchy over the nation and in their service they were under the authority of the high priest. In the New Testament order every believer is a priest unto God (1 Pet. 2:5–9; Rev. 1:6) and the whole ministering company of New Testament priests is under the authority of Christ who is the true High Priest, of whom all other high priests were but types. Therefore, according to the New Testament order, service is committed to all believers alike and on the ground of their priestly relation to God. As there was no evangel to be preached to the nations of the earth, service, in the period covered by the Old Testament, consisted only in the performance by the priests of the

divinely appointed ritual in the tabernacle or temple. In contrast to this, the New Testament priestly ministry is much broader in its scope, including not only a service to God and fellow believers, but to all men everywhere.

1. The Service of Sacrifice. At this point there is a striking similarity to be observed. The Old Testament priest was sanctified or set apart both by the fact that he was born into the priestly family of Levi and by the fact that he, with due ceremony, was inducted into the priestly office, which appointment continued so long as he lived. Likewise, at the beginning of his ministry he was ceremonially cleansed by a oncefor-all bathing (Ex. 29:4). In fulfilling the antitype, the believer priest is wholly and once for all cleansed at the moment he is saved (Col. 2:13; Titus 3:5), and, by virtue of his salvation, is set apart unto God. So, also, he is set apart by the new birth into the family of God. In addition to all this, it is peculiarly required of the New Testament priest that he shall *willingly* dedicate himself to God. Concerning his self-dedication we read: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1). The phrase, *the mercies of God*, refers to the great facts of salvation which have been set forth in the preceding chapters of the book of Romans, into which mercies every believer enters the moment he is saved, while the presentation of the body as a living sacrifice is the self-dedication to the will of God of all that the believer is and has. That which is thus yielded, God accepts and places where He wills in the field of service (Eph. 2:10). According to the Scriptures, this divine act of accepting and placing is consecration. Therefore, the believer priest may *dedicate* himself, but never *consecrates* himself, to God. In connection with the divine act of consecration, it should be observed that the present work of Christ as High Priest—appointing, directing, and administering the service of believers—fulfills that which was typified by the ministry of the Old Testament priest in the consecration of the sons of Levi. Having yielded to God and being no longer conformed to this world, the believer priest will experience a transfigured life by the power of the indwelling Spirit, and by that power he will make full proof of "what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God" (Rom. 12:2).

According to the New Testament order, priestly service in sacrifice toward God is threefold: (a) the dedication of self, which is declared to be a "reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1), or more literally (R.V.marg.), "a spiritual worship." As Christ was Himself both a Sacrificer and a Sacrifice, so the believer may glorify God by the offering of his whole body as a living sacrifice to God; (b) the sacrifice of the lips, which is the voice of praise and is to be offered continually (Heb. 13:15); (c) the sacrifice of substance (Phil. 4:18).

Referring to the cleansing of the priests, it should be noted again that the Old Testament priest upon entering his holy office was once for all cleansed by a *whole* bathing, which bathing was administered to him by another (Ex. 29:4); however, afterwards, though thus wholly bathed, he was required to be cleansed repeatedly by a *partial* bathing at the brazen laver, and this before undertaking any and every priestly service. In fulfilling the typical significance of this, the New Testament priest, though wholly cleansed and forgiven when saved, is at all times required to confess every known sin in order that he may be cleansed and qualified for fellowship with God (1 John 1:9). As the appointment of the Old Testament priest was for life, so the New Testament priest is a priest unto God forever.

2. The Service of Worship. As worship was a part of the service of every priest of the old order, so every believer is now appointed to worship. In like manner, as the furnishings of the holy place symbolized the worship of the priest in the Old Testament order and every feature and furnishing of that place spoke of Christ, so the believer's worship is by and through Christ alone. Again, in service unto God, the believer's worship may be the offering of one's self to God (Rom. 12:1), the ascribing of praise and thanksgiving to God from the heart (Heb. 13:15), or the sacrificial gifts that are offered to Him. In connection with the worship of the Old Testament priests, there were two prohibitions recorded and these, also, are of typical meaning. No "strange" incense was to be burned (Ex. 30:9)—which speaks typically of mere formality in service toward God; and no "strange" fire was allowed (Lev. 10:1)—which symbolizes the substitution of fleshly emotions in our service for true devotion to Christ by the Spirit, or the love of lesser things to the exclusion of the love for Christ (1 Cor. 1:11–13; Col. 2:8, 16–19).

3. The Service of Intercession. As the prophet is God's representative sent to the people, so the priest is the people's representative dispatched to God, and since priesthood is a divine appointment, the necessary access to God is always provided; however, no priest of the old dispensation was permitted to enter the holy of holies other than the high priest, and he but once a year on the ground of sacrificial blood (Heb. 9:7). As for this dispensation, in addition to the fact that Christ as High Priest has with His own blood now entered into the heavenly sanctuary (Heb. 4:14–16; 9:24; 10:19–22) and is now interceding for His own who are in the world (Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:25), when Christ died, the veil of the temple was rent—which signifies that the way into the holiest is now open, not to the world, but to all who come unto God on the ground of the shed blood of Christ (Heb. 10:19–22). Having unhindered access to God on the ground of the blood of Christ, the New Testament priest is thus privileged to minister in intercession (Rom. 8:26–27; Heb. 10:19–22; 1 Tim. 2:1; Col. 4:12).

The contribution which is made to the doctrine of the Church by the figure of the high priest and the kingdom of priests is that, in this life, the believer is not only closely associated with Christ positionally, being in Him, but is closely associated in those activities which He is undertaking on the plane of infinity and which may be extended, by His grace, into the finite sphere. As has been seen, these activities are: service, sacrifice, and intercession. Again, it is made clear that it is given to the members of His Body to share in the great achievement of the outcalling and perfecting of the Church of Christ. The Savior has a glory which accrues to Him because of His great accomplishment, but His own who are in the world are His instruments who will share with Him in His merited glory. Theirs is not merely a glory which is a benefaction, but is one which is due to a partnership fruition.

V. The Head and the Body with Its Many Members

In contrast to Israel, which nation was an organization or commonwealth (Eph. 2:12), and in contrast to the visible church, which is merely a human systemization, the true Church is an *organism*. The term *organism* indicates that the thing specified is permeated throughout all its parts with one common life. It is the same life in the roots and the upper structure of a tree.

It is the same life which is in every member of a human body. Similarly, it is the same life that is in the Church. Each individual in that company has not only been baptized into one Body, but has been made to drink into one Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13). The figure of the head and body with its many members is employed in the Sacred Text more than any other and serves to indicate certain essential facts respecting the Church, namely, (a) that the Church is a self-developing body, (b) that the members of this body are appointed to specific service, and (c) that the body is one.

1. The Church a Self-Developing Body. The central text bearing upon this aspect of the activity of those who comprise the Church is Ephesians 4:11–16. In this passage—following the enumeration of ministry gifts in this age of the Church, namely, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers—the writer declares that the ministry of these gifted men, especially the pastor and teacher, is for the perfecting of the saints unto *their* work of the ministry. In this age, as in no other, there is a specific message to be preached to every creature and, while there are leadership men who are God's gift to the Church, the obligation to witness rests upon every Christian alike. Too much recognition cannot be given to the uncounted multitudes of faithful witnesses who are discharging their commissions as Sunday School teachers, mission workers, personal soul-winners, and living exponents of divine grace. This is the God-appointed New Testament evangelism. The latent evangelizing forces of a congregation of believers are beyond all human calculation; but they need to be trained for their task, and God has prescribed definitely that they should be trained. How else would they be accurate and skillful even in their limited sphere of service? That they are to be trained is indicated in Ephesians 4:11–12. The revelation here is not only of the fact that the saints have a witnessing service to perform, but also of the fact that they are to be *equipped* for this service by the gifted men whom God has placed over them as their leaders. The word καταρτισμός, here translated *perfecting*, is a noun which is but once used in the New Testament and means *equipment,* and so refers to that preparation which all saints should have that they may be effective witnesses for Christ. The verb form of this word is found elsewhere in the New Testament, and with significant meaning. According to this passage (Eph. 4:11–12), the pastor and teacher is responsible for the *equipment* of those given into his

care. Although this equipment does involve methods of work, it includes much more, namely, an accurate knowledge of the truth.

But the pastor and teacher must be trained for his leadership task. Under existing conditions this preparation is committed to the professors in the theological seminary. Their responsibility is greater than that of other men inasmuch as the heavenly things transcend the things of earth. Observe this stream flowing forth from its source: whatever truth and ideals the professor imparts to students in training they, in turn, will later impart to the larger groups over which they are given spiritual care. If a congregation is not actively engaged in soul-winning and missionary work, it is usually because of the fact that they have been deprived of the God-intended leadership to that end. If the pastor has no soul-winning passion, no missionary vision, is limited in his proficiency, and inaccurate as an exponent of the Word of God, his lack in these respects may generally be traced to the fact that he has been deprived of the God-intended spiritual and vital training in the seminary. It may, therefore, be restated that the responsibility of the seminary professor is no less than superhuman. If this be true, no man is fitted to render faculty service in a seminary who is not himself awake to his responsibility and, in addition to that advanced training and accuracy in the truth which his position demands, is himself a worthy example of missionary zeal, evangelistic passion, and tireless soul-winning effort. What revival fires would be set burning and spiritual forces be released should the church demand the purification and perfection of her fountain sources of doctrinal teaching, as well as the worthy illustration of spiritual vitality and soul-winning passion in the life and ministry of those who mold the character of her God-appointed leaders!

This is not an appeal for a lowering of worthy scholarship. The all too prevalent notion that scholarship and spiritual passion cannot exist together in one person was forever answered at the beginning of the Christian era in the case of the Apostle Paul, to say nothing of thousands of great preachers of the past who have attained to enviable scholarship without restricting their spiritual lives or restraining their passion of soul.

The objective in this general witnessing on the part of the whole company of believers is to accomplish a specific task in a prescribed time: “till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of

Christ" (Eph. 4:13). The "perfect man" here cited is not to be interpreted to mean perfect men; it is the completion of the Body of Christ by the adding thereto of all who are His elect people in this age. The dangers which beset believers who are deprived of the teaching, that which was referred to in the previous verse, is described in verse 14: "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Over against this, the one who is taught will "hold the truth in love." The word in verse 15 translated *speaking* is better rendered *holding* (cf. R.V.marg.). The truth is to be held as a controlling possession. Such a one will grow up into Christ in all things. To conclude this statement respecting the development of the Body of Christ, the Apostle writes: "From whom the whole body, fitted together, and connected by every joint of supply, according to [the] working in [its] measure of each one part, works for itself the increase of the body to its self-building up in love" (vs. 16, J. N. Darby translation).

From the above it will be seen that the Church, like the human body, is self-developing. Her members, as evangelizing agencies, are appointed to secure other members. Intelligent soul-winning service on the part of Christians is the New Testament expectation.

2. The Members are Appointed to Specific Service. This extensive portion of truth which likens the Christian to a member in the human body and with a special function to perform is centered in 1 Corinthians 12, and, as these functions represent the exercise of spiritual gifts, the context continues through chapters 13 and 14. A similar and exceedingly important passage respecting the members of the Body and their service is found in Romans 12:3–8. Yet, again, contributing a vital part to the general doctrine of the gifts which the members of the Body exhibit is 1 Peter 4:7–11. It is to be seen, also, that the entire theme of the baptism with the Spirit and that which it accomplishes is closely related to the figure in question, since it is by that baptism that each individual becomes a member in Christ's Body and thus is joined to Christ (1 Cor. 6:17). It is in 1 Corinthians 12:12 that the unity of theBody in its relation to the Head is stated. The passage declares: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ." In

this connection it will be remembered that in Ephesians 4:4 the Apostle makes uncomplicated averment, “There is one body,” and it is in 1 Corinthians 12:13 that he defines the manner in which members are joined to Christ. He states: “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit” (cf. 6:17; Gal. 3:27). All believers are of the one Body: “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular” (1 Cor. 12:27); “For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones” (Eph. 5:30).

The possibility that, through human weakness, there may be jealousy and strife between the members of the Body is guarded against by first pointing out that each member in the Body is placed where he is in the sovereign will of God. Of this sovereignty the Apostle writes in strong statements: “Dividing to every man severally as he will” (1 Cor. 12:11), and, “But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him” (vs. 18). Likewise, in Romans 12:3 the same sovereign purpose is recognized with respect to those gifts which are manifestations of the specific activity of each individual member in the Body. It is written: “For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.” When dealing with jealousies and strife, the Apostle reminds the members of Christ’s Body that the honor before God is the same whatever the position in the Body may be, or whatever human ideals may suggest. All members are necessary and all will be equally rewarded, according to their fruitfulness.

3. The Body is One. The extent of this theme is to be seen in the fact that it forms the very framework upon which the highest revelation respecting the Church is fashioned—that set forth in the letter to the Ephesians (1:23; 2:15–16; 3:6; 4:12–16; 5:30). The argument relative to the one Body, after the introduction of the theme in chapter 1, begins in chapter 2. It is defined in chapter 3, is enforced in chapter 4, and concluded in chapter 5.

In chapter 1, the direct statement is made that the ascended Savior is Head over the Church and that the Church is the fulness—completion in

respect to desire—of Him that filleth all in all. The passage declares: “And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all” (vss. 22–23).

Chapter 2 is largely the disclosure of the fact that, though there was in all generations so great a difference between Jew and Gentile, the bringing of Jew and Gentile into one Body has broken down, within the Church wherein they are united, the middle wall of partition that separated them, and destroyed the enmity. After nineteen hundred years in which the privileges that constitute the distinction between Gentile and Jew have been divinely set aside, it is difficult in the present time for one to realize the difference which prevailed between these two peoples at the beginning of the present age. Two underlying facts should be observed: (a) God, while not releasing His power and sovereignty over the nations, had, nevertheless, declared His favor toward Israel alone, which people formed the acknowledged heritage of God. True, there was a welcome accorded to strangers who chose to ally themselves with Israel; but all were strangers who were not of Israel. There was no other nation or people who were the chosen of Jehovah (Deut. 7:6–11), to whom He was married (Jer. 3:14), whom alone He knew among the families of the earth (Amos 3:2), and whom He had redeemed from Egypt both by blood and by power (2 Sam. 7:23). Probably no passage of Scripture describes the peculiar estate of Israel before God more completely than Romans 9:4–5. It is written: “who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.” Certainly Israel would have been reprehensible had she failed to acknowledge, or to respond to, this divine election. However, the distinction was national and provided no basis for that Pharisaism which came to prevail in the attitude of the Jews toward individual Gentiles. (b) The prejudice of the Jew toward the Gentile, based upon divine favor, had come to be nothing less than hatred and contempt. To the Jew the Gentile was a “dog,” and it was contrary to custom for a Jew to keep company with a Gentile, let alone enter his house. Only divine command could persuade Peter to enter the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:20). Probably no other Scripture describes the actual estate of the

Gentile before God more completely than Ephesians 2:12. While the lost estate of the individual has been disclosed in verses 1–3 of this chapter, the national position of the Gentile, which was equally true of the individual, is described in verse 12. Again, it is written: “that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Five disqualifying charges are here preferred. The Gentiles were “without Christ,” not only personally Christless, as all unsaved are, but having no national Messianic hope; they were outside Israel’s one divinely recognized commonwealth; they were “strangers from the covenants of promise”—this does not deny that God had predicted great earthly blessings for the Gentiles in the coming kingdom age (Dan. 7:13–14; Mic. 4:2); it asserts, rather, that He had entered into no covenant with them as He had with Israel—the Gentiles had “no hope,” since no covenant promise had been accorded them; and they were without God in the world. So they could make no claim to His purpose or favor, and they formed that portion of humanity which was under the curse and was doomed to destruction. The world today knows little of the godless and hopeless condition of human life among the Gentiles in the days to which reference is made. It is said that, at the highest state of Greek culture under Alexander the Great, it was commonly held that the best thing was not to be born at all, and next to that was to die, so fully did the experience of the human heart reflect the actual relation which it unknowingly sustained to God.

In the midst of these distinctions between Jew and Gentile which were set up by God, owned of God, and accentuated by human prejudice and hatred, a new divine purpose was introduced, made possible on the ground of the death and resurrection of Christ and the advent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. That divine purpose is no less than the forming of a new Body of heavenly people drawn from both Jews and Gentiles, each individual in that Body perfected in Christ and the whole company destined to be to “the praise of the glory of his grace.” Therefore, because it is to the glory of His grace, each individual in this company, whether Jew or Gentile, is called and saved upon that distinct principle of selection—the sovereign grace of God, apart from all human merit. As a basis for this exercise of sovereign grace apart from human merit, the most startling divine decree was announced, startling, indeed, because never before heard of in the

world, and because it is so contrary to the hitherto divinely sanctioned exaltation of Israel over the Gentiles. That decree declares that now there is "no difference" between Jew and Gentile: they are all *under sin* (Rom. 3:9). So, again, there is "no difference" between Jew and Gentile, "for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him" (Rom. 10:12). There was little for the Gentile to unlearn in connection with this new age-purpose and plan of salvation. He had no ground for hope before, and the gospel of salvation by grace became to him as life from the dead. But the Jew stumbled over the way of salvation through the cross, and only a few, though their national preference is set aside for this age (Rom. 11:1–36), have been able to abandon their assumed national standing with God and to accept the exceeding grace of God in Christ.

By the words "but now" at the beginning of 2:13, a sharp contrast is drawn between the former estate of these Ephesian Gentiles described in verse 12, and their new position in Christ. Here they are told that they, as Gentiles, who were at a previous time "far off" from God, were henceforth, because of their new position in Christ, "made nigh," not by external ordinances or human virtue, but by the blood of Christ. To be nigh to God is one of the exalted positions unto which each believer is brought at the moment he is saved. The perfection of this position is seen from the fact that one could not be nearer to God in time or eternity than he is when in Christ. So perfect is the efficacy of the blood of Christ in providing a righteous ground for divine grace, that every desire on the part of God, though prompted by infinite love, can now be satisfied completely on behalf of those who believe on Christ.

Verse 13 is closely related to verse 17 (cf. Isa. 59:17). In the former, only Gentiles are in view; but in the latter, both Jews and Gentiles are seen. The Gentiles are identified as those who, because of no former covenant relation to God, were "far off," while the Jews, because of their covenants, were "nigh," but not nigh to the same degree in which the saved Jew and the saved Gentile are now, being *in* Christ and redeemed through His precious blood.

In verse 14, Christ is declared to be "our peace," and to have broken down the middle wall of partition between Gentile and Jew. The wall of separation, here said to be broken down, was set up by divine arrangement at the time when God entered into covenant relation with Abraham; but now

a new thing is introduced (“new” as a declared testimony and actual undertaking, but, in purpose and promise, it is older than the created universe—cf. 1:4). By saving both Jew and Gentile alike, upon the same condition, and into the same heavenly glory, Christ becomes in the fullest sense their Peace; and, by reconciling both to God, becomes thereby the most effective of reconciling agencies. Every distinction is lost in this glorious oneness in Christ. Neither Jew nor Gentile can rightfully claim superiority over the other since they are both perfected forever in Christ (Heb. 10:14). So, likewise, in addition to the fact that Christ establishes perfect peace between Jews and Gentiles, they being united to Him by faith, He breaks down the middle wall of partition between them. The revelation that Jews were under divine legislation not imposed on Gentiles—a fact typified by the wall which separated the court of the Gentiles in the temple from the restricted area reserved only for the Jews—became a wall of separation between these two classes of people. By the death of Christ, the wall was broken down. The Gentile was not elevated to the level of Jewish privilege; but the Jew was lowered to the level of the hopeless Gentile, from which position either Jew or Gentile might be saved through grace alone into a heavenly position and glory. In His flesh, Christ abolished the enmity, “even the law of commandments” (vs. 15), and every aspect of law which might seem to provide, because of its meritorious character, a basis for man’s responsibility to God, thus placing the child of God, whether Jew or Gentile, upon a new obligation—one not of striving to establish merit, but rather of living in all devotion to Him whose perfect merit is vouchsafed to all who believe. This new obligation is elsewhere termed “the law of Christ” (Gal. 6:2; cf. 1 Cor. 9:21). The removal of both the enmity and the partition between Jew and Gentile is divinely accomplished through the creation of “one new man,” not by renewing individual men, but by forming one new Body—the Church—of which Christ is the Head. Thus, in the Church (vs. 16), He reconciles both Jew and Gentile “unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby,” separated, as they were, by the different relationships they sustained to God.

It is through Christ (vs. 18) that both—Jew and Gentile—have access by one Spirit unto the Father. This declaration provides indisputable evidence that believers now have peace; and how marvelous is that peace when it is the portion of those who were not only at enmity among themselves with a

divinely established partition dividing them, but who were enemies of God (Rom. 5:10)!

Chapter 3 of Ephesians defines the Church as a sacred secret, hitherto unrevealed, which provides for the forming of a new Body by making Gentiles "fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." There is no ground for contention about whether the "promise in Christ by the gospel" is a note never before sounded. It is as *new* to Jew as it is to Gentile.

According to verse 5, this Pauline revelation is the unfolding of a mystery, or sacred secret, "which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." No better definition of a New Testament mystery will be found than that set forth in this context. A New Testament mystery is a truth hitherto withheld, or "hid in God" (vs. 9), but now revealed. The sum total of all the mysteries in the New Testament represents that entire body of added truth found in the New Testament which is unrevealed in the Old Testament. On the other hand, the New Testament mystery is to be distinguished from the mystery of the cults of Babylon and Rome, whose secrets were sealed and held on penalty of death; for the New Testament mystery, when it is revealed, is to be declared to the ends of the earth (vs. 9), and is restricted only to the extent of the limitation of the natural man (1 Cor. 2:14).

If, for the previous bringing in of other divine purposes of an earthly nature, it were necessary to employ "holy men of God [who] spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21), how reasonable is the declaration that "holy apostles and prophets" were used of the Lord for the present bringing in of the revelation of the heavenly purpose! Under these conditions, is anyone justified in the assumption that the New Testament apostles and prophets who spoke forth a later revelation were one whit less honored of God as media of divine truth than the "sons of God"—the "holy men of God"—who spoke forth the former revelation? Messiah's kingdom occupied the Old Testament prophets' vision. They saw not the mystery of that "new man" (2:15) which bears collectively the name *Christ* (1 Cor. 12:12). True, indeed, the Messiah was to die a sacrificial death. This fact had not only been typified, but it had been solemnly promised in every Jewish sacrifice. On the other hand, little had been revealed about the value

that would accrue from His resurrection. That particular event, being more related to the New Creation than to the old, was, to some extent, withheld as a part of the "mystery."

What then is the "mystery"? It is stated in verse 6 here in the simplest of terms: "that the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." This declaration must not be treated lightly. That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs and of the same body is not a recognition of the Old Testament prediction that, during Israel's coming kingdom glory, Gentiles will be raised to a subordinate participation in those covenant blessings (Isa. 60:12). Those predictions were of an earthly calling, and, being revealed in very much Old Testament prophecy, could be no part of the heavenly calling—the "mystery … hid in God." This mystery is of a present uniting of Jews and Gentiles into one Body—a new divine purpose, and, therefore, in no sense the perpetuation of anything which has been before.

That the Church is a new purpose of God could not be more clearly stated than it is in verses 3–9, yet certain schools of theology contend that the Church in her present form is but a continuation of God's one purpose from the beginning of the human family. They speak of an "Old Testament church" and seek to relate this to the one Body which constitutes the New Testament revelation. The fact that Jews are now invited into fellowheirship in the one Body with Gentiles is no warrant for the belief that Old Testament saints are included in this new divine purpose. Arguments for an Old Testament church are usually based on (1) the fact that the Old Testament sacrifices looked forward to Christ; (2) that Israel was a sanctified nation; (3) that there was a godly remnant in each of Israel's generations; (4) that the Septuagint translates the word which indicates an assembly or gathering of people by the word ἐκκλησία; and (5) that, since all saints go to heaven, they must, because of that fact, constitute one company. These arguments are insufficient at every point.

In verses 7, 8, and 9, the Apostle contends for his unique position as the one chosen of God for the reception and declaration of the new message concerning the *mystery of Christ* (vs. 4). In verse 10 he declares that it is through the Church that the angelic hosts *now* know the *manifold wisdom of God*, as, in 2:7, the angels are, in the ages to come, to know by the Church the *exceeding riches of the grace of God*. All this disclosure concerning the

Church and her present ministry to the principalities and powers as a revelation of God's wisdom is, likewise (cf. 1:9), according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord (vs. 11). It is given to the angelic hosts to observe that, through our faith in Christ, Christians have boldness, free intimacy with God, and introduction into His blessed fellowship; but how great is the privilege granted to those who experience this intimacy and fellowship!

Chapter 4, which enforces the truth of the *one body*, opens with the call to all believers to recognize and observe the obligation growing out of the doctrine of this unity which has been created by the Holy Spirit of God—a unity established by seven particulars, namely, "one body, … one Spirit, … one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father." On the assured principle that the Epistles take up and expand the germ truths constituting the substance of Christ's Upper Room Discourse, the early portion of the fourth chapter of Ephesians is evidently an amplification of the petition in Christ's prayer, "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (John 17:21) . As this point is the central theme of the next division of this discussion, its consideration is deferred at this time.

The diversified contribution which the figure of the Head and the Body with its many members makes to the doctrine of the Church has been noted above, namely, that the Body of Christ is growing by self-development, that the members render specific service under the direction of the Head, and that the Body is *one* in the sense that it is an organism indwelt by one life-principle.

Chapter V

Seven Figures Used of the Church in Her Relation to Christ (VI) the Last Adam and the New Creation

This division of Ecclesiology which contemplates the true Church as a New Creation with the resurrected Christ as its federal Head introduces a body of truth unsurpassed both in its importance and its transcendent exaltation. Naturally several vast themes combine under this conception: (a) the resurrected Christ, (b) the New Creation, (c) two creations require two commemoration days, and (d) the final transformation. As before indicated, the New Creation, as a designation of the true Church, includes more than is comprehended in the idea of the Church as Christ's Body. In the New Creation reality, Christ is seen to be the all-important part of it, whereas, in the figure of the Body, that entity is viewed as a thing to be completed in itself and separate from, and yet to be joined to, the Head. The Body is an entire unit in itself, which is vitally related to Christ. Over against this, the New Creation is a unit which incorporates the resurrected Christ and could not be what it is apart from that major contribution—the Source of all the verity which enters into it. The fourfold division indicated above now follows:

I. The Resurrected Christ

The student who examines the existing works on Systematic Theology will discover that the subject of Christ's resurrection is almost wholly absent from these writings. Extended consideration is accorded the general theme of Christ's death; but no more than a passing reference is made, if any at all, to Christ's resurrection. In the contemplation of these writers, Christ's resurrection, at most, is no more than a reversal of His death, a mere getting up out of death since He could not and should not "be holden of it" (Acts 2:24). That Christ arose into a new sphere of reality which incorporates His glorified human body, that He became a type of Being that had not existed before, and that He became the pattern of that which

glorified saints will be in heaven, are appar ently themes which are little recognized by theologians of the past. There is a sufficient reason for this neglect. It lies in the fact that the whole meaning of the resurrection is embodied in the doctrine of the New Creation and the fact that theology, almost without an exception, has considered the Church to have been in existence throughout the period covered by the Old Testament, and continuing without appreciable change into the New Testament. Under such a conception, there is no occasion for a new federal Headship since, it is assumed, there is no New Creation which requires that Headship. In other words, the resurrection of Christ is slighted in theological courses simply because the system as presented—drawn from Romish sources—does not require a resurrection more than that the Savior of men may live forever. It is but one more evidence of the confusion which arises when the whole field of a Pauline, Biblical Ecclesiology is disregarded. It is certain that these great writers on Systematic Theology—mighty, indeed, in certain aspects of divine truth—have not intended to neglect the Word of God; yet, because of the system they inherited, they could not make a place for a new beginning. If the Church began with Adam or Abraham, why should there be a new beginning?

So far from being a nonessential, as theological writers by their silence imply it to be, the resurrection of Christ is one of the seven greatest divine undertakings. These undertakings are: (1) the creation of angels; (2) the creation of material things, including man; (3) the incarnation; (4) the death of the Son of God; (5) the resurrection of the Son of God; (6) the return of Christ to reign forever; and (7) the creation of the new heavens and the new earth. These are stupendous achievements and, when rightly understood, the resurrection of Christ is not to be rated as the least of them.

It is also evident that the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ takes its most important place in Ecclesiology, and even then it is restricted to that part of Ecclesiology which deals with the New Creation. It may be expected that the doctrine would be neglected in those works on theology which give no consideration to Ecclesiology, and even more will it be neglected by those who make no mention of the New Creation, but rather attempt to exalt and perpetuate the old creation in Adam. It therefore follows that some general analysis of this lofty theme must be introduced at this point. The complete thesis on this theme includes two divisions, namely, the

resurrection of Christ, and the resurrection of those who are in Christ. The former belongs to the present consideration, while the latter, though previously introduced in Volume III, is related especially to the division of this theme which follows. The resurrection of Christ will be observed under seven general aspects of the doctrine:

1. The Resurrection of Christ is Subject to Indisputable Proofs. It has been said truthfully that no event of history is more substantiated than the resurrection of Christ from the dead. The event is wholly outside the range of the natural course of things and is, therefore, rejected by a certain class of scientists who disallow every reality which is centered in the realm of spirits. Of that which enters into this realm, they could know nothing apart from revelation, and, having subjected even revelation to human judgment, all that is supernatural is by them discarded. The issue reverts to the simplest idea, namely, that God does not exist, not, at least, as One who might manifest Himself to men. It is assumed by these scientists that man can act freely, but that God cannot.

Certain proofs of the resurrection of Christ have been set forth by various writers:

a. The Truthfulness of Christ Himself. The Savior not only predicted His own resurrection, before His death (cf. Matt. 12:38–40; 16:21; 17:9, 23; 20:19; 27:63; Mark 8:31; 9:9, 31; 10:34; 14:58; Luke 9:22; 18:33; John 2:19–21), but presented Himself as raised from the dead after the event had occurred. He was neither self-deceived nor was He an impostor. His display of a perfect knowledge of all things and His sinless character demand credence respecting His own testimony.

b. The Empty Tomb. Few would deny that the Savior died on a cross, or that He was buried, or that the tomb was empty on the third day. Theories that He swooned and was resuscitated are impossible and have been abandoned generally even by those who would welcome some natural explanation of the event. Equally impossible is the notion that His followers removed the body. Three obstacles, at least, stood in the way—the guard, the sealed stone, and the grave clothes which were left behind, retaining the form which they had when He occupied them. So, also, it is wholly unreasonable to contend that the enemies of Christ could have removed the body. They

could not have arranged the sepulchre as it was, and, when confronted by Peter on the Day of Pentecost with the fact of the resurrection, they, naturally, would have produced the body as a means of refuting this miracle, had the body been available. It is equally demonstrated by His physical appearance in which He called attention to His flesh and His bones, His wounds, to say nothing of His eating food before witnesses.

c. The Experience of Christ's Followers. The most natural emotions are recorded of those who were believers: first, overwhelming sorrow and depression; and, second, overflowing joy on recognition of the Lord in resurrection. These emotions not only demonstrate the fact of His resurrection, but indicate, as well, that these believers had no part in any attempt to remove the body from the tomb.

d. The Fact of the Church. Far more than is true at the end of the age, the early church was sustained by the fact of the resurrection and magnified it above all else. The influence of that great event is seen in the change on the part of saved Jews from the celebration of the seventh day to the celebration of the first day—the day of resurrection. The great power with which the Apostles witnessed to the resurrection at Pentecost, and after, can alone account for the fact that thousands, including a great company of the priests, were obedient to the gospel.

e. The Eye-Witnesses. The record in 1 Corinthians 15:4–8—He arose the third day, was seen of Cephas, then by the twelve, after that He was seen of above five hundred brethren, of James, of all the apostles, and last of all by the Apostle Paul—is familiar; but the most important witness is the Apostle, for his entire career is based on his vision of the risen Christ. On this particular feature of evidence, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas writes:

> In the well-known chapter (1 Cor. 15) where he is concerned to prove (not Christ's resurrection, but) the resurrection of Christians, he naturally adduces Christ's resurrection as his greatest evidence, and so gives a list of the various appearances of Christ, ending with one to himself, which he puts on an exact level with the others: "Last of all he was seen of me also." Now it is essential to give special attention to the nature and particularity of this testimony. "I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3f). This, as it has often been pointed out, is our earliest authority for the appearances of Christ after the resurrection, and dates from within 30 years of the event itself. But there is much more than this: "He affirms that within 5 years of the crucifixion of Jesus he was taught that 'Christ died for our sins according to the

> Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures' (Kennett, *Interpreter,* V, 267). … Besides, we find this narrative includes one small but significant statement which at once recalls a very definite feature of the Gospel tradition—the mention of "the third day." A reference to the passage in the Gospels where Jesus Christ spoke of His resurrection will show how prominent and persistent was this note of time. Why, then, should St. Paul have introduced it in his statement? Was it part of the teaching which he had "received"? What is the significance of this plain emphasis on the *date* of the resurrection? Is it not that it bears absolute testimony to the empty tomb? From all this it may be argued that St. Paul believed the story of the empty tomb at a date when the recollection was fresh when he could examine it for himself, when he could make the fullest possible inquiry of others, and when the fears and opposition of enemies would have made it impossible for the adherents of Jesus Christ to make any statement that was not absolutely true. "Surely common sense requires us to believe that that for which he so suffered was in his eyes established beyond the possibility of doubt" (Kennett, op. cit., V, 271). In view, therefore, of St. Paul's personal testimony to his own conversion, his interviews with those who had seen Jesus Christ on earth before and after His resurrection, and the prominence given to the resurrection in the apostle's own teaching, we may challenge attention afresh to this evidence for the resurrection. It is well known that Lord Lyttelton and his friend Gilbert West left Oxford University at the close of one academic year, each determining to give attention respectively during the long vacation to the conversion of St. Paul and the resurrection of Christ, in order to prove the baselessness of both. They met again in the autumn and compared experiences. Lord Lyttelton had become convinced of the truth of St. Paul's conversion, and Gilbert West of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If, therefore, Paul's 25 years of suffering and service for Christ were a reality, his conversion was true, for everything he did began with that sudden change. And if his conversion was true, Jesus Christ rose from the dead, for everything Paul was and did he attributed to the sight of the risen Christ.—*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, 1915 ed., IV, 2567–68

f. The Direct Assertion of the Bible. The Bible declares, both directly with reference to the event and with reference to its effect upon men, that Christ arose from the dead. A question respecting the resurrection is, therefore, a question relative to the truthfulness of the Word of God. This stupendous fact is too often ignored.

g. The Resurrection and the Divine Program. Not only was the resurrection of Christ predicted in the Old Testament—a truth yet to be examined—but it is an essential step in the realization of the divine program in the world. As certainly as the advent of Christ into the world anticipated the death of Christ, that advent also anticipated His resurrection. There were great objectives in view that would have been rendered abortive had this program not been followed with exactness. Thus, again, to question the resurrection of Christ is to question the entire divine undertaking.

2. The Resurrection of Christ is Reasonable. If the declarations of the Scriptures are accepted—which assert that for the purposes of redemption the Second Person of the Godhead became incarnate, suffered, and died on a cross, and that He is appointed to sit forever on David's throne—the resurrection is not only reasonable in itself, but is required. To a mind which excludes all that is supernatural, the theanthropic Person is excluded as well as the undertakings which are predicated of Him. To die is a human experience within the range of human observation; hence the death of Christ is allowed by many who cannot accept the resurrection, since that is not within the range of present human experience and observation. In reality, and as will be seen, the experience of resurrection is yet to be the actual experience of every person that will have lived on earth and who has passed through death. Looking backward from the ages to come, resurrection must be recognized to be as universal as death has been.

Christ is the fountain source of life. He declared, and in connection with His rising from the dead: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself" (John 5:25–26). He also said, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10). In the same context He also stated, "No man taketh it [life] from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (10:18). It is significant that He, as no man has ever been able to do, had power to take His life again after His death. At least twenty-five passages aver that He was raised by the Father (cf. Acts 2:24). Adam was a life-receiving person, but the Last Adam is a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45). By the first Adam came death; by the Last Adam came life (1 Cor. 15:22). All of this testimony converges upon one important truth, which is, that death, however possible within the range of His humanity, was utterly foreign to the Son of God. Death was permitted to intrude only that redemption might be consummated. When that purpose was realized, the One who is deathless by nature returned to His normal estate. It was not possible that He should be holden of death (Acts 2:24). It is thus the testimony of the Scriptures that the resurrection of Christ is reasonable.

3. Prophecy Respecting the Resurrection. In Old Testament prophecy the resurrection of Christ is anticipated specifically in Psalm 16 and Psalm 118, and each passage is interpreted in the book of Acts. In Psalm 16 David declares: "I have set the LORD always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell: neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (vss. 8–10). This Scripture is applied to Christ by the Apostle Peter as recorded in Acts 2:25–31. Having pointed out that David was still dead and that the words of the Psalm could not refer to him, Peter states, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption" (vss. 30–31). Similarly, in Psalm 118:22–24 the Psalmist declares, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the LORD'S doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." And again the same Apostle, while addressing the Jewish Sanhedrin—that company which effected the death of Christ—said: "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner" (Acts 4:10–11). In this declaration Peter speaks of these Jews as "you builders," accusing them of the crucifixion of Christ, and states that God raised Him from the dead. Thus the stone—Christ—which the Sanhedrin rejected by crucifixion, became by the resurrection which God achieved the Head Stone of the corner. This is Jehovah's doing and is therefore "marvellous in our eyes." This day—the resurrection day—is the "day which the LORD hath made." It is thus that the resurrection day becomes the Lord's Day. He hath made it what it is by His resurrection.

In the New Testament, prophecy concerning the resurrection is uttered by Christ alone. None of His disciples could believe that He was to die or to rise from the dead. His predictions were clear, as cited above. The force of

divine prediction gathers behind the doctrine of the resurrection and it could not fall short of fulfillment, since no word of God can fail.

4. Seven Reasons for the Resurrection. It has been indicated in the fourth Chapter of Volume III that there are at least fourteen reasons disclosed for the death of Christ, and, apparently, there are half that number of reasons for the resurrection of Christ. In naming these, a complete notation is desirable regardless of its involving restatement of truths already presented.

a. Because If Who Christ. In this connection, attention is again called to the sublime truth that the Savior who died and rose again is no less than a member of the Godhead, and, as such, is from everlasting to everlasting (Mic. 5:2), the Father of eternity (Isa. 9:6). His death was, therefore, extrinsic to all that belongs to Deity. A very special and exceptional undertaking was necessitated which was without precedent in the past and which could never occur again. It is written: "Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him" (Rom. 6:9); "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever" (Heb. 13:8). This voluntary excursus into the realms of death—death which is itself the divine judgment upon sin (Gen. 2:17)—was an immeasurable demand upon each Person of the Trinity. The Father "gave" and "spared not" His Son; the Son "endured the cross, despising the shame"; and it was through the eternal Spirit that the incomprehensible sacrifice was made. It thus follows that the eternal Son would not, and could not, remain in the sphere of His own curse and judgment upon sin a moment beyond the precise time that was divinely indicated as required for the accomplishment of all satisfaction respecting sin. This time anticipated in type (Jonah 1:17; cf. Matt. 12:40) and measured in history was "three days and three nights." It remains therefore true that the resurrection of Christ was required in the very nature of the case, for, being what He is, He could not be holden of death (Acts 2:24).

b. To Fulfill Prophecy. Under this division of the theme, the line of reasoning is that, since great responsibilities were assigned to Christ which were to be achieved after His death, the necessity was laid upon Him to revive out of death to the end that these expectations might be effectuated. That allotted

to Him to be wrought by Him after His death includes all that He is doing as Head and High Priest over the Church; but the predictions are largely centered on the Davidic throne and His kingly reign. As in the instance of the incarnation where, in each of two passages that are especially direct and specific, Christ is said to have become incarnate to the end that He might sit on David's throne (Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:31–33), so, in respect to His resurrection, it is written: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. 16:10). As has been indicated, this is a prediction of Christ's resurrection (cf. Acts 2:25–31). Thus it is disclosed that, in the field of prophecy, the major objective in Christ's resurrection was that He might sit on David's throne. Two revelations were made to David: (1) that his kingly line would endure forever and this would eventually be realized in the Messiah who would reign forever, and (2) that the Messiah would become a sacrifice in death (Ps. 22:1–21). David reasoned, by the Spirit, that, if the Messiah should reign forever, He must first die and be raised to that end.

c. To Become a Bestower of Life. According to 1 Corinthians 15:45, Christ, in His resurrection, is declared to be a life-giving Spirit. In contrast to this, Adam is said to have been a life—receiver. The truth that the resurrected Christ is now a bestower of resurrection life has been considered earlier. In John 20:22 it is recorded that Christ, immediately after His resurrection, breathed on His disciples and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." This was as He had promised, when before His death He said with reference to their relation to the Holy Spirit, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

In the sense that the believer is now the recipient of resurrection life, he is said to be both positionally raised in Christ's resurrection and the possessor of that life. Writing to the Colossians, the Apostle Paul says, "Ye are risen with him" (Col. 2:12). In this passage the truth is being set forth that, being in Christ by the baptism with the Spirit, the believer partakes of the value of Christ's death and resurrection as fully as though the believer had himself died and had arisen from the dead. In fact, the central reason for Christ's death and resurrection is that He might substitute for those whom He would save. This is the "operation of God" in which the Christian's faith rests. Continuing the thought of a coresurrection with Christ, the Apostle also says, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those

things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:1–4). Beyond all this and as an indivisible part of it, is the truth that the believer's body is yet to be raised at the return of Christ (1 Thess. 4:13–18).

d. To Impart Power. He who said as He left this world, "All power is given unto me," is a constant supply of life and power to the believer, as the sap is vitality to the branches of the vine. As the Spirit's baptism has made the child of God a cosharer in the death and burial of Christ, so, also, Christ is raised that the saved one in Him may walk upon a new life-principle, namely, by the power of the resurrected Christ. Of this it is written, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:3–4). To this truth the Apostle testified, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13); and Christ Himself as clearly asserted, "For without [apart from] me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5).

e. To Be Head to His Body, the Church. This as a specific purpose of the Father in raising His Son from the dead is stated in Ephesians 1:20–23: "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." By this Scripture it will be seen that Christ is "highly exalted" and elevated, as He should be, above all principalities and powers and might and dominion and every name that is named in this world or in that which is to come. Of this exaltation it is also written, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:9–11). Yet the highest consummating

authority and glory is said to be that He is “head over all things to the church, which is his body” (Eph. 1:22–23). He is to the Church what the head is to the body. The figure suggests a number of vital realities of relationship.

f. Resurrection and Justification. Because of a complicated translation in the A.V. of Romans 4:25, the impression is abroad that in some way—not well defined—Christ was delivered to death for our sins, but was raised again to the end that believers might be justified. However, justification does not depend on the resurrection of Christ, but on His death; and this particular text really asserts a quite different idea. The A.V. rendering is, “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” Romans 3:24 states that justification is “through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus”; and, again, “justified by his blood” (Rom. 5:9). The sense of Romans 4:25 is that, the ground having been provided for justification by His death, the Lord arose from the grave. Bishop Moule writes in the *Cambridge Bible* on this verse:

> Lit. because of our justification. The construction is identical [i.e., in this and the corresponding phrase earlier]. This, and the balance of the clauses, seem to demand the exposition: “He was raised, *because our justification was effected*; ” not, “*in order to give us* justification, ” as many interpret it. The parallel is complete: “We sinned, therefore He suffered: we were justified, therefore He rose.”—To this it is objected that the thought is not doctrinally true; justification being, for each believer, *dated* not from the Lord’s death, but from the time of faith (see ch. v. 1). But the answer is obvious: the Apostle here states the Ideal of the matter; he means not individual justifications, but the Work which for ever secured Justification for the believing Church. A close parallel is the “IT IS FINISHED” (John 19:30). (See too the *ideal* language in 8:30; and instructive parallels in Heb. 1:3 and 10:14.) In the Divine Idea every future believer was declared to be justified, through an accomplished Propitiation, when Jesus rose. His resurrection proved His acceptance as our Substitute, and therefore our acceptance in Him. No doubt the other interpretation is true as to *fact*: He was raised that, through the Gospel, (which but for His resurrection would never have been preached,) we might receive justification. But the Gr. construction, and the balance of clauses, are certainly in favour of that now given.—“Romans,” p. 98

To the same purpose, F. Godet writes, “In the same way, as Jesus died because of our offences, that is our (merited) condemnation, *He was raised because of our* (accomplished) *justification*. Our sin had killed Him; our justification raised Him again. How so? The expiation of our trespasses once accomplished by His death, and the right of God’s justice proved in earnest, God could pronounce the collective acquittal of future believers,

and He did so. … So long as the security is in prison the debt is not paid; the immediate *effect* of payment would be his liberation. Similarly, if Jesus were not raised, we should be more than ignorant whether our debt were paid: we might be certain that it was not. His resurrection is the *proof* of our justification, only because it is the necessary effect of it" (*Romans*, I, 312, cited by Griffith Thomas, *Romans*, I, 187).

g. Christ the Pattern or First—Fruits. At no point is it more clearly indicated than in this phase of the truth that a wholly new thing was brought into being through the resurrection of Christ, and that this new thing is the pattern of the believer's eternal existence in glory. In the Person of the resurrected Christ, the angelic hosts have before their vision the representation of that unnumbered company of glorified believers who are to throng the vast spheres of heaven. The Scripture declares that these believers are to be conformed to the image of Christ. It is said, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29); "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body …" (Phil. 3:20–21); "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him … (1 John 3:2). The title *FirstFruits* secures its meaning from this sublime reality. The designation appears in 1 Corinthians 15:20, 23: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. … But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming."

5. Three Standards of Power. The three dispensations—that which is past, that which is present, and that which is to come—suggest, each in turn, a standard or measurement of divine power. "The LORD, which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt" (Deut. 6:12) is the oftrepeated declaration to Israel from Jehovah. The deliverance from Egyptian bondage and the parting of the sea serve as an indication of Jehovah's mighty power. So, also, the day is coming when Israel, now scattered over the whole earth, will be gathered into her own land and blessed in the realization of all her covenants. It is then in that yet future dispensation that a new standard of divine power will have been set up by that regathering—itself an angelic

ministration—of Israel from all nations into her own land. Jeremiah writes thus of that event: "Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that they shall no more say, The LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land" (Jer. 23:7–8). And Christ described that event after this manner: "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matt. 24:31). However, the supreme manifestation of divine power is not in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt or in the regathering of that people into their own land; it is rather exhibited in the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and that undertaking measures the power of God for the present dispensation. Of this power it is written in Ephesians 1:19–21, "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." Thus the resurrection of Christ is the demonstration of the "exceeding greatness" of His power. And this is the power which is engaged in behalf of the believer.

6. IT WAS AN ACTUAL RESURRECTION. There is little occasion to point out the utter failure of the theories which unbelievers have advanced as an explanation of the indisputable fact that, according to the Scripture, Christ both died and rose again. It was a complete physical death and a complete resurrection. In this connection it may be observed that the illustrations commonly employed to represent Christ's resurrection are misleading—the hatching of an egg, the bursting of a chrysalis, or the growth of a bulb. No egg ever hatched that did not have in it the germ of life, no chrysalis ever released its butterfly that was not a living thing, and no really dead bulb ever sprang into life. Over against this, there was no life in the tomb; and it is to be doubted whether nature could produce a worthy symbol of Christ's resurrection. It was God the Father who raised His Son from the dead, though it is also asserted that the Son exercised His own power in taking

His life again, and that by the eternal Spirit. To what purpose is all this marshaling of the infinite power of the three Persons of the Godhead if, perchance, the Son of God did not really die?

7. The Resurrection of Christ is Unto a New Order. Apart from a careful investigation into the New Testament teaching, it would be natural to assume that the resurrection of Christ was, like other experiences recorded in the Bible, only a reversal of death. Every so-called resurrection which the Sacred Text chronicles was but a restoration. The one who died was returned to the same sphere of existence which he occupied before, and, eventually, he died again. There is no parallel in these incidents with the resurrection of Christ. He did not return to a death-doomed estate, nor was He the same order of Being in resurrection that He had been before. He is not only the incomparable theanthropic Person, but He has experienced a marvelous transformation in respect to the nature, structure, and mutability of the body in which He died. It is now a "glorious body" in its nature, a body of flesh and bones (but without blood) in its structure, and immortal and therefore immutable in its endurance. It is a body suited both to heaven and to eternity. No other human body has yet experienced such a change. It is written of Christ, "who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto" (1 Tim. 6:16). It is needful to remember that, in spite of incorrect terms which men carelessly employ, the word *immortality* refers only to the physical body and not to the soul. Christ died, but He did not see corruption (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27); He passed from the mortal to the immortal even though He died and was in the realms of dissolution for three days and three nights (cf. John 11:39). Those believers who have died have seen corruption and they must yet put on incorruption; that is, they have not yet received their resurrection bodies. With the same certainty it can be declared, and on the authority of God's Word, that none of all humanity has "put on immortality," which experience is appointed to occur at the moment of translation, when those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord (1 Thess. 4:17) will be changed. It is, therefore, to be accepted as true that Christ alone hath immortality. He alone represents that marvelous change which the physical body of the Christian is to undergo; and nothing more effective could be said of them with respect to their bodies than is asserted by the Apostle when he said, "For our conversation is in heaven;

from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:20–21); "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:53).

But much, indeed, depends upon the precise and unerring recognition of the truth that, in His resurrection, Christ became the incomparable Being, the Head of a new race of humanity who not only partake of His resurrection life from the moment they are saved, but are destined to be like Him—even in respect to a glorious body—and to be as He is, adapted to heaven and eternity.

II. The Believer's Position in Christ

Far-reaching, indeed, is the scope and extent of the change of the Christian's estate which the Apostle describes by the words, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son" (Col. 1:13). The magnitude of this change is not manifest in this world, but must be in its ultimate reality in glory. In truth, the individual who believes undergoes so great a change that, as he will ultimately be situated, he cannot be rated then at all as the being he was at the time he was born of the flesh. He is born of God into the household and family of God and occupies the place of an adult son; he is transferred from the fallen headship of the first Adam into the exalted and infinite Headship of the Last Adam; he is qualified through the imputed merit of Christ to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light; being in Christ, he possesses every spiritual blessing and is made complete, even to the satisfaction of God; he is justified forever; his citizenship is changed from earth to heaven; he will yet be delivered from the Adamic nature; and he will receive a glorious body like Christ's resurrection body. On the basis of these great transformations, it is restated that the final estate of the child of God retains almost nothing of its earthly character. Though the same person continues, all else is changed. Of the items of change enumerated above, the last three—the entrance into heavenly citizenship, the dismissal of the Adamic nature, and the reception of the glorified body—are yet to be realized at the coming of Christ (cf. Eph. 5:27; 1 John 3:2; Jude 1:24).

It is a large order to be laid upon any person, to declare what the believer's estate in glory will be; for, it is probable, that "the half has never yet been told." These glories have been enumerated again, to the end that the mind may be aided in its effort to recognize definitely and to infinite perfection that the believer is a new creature in Christ Jesus (2 Cor. 5:17).

The whole New Creation incorporates two factors, namely, the resurrected Christ, and that entire company of believers who are identified as the true Church which is vitally united to Christ—the new humanity.

1. The Resurrected Christ. An effort was made earlier to clarify the truth that Christ has Himself through His resurrection entered into a sphere of existence that the universe has never seen before. When on earth and before His death, He was "God manifest in the flesh," but now He is God manifest in a resurrection body of infinite perfection and glory. There is no implication that Christ is in any sense a creation of God, but that which He became through the incarnation has been "highly exalted." The Apostle John had seen the Lord possibly in childhood, in manhood, in transfiguration, in death, and in that form in which He appeared in resurrection when remaining here for forty days; but when John saw the glorified Christ—as described in Revelation 1:12–18—he fell at His feet as dead. This description of the glorified Christ claims close attention on the part of those who are His, as, also, every reference in the Gospels to His resurrection body, since this glorified body is the pattern of that body which the believer will possess. It is that glory which the believer will share (Col. 3:4). Christians will not only have joined the heavenly beings, but will be constitutionally fitted for that sphere and fellowship. All this, it will be seen, depends wholly on the Savior and what He is "made" to the believer—the great redemption through His death, the great transformation through His resurrection, and partaking of His knowledge-surpassing exaltation in heaven. Christ is now the Lord of Glory, the rightful Head of the new humanity which He is gathering unto Himself.

2. The New Humanity. Uncounted errors in theological teaching have been engendered through the failure to comprehend the distinctive, unrelated, and supremely exalted character of the true Church. No differentiating quality in this eminent humanity is more to be apotheosized

than the truth that by the baptism with the Spirit each individual of this company, including the entire group, is vitally joined to Christ in a union which is absolute, and which establishes identity between Christ and the believer and creates the ground upon which all that Christ is may be imputed to the one who is in Him. Doubtless, in a logical order, divine forgiveness and divinely wrought regeneration through the operation of the Spirit serve as a qualifying preparation for this high estate. The generating work of the Spirit is a creative work of God; but what is termed a New Creation is apparently that which results from the union with Christ which is accomplished by the baptism with the Spirit. Certain New Testament texts are a guide in this important issue:

2 Corinthians 5:17–18. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ."

It is asserted in this passage that to be in Christ is to become a new creation in which old things—relative to position rather than experience—have passed away, and these new things are, all of them, wrought of God.

Galatians 3:27–28. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Thus, again, to be joined to Christ is to have put on Christ, and that relationship results in a unity, since those joined to Christ "are all one in Christ Jesus."

Galatians 6:15. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

The truth is asserted that works of merit are of no avail to the one who is in Christ Jesus. All that counts—and how immeasurable is its value—is a new creation which is secured by a vital union with the Lord of Glory.

Ephesians 2:10. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

So far as its influence upon the believer's daily life is concerned, the New Creation position for the believer is, incidentally, "unto good works";

but the greater reality is acknowledged in the words “created in Christ Jesus,” whatever the daily life may be.

Ephesians 2:15. “Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.”

Though this text emphasizes the truth that Jew and Gentile find peace in the one Body, the purpose is to make in Himself one “new man”—not new men individually, but one complete unity composed of Christ and the Church.

Ephesians 4:21–24. “If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”

The Ephesians had been taught by Christ (through His Apostle) the truth respecting position in Christ, which is, “that ye [did, when saved,] put off … the old man.” The form of the verb places this putting off as a complete past action. You were taught, the Apostle says, the truth about being in Christ and that by so much your “old man” was laid aside. The former Adamic standing is in view, and with it its corrupt practices which are no longer in order. At that time, also, ye did put on the new man—the Last Adam—which after God (answering to His eternal purpose) is created in righteousness and true holiness. While this passage presents a challenge to the student for careful exegesis, its contribution at this point is seen in the declaration that the believer has been transferred from one Adam to Another. The term *old man*, as used here, is not equivalent to the flesh, or the Adamic nature. The standing in Adam is terminated with salvation, while the flesh and the nature continue (cf. Gal. 5:16–17).

Colossians 3:9–10. “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.”

On this equally important Scripture, Bishop Moule writes: “The ‘*taking off*’ and ‘*putting on*’ here may be explained as meaning, practically, ‘you broke connexion (of guilt and helplessness) with the First Adam, and formed connexion (of acceptance and of life) with the Second.’ … ‘The old Man’ is, so to speak, the parent of ‘the deceitfulness of sin’ in all its phases;

connexion with ‘the new Man’ is the deathblow to it, as the anxious conscience is set at rest, the relation of the believer to God wholly altered, and a spiritual force not his own given to him. … By union with Him his members become (be it said with reverence and caution) repetitions of Him the glorious Archetype. To come to be ‘in Him’ is thus to ‘*put on (Him as) the New Man*, ’ in sharing His acceptance and His life and power” (*Cambridge Bible for Schools And Colleges—Colossians and Philemon*, p. 124).

From the seven passages, cited above, the truth is established that there is a New Creation which is engendered directly by organic union with Christ. A complete disposition of the former existence in the first Adam has been accomplished. It has been terminated by cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial with Christ. Of this termination it is written: “How shall we that are dead [who died] to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life” (Rom. 6:2–4). In this instance, the words of Ephesians 4:22 and Colossians 3:9—“ye have put off”—are again in evidence (cf. Col. 2:12–13, 20). In the same actual manner, there is now a perfect vital union with Christ on the part of all who are in Christ. It is written: “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead [ye died], and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory” (Col. 3:1–4). Similarly, Romans 6:5: “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” Here the child of God is assured that as certainly as he has shared in Christ’s death, he as certainly shares in Christ’s resurrection. It is thus by the resurrection of Christ that the Christian is eligible to entrance into the New Creation. Christ did not die, nor did He rise from the dead, in behalf of Himself; it was substitutionary and representative. The Christian was truly raised in Christ’s resurrection. This is the deeper meaning of the words of Christ: “I am the resurrection, and the life” (John 11:25). Reference was not made by Christ to the truth that He would Himself rise from the dead, or that He would cause the dead

to rise at the last day (cf. John 5:21, 25, 28–29); but to the present aspect of truth that all who are in Him are, by virtue of their place in His resurrection, raised in Him. This positional truth respecting the child of God is asserted in two passages: (a) Ephesians 2:4–6, “But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.” Both with respect to resurrection and with respect to seating in the heavenly, the believer is now vitally joined to Christ. The word *together*, twice used in this sixth verse, relates him, not to the fellowship of the saints as in 1 Thessalonians 4:17, but to the risen and glorified Christ. The Apostle is justified in the confidence that the reader will not have forgotten the setting forth of Christ’s glorious resurrection and exaltation in the verses immediately preceding (1:20–23), and that he will understand to some degree the surpassing, heavenly reality and glory which belong to the one who, because of his union with Christ, is now raised and seated in Christ Jesus, far above all earthly or heavenly comparison (1:21). To be in Christ, which is the portion of all who are saved, is to partake of all that Christ has done, all that He is, and all that He will ever be. It is to have died in His death, to have been buried in His burial, to have been raised in His resurrection, to have ascended in His ascension, and to be seated now *with* Him (because he is *in* Him) in glory. Such is the believer’s present position in Christ Jesus. Over against all this, and in no way to be confused with it, is the experimental fact that a bodily resurrection and actual heavenly exaltation await all those who “sleep in Jesus”; and a bodily translation and heavenly exaltation await all who are “alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord,” the present, unalterable fact of the believer’s position in Christ being the guarantee of the yet future experience. (b) “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead [ye died], and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory” (Col. 3:1–4). Aside from the exhortation to a worthy manner of life, which the passage enforces, the essential fact is again revealed that the believer has not only died in Christ’s death, but is now actually risen in Him.

Generally speaking, all that enters into the reality which constitutes salvation—already analyzed as representing at least thirty-three positions and possessions—contributes directly or indirectly to the fact of the New Creation. However, as the Scriptures, cited above, demonstrate, the New Creation is specifically the result of the believer's position in Christ.

There is probably no word of Scripture which more clearly defines the essential fact concerning the Christian than the phrase, *in Christ*; and as the Christian is the most important fact of all creation, there has never been a word uttered which was so far-reaching in its implication, or which is fraught with greater meaning to humanity than the phrase, *in Christ*. This phrase, with its equivalents, "in Christ Jesus, in him, in the beloved, by him, through him, and with him," appears in the grace teachings of the New Testament no less than 130 times. This most unusual emphasis upon one particular truth is arresting, and its import must not be slighted. Over against the emphasis which is given to this truth in the teachings of grace, is the corresponding fact that there is no hint of a possible position in Christ in any teaching of the law or of the kingdom. The believer's present position in Christ was not seen even in type or prophecy. In the ages past it was a secret hid in the mind and heart of God. He who "hath blessed us" with all spiritual blessings in Christ, "hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery [sacred secret] of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will: that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ." Who can comprehend the full scope of these eternal wonders? Knowing the limitation of the human heart, at this point the Apostle breaks forth into prayer: "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord

Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding [heart] being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints."

Having thus prayed that the Christian may *know* by divine illumination the hope of his calling and the riches of the glory of the inheritance which God now has in the saints, he continues to pray that they may also know by the same divine revelation "the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1:3–12, 15–23). Growing out of this glorious relationship in Christ is a most natural responsibility to walk worthy of the calling; but the issues of a daily life and the character of the conduct which should enter into it, though important in their place, are lost and forgotten in the blaze of the eternal glory of that unchangeable grace which has brought the believer into the New Creation in Christ Jesus. To be in Christ is to be in the sphere of His own infinite Person, power, and glory. He surrounds, He protects, He separates from all else, and He indwells the one in Him. He also supplies in Himself *all* that a soul will ever need in time or eternity. The union which is formed in Christ is deeper than any relationship the human mind has ever conceived. In His Priestly prayer, in which He had advanced on to resurrection ground, and where He contemplated the glory of His finished work as having been already accomplished (cf. John 17:11), Christ spoke of three unities within the sphere of one relationship: (1) the unity within the Persons of the blessed Trinity, (2) the unity between the Persons of the Trinity and all believers, and (3) the unity between the believers themselves, since they are in Him. We read: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us … I in them,

and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one" (John 17:20–23). Who can fathom the depths of the revelation that the believer is related to Christ on the very plane of that oneness which exists between the Father and the Son?

Again, as before stated, Christ likens the union which exists between Himself and the believer to the vital, organic relation that exists between the vine and its living branch. The branch is *in* the vine and the life of the vine is *in* the branch; but the branch possesses no independent life in itself. It cannot exist apart from the vine. The human child may outgrow dependence upon its parents and, in turn, support and sustain them; but the branch can never become independent of the vine. In like manner, the fruit and every manifestation of life in the branch is due to the ceaseless inflow of the vitality of the vine. The fruit is as much the fruit of the vine as it is the fruit of the branch (cf. John 15:5; Rom. 7:4; Gal. 5:22–23). Thus it is with the one who is in Christ. Considering the same fact of unity, the Apostle Paul likens Christ to the head and the believers to members in a body. This figure illustrates the same vital, dependent relationship. The member in the body partakes of the merit and honor of the head, and the life and power of the head is imparted to the member. So perfect is this unity between the Head and the members of the Body, that it is probable that Christ will never be seen in glory apart from His Body, and the Body will never be seen apart from Him (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12).

From these illustrative Scriptures it will be observed that the unity between Christ and the believer is twofold: The believer is in Christ, and Christ is in the believer. The believer is in Christ with regard to positions, possessions, safekeeping, and association; and Christ is in the believer giving life, character, and dynamic for conduct.

It has already been pointed out that the Upper Room conversation, recorded in John 13–16, presents the grace teachings of Christ, and is the germ of all the truth that is found in the Epistles, which, in turn, contain the revelation of the essential fact of the New Creation and the resulting obligation in daily life. The doctrinal truth of the Epistles, which is the doctrinal truth of grace, is subject to the same twofold division—what the saved one is in Christ, and the character and power of the daily life that will be experienced when the victorious energy of the indwelling Christ is imparted. At one point in the midst of the Upper Room Discourse, Christ

compressed the whole doctrinal structure of grace into one brief phrase. This phrase is notable because it is the key to all the facts and relationships under grace, and because of its simplicity and brevity of language: “Ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:20).

III. Two Creations Require Two Commemoration Days

The distinction between the reign of law and the reign of grace is at no point more sharply drawn than in the question of the observance of the seventh day of the week or the first day of the week; for these two days are symbolical of the dispensations to which they are related. Likewise, at no point is personal religious prejudice, which is born of early training and sentiment, more assertive than on the Sabbath question. It was His liberal teaching on the observance of the Sabbath which, more than aught else, provoked the wrath of the Jewish leaders against Christ; and, it may be observed, there is no religious subject today which so draws out personal convictions and opinions. The reason is evident. Few have really comprehended the exact character and principle of grace. To many, Christianity is a system of human works and character building from which merit accrues. And the observance of a Sabbath day presents extraordinary opportunities for the exercise of meritorious works. The question is a far deeper one than the observance, or the manner of observance, of a day. It is the fundamental question whether grace is to reign supreme in place of law, or whether it is to be commingled with law. The roots of this problem reach down to the bedrock issue which forms the very structure of the two opposing principles of pure law and pure grace. For its solution, the question demands more than a superficial opinion. Truly the choice of a particular day and the manner of its observance are a test question respecting the individual’s intelligent adjustment to the whole grace revelation. As there can be no proper commingling of the reign of law and the reign of grace, there can be no proper commingling of elements which, according to the Scriptures, are the essential features of these widely different days. A “Christian Sabbath” is a misnomer; and the very use of the term indicates inexcusable inattention to Bible terms, and an unchallenged freedom of mind and heart which is willing to sacrifice the richest treasures of grace by commingling them with law. It is not a problem of

interpretation; it is a question of whether personal sentiment, prejudice, or ignorance shall override blindly the very foundation of the right divisions of Scripture. These two days, typical of two opposing governing principles and two great dispensations, are absolutely unrelated. Of the whole Decalogue, it is the Sabbath day commandment only which is *not* carried forward in any manner whatsoever into the reign of grace; nor could it be. Failure to base the distinction between these age-representing days upon the essential character of their respective relationships—pure law and pure grace—is resulting in an almost universal confusion of mind on the subject among Christians, and this, in turn, provides the opportunity for present-day legalists to promote their Christ-rejecting heresies. Intelligent comprehension of pure law is clarifying to the mind, for its very oppositeness to pure grace safeguards a clear comprehension of grace. On the other hand, the greatest foe of such clear comprehension of pure grace and its issues is the confusing, soul-wrecking, and unscriptural admixture of these opposing principles. This admixture is ruinous at every point; but at no point is it more destructive of Scriptural distinctions than in the confusion of a Jewish Sabbath with the Christian's day—the Lord's day, or Sunday. Consideration at length might be given to many vital differences between the law obligations and the obligations under grace, such as circumcision, tithing, and sacrifices; but unlike the Sabbath question, these issues are self-adjusting when the glory of grace in some measure is comprehended. To many, on the other hand, the Sabbath question bulks largest as an essential of their religion. It, therefore, demands particular consideration. The reasons for this discussion are four: (1) It vitally determines the individual's conception of, and blessing in, grace. (2) It, of necessity, determines the character of the believer's conduct and measure of comprehension of his Scriptural obligation to God. (3) It is the central issue of a misleading heresy. And (4) it is now urged as a national reform, in which it is proposed more or less to enforce a Jewish Sabbath on a Christ-rejecting world. In so far as an earnest appeal may avail, the reader is besought to leave prejudice behind, and to stand on the uncompromised "Thus saith the Lord."

Two major aspects of this subject are here considered: (1) the Biblical testimony regarding the Jewish Sabbath, and (2) the Biblical testimony concerning the "Lord's day."

1. The Biblical Testimony Regarding the Jewish Sabbath. This theme is to be taken up in subdivisions in which the Jewish Sabbath is considered as related to various periods of time:

a. The Period from Adam to Moses. Two theories obtain concerning the question of Sabbath observance during this period. There are those who contend that the Sabbath was committed to man in Eden, and there are those who contend that the Sabbath was given to Israel only, at the hand of Moses. The first theory is usually advanced with a view to applying the institution of the Sabbath to *all* men before the law even was given, in order that the Sabbath law may be treated as now applicable to *all* men, even after the termination of the Mosaic Law in the cross. This form of argument is not restricted to the Seventh Day legalists; it is employed by many writers and religious leaders who are attempting to transfer the Biblical authority concerning the Jewish Sabbath to the observance of the Lord's day. These, by Judaizing Christianity, are obscuring the truth about grace. When it is claimed that the Sabbath obtained from Adam to Moses it is said: "The Sabbath was divinely sanctified at creation." This sanctification, it is true, is clearly stated in Genesis 2:1–3: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." When it is assumed that the Sabbath was imposed on man at Eden, it is based on the supposition that this passage so teaches; which, however, the passage does not necessarily imply. And it should also be remembered that Genesis was not written until Moses' time; and, when seeking for Biblical evidence regarding the pre-Mosaic observance of the seventh day, it will be found that, unlike other religious activities, such as prayer, circumcision (cf. John 7:22), and sacrifices, the observance of which is recorded of that period, there is no mention of a Sabbath observance from creation to Moses. It is incredible that this great institution of the Sabbath could have existed during all these centuries and there be no mention of it in the Scriptures dealing with that time. The words of job, who lived five hundred years and more before Moses, offer an illustration. His experience discloses the spiritual life of the pre-Mosaic saint, having no written Scriptures, and

striving to know his whole duty to God. Job and his friends refer to creation, the flood, and many details of human obligation to God; but not once do they mention the Sabbath. Again, it is impossible that this great institution, with all that it contemplated of relationship between God and man, could have existed at that time and not have been mentioned in any portion of the argument of the book of job.

There is little force in the contention that a seven-day week was recognized as early as Jacob's time, and therefore a Sabbath day must have existed which marked off the week. The seven-day week is the natural fourth part of a lunar month and does not necessarily demand a Sabbath day with religious significance for its measurement. Likewise, there is little force in the suggestion that Chinese history hints at the observance of one sacred day in every week. Such argument, even if true, should not be set over against the positive testimony of the Scriptures.

There is one passage which determines this question beyond all discussion. The following quotation from the confession of the priests and Levites under Nehemiah definitely fixes the time of the institution of the Sabbath: "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant" (Neh. 9:13–14). The Sabbath, given to Israel as a *sign* (Ex. 31:12–17), was never given to Gentiles. There is no record that Gentiles ever recognized the Sabbath, either between Adam and Moses, or between Moses and Christ. The Sabbath is of the law; but the law did not begin to reign until Moses (Rom. 5:12–14). Ezekiel 20:10–12 is equally important in fixing the exact time when the Sabbath law was imposed. We read: "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them my statutes, and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the LORD that sanctify them."

Likewise, from the historical narrative given in Exodus 16, it will be seen that the day which was seven days, or one full week, previous to that Sabbath which, so far as Scripture records, was first observed by man, was not kept as a Sabbath according to the Mosaic Law; for on that day, which

was seven days previous to the first recorded Sabbath, the children of Israel are said to have journeyed from Elim to the wilderness of Sin—a distance of over twenty miles. It is to be concluded, then, that the Sabbath was imposed upon Israel only and as a part of the law as given by Moses.

b. The Period from Moses to Christ. The Sabbath began to be observed by Israel from the time of its institution through Moses. Invested with the character of a sign between Jehovah and the nation Israel, it was in no sense extended to Gentiles. These facts are disclosed in the following Scriptures: "The LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the LORD that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the LORD: whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed" (Ex. 31:12–17). Nothing but blind prejudice could apply this, or any other Old Testament Scripture concerning the Sabbath, to the Gentiles. The Sabbath was a part of Israel's law, and it was the possession of that law which distinguished that nation from all other peoples of the earth. It is equally erroneous to insist that the Sabbath was always celebrated on the last day of the week.The Sabbath, but for necessary exceptions, was the seventh in a series of seven, whether days or years. Of necessity it often fell on other days of the week as well as on Saturday. There were at least fifteen Sabbaths which were fixed dates in their given month, and these Sabbaths fell on those particular dates regardless of the day of the week.In one instance, seven Sabbaths were counted from the "morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering," and the day following that last Sabbath of the seven, was Pentecost (Lev. 23:15–16). These seven Sabbaths, it is evident, became predetermined dates by arbitrary reckoning from the first Sabbath. So, likewise, the day that Christ

was in the tomb was a fixed Sabbath. It was the fifteenth of Abib, which by divine arrangement in that particular year fell on a Saturday. That this was a fixed Sabbath is proved by the fact that the day before was “preparation” day (Mark 15:42), which day was determined for the fourteenth of that month (Ex. 12:2, 6). Again, certain working days were established days. The lamb must be taken on the tenth day of the first month and be killed, roasted with fire, and eaten on the fourteenth day of the month. Likewise, the feast of First-Fruits could in no wise have been a Sabbath, for that date was appointed as the beginning of harvest (Deut. 16:9; cf. Lev. 23:15). All these labors would have been direct violations of the Sabbath law; yet these ceremonies were appointed for certain predetermined dates, and from time to time must inevitably have been in conflict with the predetermined Sabbaths. By all of this it is evident that the sacred character of the day belonged to its relative place in a series of seven days, and not to a particular day of the week.

During the period from Moses to Christ in which the Sabbath obtained under the direct sanction of God, it was, as the word *Sabbath* indicates, a day of physical rest. It was binding on the whole nation Israel, and death was the penalty for its violation. No fire was to be kindled, no food prepared, no journey undertaken, no buying or selling permitted, and no burden to be borne. Even the land was to have its Sabbaths (Ex. 31:12–17; 35:3; 16:22–26; Neh. 10:31; 13:15–21; Lev. 25:4; 2 Chron. 36:21). The Sabbath law, like all of the law, was so poorly observed that Jehovah finally carried the nation into captivity with the declared purpose that the land might enjoy its Sabbaths.

The Sabbath was interrelated with the law, just as it is embedded in the heart of the Decalogue. The exact manner of its observance is revealed only in the teachings of Moses, and since the law was a covenant of human works, the Sabbath was the divine provision for rest under that covenant. The modern conception of a Sabbath, isolated from the laws which governed it, and adapted to the Christian dispensation as the day of religious activity, public meetings, Christian service, and worship, is entirely out of harmony with every Scripture bearing on the Sabbath. It is taught by some that, although the laws which conditioned the manner of Sabbath observance have ceased, the recognition of the day, whether it be Saturday or Sunday, remains’ as a binding obligation. The result of such

teaching is the imposition of the observance of a day without any exact instruction about the manner of such observance. This teaching is both inconsistent and unscriptural. Moreover, the unscriptural inconsistency is greatly increased when the celebration of the Sabbath is changed from Saturday to Sunday, and is imposed on Gentiles.

The Sabbath was a vital institution under the reign of the law. It depended on the entire law system for its proper observance, and the law system depended on the Sabbath for its normal action. The complete legal system stands, or falls, together. The Mosaic age was given over to the uncomplicated functioning of the entire law system; but that age, and all that characterized it, was, when Christ died, superseded by the reign of grace.

c. The Period Represented by the Gospels. Much Confusion concerning the Sabbath is due to a failure to recognize the peculiar character of the period represented by the Gospels. It should be remembered that Christ was first a "minister of the circumcision"; He was "made under the law"; and He lived and wrought under the law. The law did not pass at His birth. It passed at His death. During the days of His ministry, He recognized, kept, and enforced the Sabbath as an integral part of the whole Mosaic system. True, He insisted that the Mosaic system, and the Sabbath in particular, be delivered from the encrusted teachings of men which had been superimposed on the Law of Moses. These man-made additions to the law were held by the Jews to be as binding and sacred as the very Word of God. Because He ignored all else but the Word of God, Christ appeared as a liberalist on the question of the Sabbath. He also claimed to be "Lord of the Sabbath," which He was, and, by virtue of that position, He had authority to change the Sabbath, or, if He chose, to abolish it forever. A greater than Moses, through whom the law came, was in their midst. It is certain that He purposed to rescue the Sabbath from being an enslaving institution and to restore its functions as a benefit to man. This He announced when He said: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." That is, man was not made to be sacrificed for a day; but the day was made for the blessing of man.

Before His death, the Sabbath was one of the most important issues in the experience and ministry of Christ. However, it is both obvious and

suggestive that He never mentioned that day in the Upper Room Discourse, nor is that day once mentioned as an obligation in all of His postresurrection ministry. It is inconceivable that the Sabbath, which was so vital a part of the Mosaic system, should be omitted from these great age-characterizing teachings of Christ, if it was the purpose of God that this Jewish day should have any place in the present reign of grace.

It has also been claimed that Christ extended the Sabbath-keeping obligation to all men when He said: “The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.” This issue turns on the exact meaning of the word *man* as here used. Did Christ signify by this statement that the Jewish Sabbath was by His authority extended to *all* men? Or did He use the word *man* in its more limited sense as applying only to the nation Israel? Two facts determine the answer: (1) The Sabbath is *never* by any subsequent Scripture applied to Gentiles, and (2) the word *man* is used in the Old Testament no less than 336 times when referring to Israel alone, and many times in the New Testament when referring only to Christians. It is said: “The head of every man is Christ"; the manifestation of the Spirit “is given to every man”; “if any man build upon this foundation”; “Every man shall have praise”; “that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.” In all these Scriptures the word *man* has only the limited meaning. It is therefore evident that Christ said, in harmony with all Scripture, that the Sabbath was made for Israel; for there is no Biblical evidence that Christ ever imposed the Jewish Sabbath on either Gentiles or Christians, but, true to the law, He did recognize its important place and obligation in relation to Israel until the reign of the law should be terminated through His death.

d. The Period Represented by the Acts and the Epistles. In considering the Sabbath question, great importance must be attributed to the exact character of those teachings of the New Testament which come after the founding of Christianity through the death and resurrection of Christ, and by the advent of the Spirit on Pentecost. It should be observed first that the law, as a rule of conduct, is not once applied to the Christian, and that these Scriptures, by overwhelming revelation, assert that the law has passed, through the death of Christ. They assert that the law has ceased both as a means of justification, and as a rule of life for the one who is justified (John 1:16–17; Rom. 6:14; 7:1–6; 2 Cor. 3:1–18; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14; Gal. 3:19–25). If it

is claimed that the Decalogue, in which the Sabbath is embedded, was not of the law, and therefore was not terminated with the death of Christ, this contention is disposed of completely by the reference in Romans 7:7–14 to the last of the commandments, in which Scripture this commandment is explicitly mentioned as *the law*. So, also, according to 2 Corinthians 3:7–14, that which was "written and engraven in stones"—the Decalogue, including the Sabbath day—is *done away* and *abolished*. It should be observed next that, if an issue so vital as was the Sabbath under the law is imposed on the Church, it is incredible (a) that the early Christians would not be reported as having at some time discharged their personal obligation to the Sabbath, or (b) that the necessity of recognizing the Sabbath would not be somewhere incorporated in the new teachings of grace. Turning to these Scriptures we discover:

(1) *The Sabbath in the Book of the Acts.* The word *Sabbath* is used nine times in the Acts, and wherever it is referred to as a day which is observed, it is related only to the unbelieving Jews, who, as would be expected, perpetuated—and who still perpetuate the observance of the Sabbath day. Not once in this book is it stated, or even implied, that Christians kept a Sabbath day. It is said that the Apostle Paul went into the synagogue of the Jews and reasoned with them every Sabbath; but this can imply nothing more than that he took advantage of their gathering together on that day in order that he might preach to them. Such may be the experience of any missionary to the Jews today.

(2) *The Sabbath in the Epistles.* Turning to the Epistles, it will be seen in this portion of the Scriptures, as in the Book of Acts, that no Christian is said to have observed a Sabbath day. It is highly probable that some in the early church who were drawn into the observance of the law were also complicated with issues of Sabbath-keeping; but the Spirit of God has omitted every such incident, if such there was, from the pages of Scripture. Thus the Inspired Record does not reveal the complication of one believer with the Jewish Sabbath, even as an error in conduct; nor are sinners termed Sabbath-breakers.

Upon examination of the direct injunctions and doctrinal teachings of the Epistles, it is discovered that the word *Sabbath* is used but once, the term *seventh day* mentioned in one passage only, and the legalistic observance of a *day* is referred to but once. These passages deserve particular attention:

Colossians 2:16–17. In the context in which this Scripture is found, the Apostle warns believers against any complicity with the law, or works-covenant, since they have been transferred to a position under grace. The passage states that they have been made "complete" in Christ, to which estate nothing could ever be added; hence, for the one who is in Christ the objective of all meritorious works is already gained, and the legal obligation to do good works is forever met (vs. 10). The believer is also said to be "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Therefore, since the flesh—the one thing the law proposed to control—is, in the sight of God, put away, there is no need of the law. The Jewish child was circumcised on the eighth day, which was the first day of a new week following the passing of a completed week. The circumcision on the eighth day, or first day of a new week, typified the deliverance from the old creation which would be accomplished for believers through the resurrection of Christ from the dead; for in that death He bore all the curse of the old creation. For this reason the believer under grace is not called upon to celebrate any aspect of the old creation which was represented by the Sabbath (vs. 11). The one who is saved has been "buried with him in baptism, wherein [i.e., the baptism] also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God [his own faith in God's power], who hath raised him from the dead." The use of the aorist tense in connection with the reference to a burial with Him in baptism, makes that burial out as being contemporaneous with the circumcision just mentioned. Therefore it is evident that the baptism with the Spirit which vitally relates the believer to Christ is in view (1 Cor. 12:13; cf. Gal. 3:27). In that baptism, as in no other, the Christian partakes of all that Christ is, and all that Christ has done. He shares in Christ's crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection (Rom. 6:1–10). With the old creation thus buried in the tomb of Christ, the believer is in no wise obligated to any observance related to the old creation (vs. 12). Again, the believer has been delivered from the law by no less an undertaking than the nailing of the law with its handwriting of ordinances to the cross. After this great transaction, how can the child of God reasonably recognize the law in any respect whatsoever (vs. 14)? To the one who is thus complete in Christ, circumcised in Christ, buried with Christ, and delivered from the authority of all handwriting of ordinances, the Apostle

writes: “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days [day]: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body [substance] is of Christ.” All these were essential features of the law (1 Chron. 23:31; 2 Chron. 2:4; 31:3), and as such were to cease in the present age of Israel’s chastisement (Hos. 2:11), and are to be reinstated in the coming kingdom (Ezek. 45:17). They were but shadows of the Substance—Christ. Having the Substance, the believer is warned against turning to the mere shadow. According to this Scripture, the law, which included the Sabbath day, is abolished. If it is objected that the reference in this passage is to extraceremonial Sabbaths, the contention cannot be sustained; for the word here used is σάββατα, which is the exact word invariably used to designate the regular Jewish Sabbath. It is significant, then, that in all the Epistles wherein the believer’s obligation under grace is set forth the only use of the word *Sabbath* is under absolute prohibition concerning its observance, and that it is there held to be in conflict with the most vital and superseding elements of grace.

Hebrews 4:4. In this passage the one reference in all the Epistles to the *seventh day* is found. We read: “For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works.” As before, the occasion for this reference to a seventh day is explicit in the context. In the whole passage (4:1–13) Hebrew Christians are warned lest, as their fathers failed to enter into rest under Joshua (vs. 8), they themselves should fail to enter, experimentally, into the rest provided in the finished work of Christ, of whom Joshua was but a type. In the application of this passage, it may be noted that the rest under Christ is not for one day in the week, nor is it that Sabbath rest which was due after a six-day strain of meritorious works. It is rather the abiding rest of faith in Another who, as Substitute, has wrought all the “works of God.” This blessed rest is promised “to him that worketh not.” Likewise, it is in no sense the rest of death. It is rather the rest of Christ’s imparted, resurrection life, and that life is ceaselessly active. The extent and character of the activity of the new life in Christ is a violation of every commandment which enjoins a Sabbath day of rest.

Galatians 4:9–10. At this point in this Epistle, the Apostle chides the Galatian believers for observing *days* which are borrowed from the law, and tells them that by the keeping of legal days they have turned from grace to

the law: “But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.” The phrase, *weak and beggarly elements*, is a description of the character of the law. As a means of securing moral and spiritual conduct, the law was “weak” since its correct observance was impossible through the “weakness of the flesh” (Rom. 8:3). As a source of heart blessing, the law was “beggarly” (lit., poverty-stricken) as compared to the riches of grace in Christ Jesus. From this consideration of the passages which describe and define the life of the believer after the cross, it is notable that in these Scriptures there is no example of the observance of a Sabbath day by any believer, and no injunction for such observance. On the other hand, there is the most conclusive teaching concerning the complete ending of the law by the death of Christ, and the most faithful warnings lest the believer shall become ensnared by complicity with Sabbath day observance.

e. The Sabbath in Prophecy. There are two distinct aspects of the Sabbath in prophecy: (1) concerning its cessation in this age of Israel’s chastisement and (2) concerning its re-establishment when the present purpose in the Church is accomplished.

(1) *The Cessation of the Sabbath.* It is clear from Hosea 2:11 that the chastisement which was to fall on Israel, and which she is now experiencing, would be characterized by the cessation of *all* her solemn feasts and Sabbaths: “I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.” Such is the unalterable decree of God, and had one word of this prophecy failed He would have been proved untrue. These Jewish observances which were to cease included *all* her Sabbaths. They ceased at the beginning of this age of grace, so far as any recognition from God is concerned. Otherwise, when will this prophecy be fulfilled? Uninstructed people may impose a solemn feast, or a Jewish Sabbath, upon themselves; but this would accomplish no more than the creation of an abnormal conscience which either accuses or excuses but never satisfies the heart. Such is the invariable effect of self-imposed law (cf. Rom. 2:14–15).

(2) *The Re-Establishment of the Sabbath.* Upon the completion of the present divine purpose in the Church, Israel’s Sabbaths will be reinstated.

This is assured both for the great tribulation which must precede the glorious coming of Christ, and for the kingdom age which follows that coming. Concerning the great tribulation it is said: “But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day” (24:20). No Christian has ever been inclined to offer this prayer. The time of its fulfillment does not concern him, nor does he have any relation to a Sabbath day. It will be in the “time of Jacob’s trouble,” and Israel’s Sabbaths will then be observed again. Concerning the kingdom age we read: “And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD” (Isa. 66:23); “Thus saith the Lord GOD; The gate of the inner court that looketh toward the east shall be shut the six working days; but on the Sabbath it shall be opened, and in the day of the new moon it shall be opened” (Ezek. 46:1). This is according to all prophecy concerning the kingdom. It is then that Israel shall “do all his commandments,” including the Sabbath (Deut. 30:8). The Sabbath must be reinstated; for it is a “perpetual covenant” and sign between Jehovah and Israel, except for such time as He shall cause it to cease in His chastisement of that people (Ex. 31:16).

f. The Exact Day. The supposition that an *exact* continuation of weekly Sabbaths is now being kept by all who observe the seventh day, is without foundation. It should be noted: (a) No day is holy in itself. From the natural standpoint, all days are alike and are equally subject to the same physical conditions. A day is holy by divine decree, and that decree is subject to change at the appointment of God. By no means did the day always fall on Saturday, nor were the Sabbaths always separated by six full working days. (b) The Sabbath was to begin with sunset and end with sunset. This was simple enough when ordered for Israel in the small geographical boundaries of Palestine. It is far different when applied to the whole earth, and, as some dare to claim, to heaven as well. No uniformity of the observance of an exact day is possible over the whole earth. While some are keeping Saturday on one hemisphere, others are keeping Sunday (as Sabbath) on the other. Should two persons start from a given point to go around the earth in opposite directions, and both observe each Sabbath from sundown to sundown, upon their return to the starting point, one would be observing Friday and the other Sunday. The question of observing an exact day from

sunset is even more perplexing in the far North. The sun sets there but once in six months. In that region, to be Biblical and exact, there must be a twelve-month Sabbath, and a week of seven years. (c) The exact day in which God finished creation and rested is quite unknown. He rested on the seventh day; but it could hardly be proved that sundown on Friday night at a given place on the earth is the perpetuation of the exact moment when God began to rest from His work of creation. Who can trace the exact moment, day, or year, through Eden, the flood, the bondage in Egypt, and the dark ages? Yet apart from the assurance that Saturday at a given place on the earth is the exact day in rotation of weeks from creation, there is no basis for the claim to the sacredness of the exact time to be observed. Ignorant people are too often encouraged in the belief that they are actually celebrating the rest of God in creation when they observe the hours as they fall on Saturday in the locality where they chance to live. It is therefore the *manner* of the observance of the day, and not the exact time, which is in question. Shall it be the seventh day, or the first day? It must be one or the other; for there is nothing more unreasonable, illogical, and unbiblical than the observance of the seventh day with confusion of Christian issues of worship and service, which is the practice of every Sabbatarian; or the observance of the first day with confusion of the Sabbath law, which is the present practice of Christendom. There would be little occasion for discussion of the question if the simple distinctions between law and grace were recognized.

2. The Biblical Testimony Concerning the Lord's Day. Even a cursory reading of those portions of Scripture which condition the daily life of the Christian will reveal that fact that, while every other fundamental principle of righteousness found in the Decalogue is restated in the teachings of grace, the Sabbath is not once imposed upon the believer. On the contrary, as before shown, there is explicit warning against the observance of a Sabbath day. This is a fact of revelation which should not be overlooked. Throughout the history of the church, a new day has been observed which superseded the Jewish Sabbath, and this change of days has not been contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, as some insist; it has, rather, been according to the revealed plan and purpose of God. There are certain Biblical reasons for this change:

a. The Mosaic System Has Ceased. The whole Mosaic system, including its Sabbath day, has given way to the reign of grace. To this important truth sufficient proof has already been presented; but, in spite of the clearest Biblical statement on this subject, there are two groups of professing Christians who evidently do not receive this divine testimony: (a) those who persist in the observance of the seventh day, and (b) those who observe the first day, but who invest it with the character of the Jewish Sabbath, and observe it on the authority of the law which was given to Israel by Moses. The position of these two classes should be considered separately:

First, those who persist in the observance of the seventh day do so on the claim that, while the law passed away in the death of Christ, the Decalogue is not a part of the law and therefore it, with its Sabbath day, has not been abolished. The answer to this subtle argument is clear and conclusive. Not only is the Decalogue included and embedded in the Old Testament statement of the law, but, in the New Testament, the Decalogue, as has already been shown, is distinctly said to be "the law." In Romans 7:7, the Apostle Paul has written of the tendency of his own heart toward sin. He states: "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Thus he refers to the Tenth Commandment as "the law." Furthermore, it is impossible now for any Jew or Gentile to keep the ceremonial law of Moses, and thus it is evident that the New Testament warnings against law observance could not be a warning against an observance of the ceremonial law. The ceremonial law required for its observance the presence of Jehovah in the holy of holies, an altar, a priesthood, and a temple in Jerusalem. All these prerequisites for the observance of the ceremonial law were withdrawn at the beginning of the present age. The Church of Rome, in its attempt to continue the law system, proposed to meet this difficulty by creating its own altar, temple service, and priesthood, and alleges that the Lord is present in the consecrated bread. The warnings which are found under grace against the keeping of the law are of necessity applicable only to the Decalogue, and not to the ceremonial law. The ceremonial law governed the precise manner of the observance of the Sabbath and there is great unreasonableness, with attending confusion, when an attempt is now made to keep the Jewish Sabbath apart from the ceremonial law. The class of legalists who now try to observe the seventh day, having no way to introduce the ceremonial law, borrow the features of

the new day of grace. They hold services, worship, and do much religious work on the seventh day, which, being strictly a day of rest, was never designed to be a day of activity, religious or otherwise, nor was such activity ever allowed on this day during the reign of the law.

Second, there is even greater inconsistency in the position of those who recognize the first day of the week, but invest that day with the character of the Sabbath, and keep the day on the authority of the Law of Moses. Not only has the whole Mosaic system ceased with its Sabbath and every requirement related to that day, but there could be no consistency in borrowing even one of the features of the Jewish Sabbath. This error of borrowing certain features of the Jewish Sabbath is committed by both of these classes of legalists. The Law of Moses was never subject to a *partial* observance. It is a unit; for "what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law"; and, "the man which doath those things shall live by them"; and again, "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of law to do them." There is no Scriptural warrant for a partial acceptance of the law, or a partial recognition of its Sabbath day. The observance of the day with all its requirements must be *perfectly* kept, or *not at all*. The slightest recognition of the least of all the features of the Sabbath commits a person who attempts it to keep the whole law. It therefore follows that the Christian who, while keeping the first day of the week, is influenced in the slightest degree by the Law of Moses concerning a Sabbath day, is, both by Scripture and reason, committed to keep every feature of the Jewish Sabbath, as well as the whole Mosaic system. For example, the person who adopts even one feature of Sabbath observance on the ground that it is enjoined by the law, is bound by that same Sabbath law to stone to death every person who fails to keep any feature of that law. In fact, if he himself had been so guilty as to observe the first day of the week in place of the seventh, he must bow to the death penalty, in vindication of the righteous judgments of God. This death penalty is the uncompromising provision made in God's Word for Sabbath breakers.

The original heresy of the church was the attempted admixture of law and grace teachings. It is one of the most destructive heresies of the present hour, and at no point of contact do the opposing principles of law and grace become more clearly crystallized than in the question of the exact day

which is to be observed. There is no *Christian Sabbath*. The new day which belongs to grace is in no way related to the Sabbath. Observance must be of either one day or the other. To commingle them, as every legalist does, is to frustrate grace.

b. A New Day is Divinely Appointed Under Grace. This new day is also a particular day of the week and has been given a name which is in accordance with its character. Its divine appointment is first recorded in a prophetic message: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the LORD'S doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it" (Ps. 118:22–24). In this Scripture, both the death and the resurrection of Christ are in view. He was the rejected Stone, and His Father, through the resurrection, has made Him the Headstone of the Corner. The resurrection was appointed to take place on a certain day which the Lord had determined, and that day was by divine intention to be celebrated with joy and gladness. The divine commentary on this passage is given through the Apostle Peter as recorded in Acts 4:10–11: "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." Therefore the day which the Lord had appointed when the rejected Stone would become the Headstone of the Corner, is the day of His resurrection. This is the "day which the LORD hath made." It is therefore the Lord's day. In that day men are to "rejoice and be glad."

The Lord's day should in nowise be confused with "the day of the LORD." One is the first day of every week, which is observed as a commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. The other is a prophetic period, which is still future, and which concerns Israel and the whole creation.

The first Lord's day was the pattern of all the Lord's days that should follow. It began "very early in the morning," when the risen Lord said, "All hail" (lit., rejoice) ! It continued with His precious fellowship, and closed with His benediction of peace. From that early morning to its close it was a day of worship, activity, and joy. The Sabbath, on the other hand, with no

less symbolical significance, began with the setting sun, which spoke of complete cessation of activity and of perfect rest.

The Christian has an unchangeable day. He may extend its observance to all days, but he cannot change the one day, which is divinely appointed, any more than Israel, or any one else, could change the divinely appointed seventh day. A change of the first day to another breaks the symbolic meaning of the day as it represents the true relationships under grace. It results in robbing Christ of that glory which is His alone. This is one of the wrongs committed by all those who persist in an attempted seventh-day observance. The two days do not present an optional choice to the Christian. The choice between these days is one which carries either acceptance or rejection of the most vital relationships between Christ and the believer under grace.

c. A New Day is Indicated by Important Events. Beginning with the resurrection, and following it, every event recorded in the New Testament which had important religious significance fell on the first day of the week, or the Lord's day. No greater emphasis through events could be given to this new day than that found in the teachings of grace, and, added to this, is the fact that in these same Scriptures the Sabbath day is wholly set aside. If it be claimed that there is no direct commandment for the keeping of the Lord's day, it should be observed that there is explicit command *against* the observance of the Sabbath day, and that the lack of commandments concerning the Lord's day is both in accordance with the character of the new day, and the entire order of grace which it represents and to which it is related. Mention should be made of the great events which fell on the first day of the week.

On the first day of the week Christ arose from the dead. His resurrection is vitally related to the ages past, to the fulfillment of all prophecy, to the values of His death, to the Church, to Israel, to creation, to the purposes of God in grace which reach beyond to the ages to come, and to the eternal glory of God. Fulfillment of the eternal purposes related to all of these was dependent upon the coming forth of the Son of God from that tomb. He arose from the dead, and the greatness of that event is indicated by the importance of its place in Christian doctrine. Had not Christ arisen—He by whom all things were created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth,

visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, He for whom things were created, who is before all things, and by whom all things consist (hold together)—every divine purpose and blessing would have failed, yea, the very universe and the throne of God would have dissolved and would have been dismissed forever. All life, light, and hope would have ceased. Death, darkness, and despair would have reigned. Though the spiritual powers of darkness might have continued, the last hope for a ruined world would have been banished eternally. It is impossible for the mind to grasp the mighty issues which were at stake at the moment when Christ came forth from the tomb. At no moment of time, however, were these great issues in jeopardy. The consummation of His resurrection was sure, for omnipotent power was engaged to bring it to pass. Every feature of the Christian's salvation, position, and hope was dependent on the resurrection of his Lord. Very much depended on the death of Christ, but every value of that death would have been sacrificed apart from the resurrection. When Christ arose from the dead, Christianity was born, and the New Creation was brought into existence. There is nothing in the old order for the believer. He stands on resurrection ground. He belongs only to the New Creation. God is faithful to all that He has wrought in Christ and He, according to His Word, will not suffer the child of the New Creation to go back and celebrate the beginning of the old and fallen creation from which His child has been saved through infinite riches of grace. If the children of grace persist in relating themselves to the old creation by the observance of the Sabbath, it is evidence of their limitations in the knowledge of the Word and will of God; it is to fall from grace.

Since the day of Christ's resurrection is the day in which the New Creation was formed, and all that enters into the Christian's life and hope was brought into being, both according to Scripture and according to reason the Christian can celebrate no other day than the Lord's day.

On the first day of the week Christ met His disciples in the new power and fellowship of His resurrection-life.

On the first day of the week Christ symbolized the new resurrection-fellowship by breaking bread with His disciples.

On the first day of the week He gave them instructions in their new resurrection-ministry and life for Him.

On the first day of the week He commanded the disciples to preach the new message to all the world.

On the first day of the week Christ ascended into heaven as the "wave sheaf." In fulfilling the Old Testament type and the eternal purpose of God, it was necessary that He should appear in heaven as the earnest of the mighty harvest of souls whom He had redeemed and who came out of that tomb with Him to share His eternal life and glory. So, also, He must, having accomplished the sacrifice for sin, present His own blood in heaven (Lev. 16:1–34; Heb. 9:16–28). Having not yet ascended, He said to Mary, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20:17). How little the import of this message from Christ was understood then, and how little it is understood even now! That He ascended on that day is evident; for He said unto them at evening of that day, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see" (Luke 24:39). He had ascended to heaven, accomplished His work there, and returned to earth to complete His postresurrection ministry.

On the first day of the week He breathed on His disciples and imparted the Holy Spirit to them.

On the first day of the week the Spirit descended to take up His agecharacterizing ministries in the world.

On the first day of the week the Apostle Paul preached to the assembled believers at Troas. The Spirit of God has distinctly emphasized the fact that the Apostle was in Troas seven days. Of necessity, then, the stay in that city included both a seventh day and a first day of the week. The Apostle was thus free to choose either day for his public ministry to the assembled saints. The record reads: "We … came unto them to Troas … where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them" (Acts 20:6–7).

The Apostle commanded the Corinthian believer to "lay by him in store," on the first day of the week, "as God hath prospered him" (1 Cor. 16:2).

d. The New Day Typifies the New Creation. The rite of circumcision, being accomplished on the eighth day, was a suggestion of the spiritual circumcision of the flesh which Christ wrought by His death and

resurrection. The eighth day was the first day following a completed week. It is thus a picture of that new order which came through the death and resurrection of Christ. The Apostle writes: “In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ” (Col. 2:11). Not only has the old nature been judged in the crucifixion, death, and burial of the Son of God, and the new victory in the resurrection life of Christ been made possible, but, for the believer, the old creation went into that tomb and a New Creation with its heavenly power and glory came out. The old creation was abolished and with it the Sabbath which commemorated it. Only a new standing in the resurrected Christ abides and this both demands and provides a new day. That new day is the eighth day, or the first day following the ending of the old creation.

e. The New Day is Typical of Unmerited Grace. The first day of the week is a type of the facts and relationships which are under grace, while the seventh day is a type of the facts and relationships which are under the law. On the seventh day man rested from all his work. This is in harmony with the law covenant of works, which required a man to do good in order that he might receive the blessing of God. Under the law, six days of faithful labor are followed by one day of absolute rest. On the other hand, the observance of the first day of the week is typical of the believer’s position under unmerited grace. He begins with a day of blessing before any works are wrought, and then he is expected to live the following six days in the power and blessing he has received on that day. This is the order of the grace covenant of faith in which all saving grace is first bestowed as a gift from God, and is then followed by a life which is lived in the power of that new relationship with God. A day of rest belonged to a people who were related to God by works which were to be accomplished. A day of ceaseless worship and service belongs to a people who are related to God by the finished work of Christ. The seventh day was governed by an unyielding, ironclad law. The first day is characterized by the latitude and liberty belonging to grace. The seventh day was observed with the hope that by it one might be accepted of God. The first day is observed with the assurance that one is already accepted of God. The keeping of the seventh day was

wrought by the flesh. The keeping of the first day is to be wrought by the indwelling Spirit.

f. The New Day Began to Be Observed with the Resurrection of Christ. It is claimed by a certain group of Sabbatarians that the Sabbath was kept by the early church until the day was changed by the Emperor Constantine in the year 321 A.D., or even later by the Pope of Rome. There is no ground for this erroneous and misleading teaching. The Sabbath was never changed. It could not be. A new and far different day in significance, which alone could belong to this age of grace, superseded it. When this age is completed and law reigns again in the earth, the Sabbath will be observed; but in nowise will man have changed the day. There is conclusive evidence that the first day of the week has been observed by the church from the very resurrection of Christ. This evidence is found both (a) in the Scriptures and (b) in the writings of the early Fathers:

Turning to the Epistles of the New Testament, wherein is conditioned the believer's life under grace, it is discovered that there is prohibition against the observance of a Sabbath day, and that there is not one record that any Christian kept a Sabbath day, even in error. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence, as has been seen, that the first day of the week was observed in the manner consistent with its significance.

The testimony from the early Fathers is also conclusive.

Eusebius, 315 A.D., says: "The churches throughout the rest of the world observe the practice that has prevailed from Apostolic tradition until the present time so that it would not be proper to terminate our fast on any other day but the resurrection day of our Saviour. Hence there were synods and convocations of our Bishops on this question and all unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree which they communicated to churches in all places —that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other than the Lord's Day."

Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, 300 A.D., says: "We keep the Lord's Day as a day of joy because of him who rose thereon."

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 253 A.D., says: "The Lord's Day is both the 1st, and the 8th day."

Tertullian, of Carthage, 200 A.D., says, speaking of the "sun worshipper": "Though we share with them Sunday, we are not apprehensive lest we seem

to be heathen."

Clement of Alexandria, 194 A.D., says: "The old sabbath day has become nothing more than a working day [to Christians]."

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, 178 A.D., says: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's Day."

Bardesanes, 180 A.D., says: "Wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, namely Christians, and upon one day, which is the first day of the week, we assemble ourselves together and on the appointed days we abstain from food."

Justin Martyr, 135 A.D., says: "Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God having wrought a change in the darkness and matter made the world and Jesus Christ our Saviour, on the same day, rose from the dead." "And on the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits." "On the Lord's Day all Christians in the city or country meet together because that is the day of our Lord's resurrection; and then we read the apostles and prophets. This being done, the president [presiding minister] makes an oration [verbal admonition] to the assembly exhorting them to imitate and to practice the things which they have heard, and then we all join in prayer, and after that we celebrate the Lord's Supper."

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, 110 A.D., says: "Those who walked in the ancient practices attain unto newness of hope no longer observing sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's Day, on which our life also rose through him, that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only teacher."

Barnabas, one of the Apostolic Fathers, 70 A.D., says: "Finally He saith, 'Your present sabbaths are not acceptable to me. I shall make a new beginning of the eighth day, that is the beginning of another order of the world,' wherefore also we keep the Lord's Day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead."

Also, the "Didache of the Apostles," 140 (perhaps, 70) A.D., says: "On the Lord's own Day do ye gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks."

By this line of unbroken testimony the evidence concerning the observance of the Lord's day is carried back to the days of the writings of the New Testament. It is quite true that emperors and popes have made decrees regarding the first day of the week. Everything was done that could be done to persecute the Jew, and to abolish Jewish practices; but the Jewish Sabbath passed, and the new day came to be, not by the decree of man, but by the resurrection of Christ which brought in all that the Lord's day signifies.

g. The New Day Has Been Blessed of God. Christians have observed the Lord's day under the evident blessing of God for nearly 2000 years. Among them have been the most devout believers, the martyrs, the missionaries, and a countless throng of those who would have passed through any trial or persecution to know and do the will of God. It is a very serious charge to say that all these faithful saints have been disobedient, or as some Sabbatarians now call all Christians who do not keep Sabbath, "heretics, deceivers, having the mark of the Beast, and blinded by Satan." The gospel of grace is by these people replaced by "another gospel," which is to the effect that only those who keep the Sabbath will be saved; and they also teach that God has "forsaken His church" and that she is "abandoned to Satan who rules her." In spite of the fact that God has never once imposed the Sabbath upon the age of grace, they make the preaching of the Sabbath their major theme, and, in seeming bitterness, do not hesitate to hinder the good works of all who love and keep the Lord's day. Along with the error of preaching the law in place of the gospel, these Sabbatarians hold and teach other misleading heresies and unbiblical doctrines. Being so much in error concerning many fundamental doctrines of the Bible, it is not strange that they persist in Sabbath legality.

The reasons for keeping the Lord's day, or the first day of the week, are clear and sufficient to those who will receive the teachings of God's Word without prejudice.

IV. The Final Transformation

As stated above, very much that enters into the New Creation reality is already an accomplished fact in the believer. Every aspect of his salvation is a distinctive quality in the new order of being which he is, especially the

new position in Christ. However, there are at least three great benefits which, though assured by all the faithfulness of infinity, are yet deferred. Though mentioned before, attention should be given more at length to these particulars.

1. Release from the Sin Nature. At the end of his pilgrim journey, there is for the believer a release from the lifelong conflict with the sin nature. He will have sustained a warfare with the *cosmos* world and with Satan; but these are forces from without whose pressure will be withdrawn forever. The release from the sin nature involves a constitutional change—the removal of a force from within which has been an integral part of the believer all his days. The great Apostle included himself—and it was true of him at the time of his deepest spiritual development—when he said, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would" (Gal. 5:17). The end of this conflict was anticipated by him when he wrote as the closing testimony of his life, "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing" (2 Tim. 4:6–8).

2. The Actual Occupation of Heavenly Citizenship. In this aspect of the Christian's release, there is a conveyance from this sphere of ambassadorship, from this existence as a stranger and pilgrim, into that home-center in glory which has been held by right and title, though unoccupied, from the moment of salvation through Christ. No imagination can portray nor can language describe this stupendous change with its transfer from earth to heaven, from part knowledge to whole knowledge, from seeing through a glass darkly to seeing face to face, from association with fallen humanity to fellowship with glorified saints and angels, from a death-doomed body to a glorious, eternal body, from earthly hovels to the mansions He has gone to prepare, and from an existence which is defined as "absent from the Lord" to that which is characterized by His immediate presence. The Patmos seer avers:

> Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also (John 14:1–3); And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years (Rev. 20:4); And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him: and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads (Rev. 22:1–4).

3. The Possession of a Transformed Body. The third deferred feature of salvation to be realized at the end of this life and which makes its contribution to the sum total of that which constitutes the Christian a new creation, is the reception and occupancy of a transformed body. In respect to the physical or material part of the believer, a stupendous metamorphosis awaits him. Though two possibilities of process are held before him, the end is the same in either case. He may go by the way of death and resurrection, or he may go by translation; yet a standardized reality awaits him. He will have a body like unto Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:20–21).

As is to be expected, there is a central and exhaustive portion of Scripture bearing on so great a theme as the resurrection of the believer's body; and that Scripture is 1 Corinthians 15:20–23, 35–57. In the first section—15:20–23—the resurrection of the believer's body is seen in its order as preceded by the resurrection of Christ, with the present period between the first and second advents intervening, and followed by the resurrection of all humanity—which resurrection is termed "the end" resurrection, or the last in the order of resurrections (cf. Rev. 20:12–15)—and separated from the believer's resurrection by Christ's reign and authority which must continue until all enemies are under His feet. This period is determined with regard to its duration by the testimony of Revelation 20, and is declared to be a thousand years (cf. 2 Pet. 3:7–10). In this time the Church, having been raised and translated, is reigning with Christ (Rev. 20:4).

The second section of this central passage presents the essential facts related to the resurrection of the bodies of those that are Christ's. If the question—natural, indeed—be asked, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" (1 Cor. 15:35), the answer is that, as there is a great variety of forms and bodies in God's creation, it is not strange that God will give the believer a transformed body in resurrection, or in translation. Concerning the transformation that comes by resurrection, there are four contrasts drawn: (a) that sown—note this significant synonym for the word *burial*—in corruption is raised in incorruption; (b) that sown in dishonor, or humiliation, is raised in glory; (c) that sown in weakness is raised a powerful body; and (d) that sown as a natural body—adapted to the soul—is raised a spiritual body, i.e. adapted to the human spirit. This aspect of truth is concluded with the assuring words: "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (vs. 49).

Over against this is the engaging truth that some will not die, or "sleep," but will be translated in their living state. They are not to go to heaven burdened and restricted by this body of limitations. They being mortal—alive in the flesh—will put on immortality. The change is sudden and complete. It is wrought "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." The trump shall sound and the dead in Christ shall be raised incorruptible, but those living—and the Apostle again rightly includes himself as one who entertained this blessed hope—shall be changed. The decree and purpose of God cannot fail: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." All of this, and translation is far better than having to die first, is stated by the Apostle when he says, "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15: 51–53).

Though He did not see corruption (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27, 31), Christ's present body is the pattern of the believer's resurrection body. Here it may well be restated that Christ's resurrection was vastly more than a mere reversal of death; and such, indeed, will be the character of the believer's glorified body. The Scriptures record restorations from death back into the present sphere to die again (cf. 2 Kings 4:32–35; 13:21; Matt. 9:25; Luke

7:12–15; John 11:43; Acts 9:36–41; 14:19–20). One has but to reconsider the four great changes listed above which are recorded in 1 Corinthians 15:42–44 to be assured that a different form of resurrection awaits the body of the child of God who has died, quite diverse from any restoration ever accomplished in human history. The transformed, resurrected body will be limitless in power, infinite in glory, eternal in endurance, and adapted to the spirit. Such is the particular glory each individual will contribute to the whole New Creation.

All this is assured both by unfailing promise and by incomprehensible rights through identification with the glorified Savior. Being thus in Christ and therefore possessing all the values of His death and resurrection as fully as those values would be possessed had one actually died in Christ's death and been actually raised in His resurrection, there is nothing unreasonable in the disclosure that the body, too, will yet be raised and be changed that it may be like His glorious body (Phil. 3:20–21).

The Apostle writes in Romans 8:23 of the "redemption of our body." This phrase evidently comprehends the metamorphosis which is wrought either by becoming incorruptible or immortal. This truth respecting the redemption of the body closely parallels the resurrection doctrine; for the saints are redeemed in this present estate, and yet their bodies are to be redeemed—which is similar to the fact that, though they are now raised in Christ, their bodies are yet to be raised or changed.

Conclusion

In concluding this the sixth figure of relationship between Christ and the Church, it may be said that extended space has been claimed for this aspect of truth in view of the fact that it incorporates the doctrine of the believer's position in Christ as the new federal Head, the doctrine of Christ's resurrection, and the doctrine of the resurrection or translation of all who are in Christ. These are great and distinctive Christian tenets which logically appear at this point in an ordered system of theology.

Chapter VI

Seven Figures Used of the Church in Her Relation to Christ (VII)
the Bridegroom and the Bride

This, the last of the seven figures which speak of the relationship between Christ and the Church, is distinctive in certain respects, and may be developed by noting as points: (1) the type as contrasted with Israel, (2) as a delineation of Christ's knowledge-surpassing love, (3) as an assurance of the Consort's authority, (4) as a revelation of the Bride's position above all created beings, (5) as a surety of infinite glory, (6) the Bride types, and (7) the meaning of this figure.

It is evident that the majority of these distinctions are anticipations of realities to be enjoyed in ages to come. In this respect this figure serves a specific purpose and introduces contemplations into which no man may enter fully either in understanding or expression.

This discussion may well follow the general order of topics indicated above.

I. Contrasted with Israel

The constant source of doctrinal error through confusing the truth respecting Israel with that of the Church is no less evident in this figure than previously. One of the inaccuracies of that indefatigable student and scholar, Dr. Ethelbert W. Bullinger—which inaccuracy, along with others, he recanted before his death—was the theory that Israel is the Bride of Christ while the Church is His Body. The supposedly convincing argument is that the Church could not be both the Body and the Bride at the same time; whereas, the Church, as has been seen, is related to Christ by seven symbolisms, all of which are not only true but are required if the extent of this relationship is to be disclosed. It has been indicated, also, that there is in Israel's relationship to Jehovah a truth which parallels whatever may be revealed respecting Christ and the Church. The figure of the Bridegroom and the Bride is no exception. Even so clear a writer and teacher—usually

free from misconceptions—as Sir Robert Anderson attempted to sustain the Israel-bride theory. In a footnote on page 200 of his book *The Coming Prince* (2nd ed.) he wrote: "In Scripture the church of this dispensation is symbolized as the Body of Christ, never as the Bride. From the close of John Baptist's ministry the Bride is never mentioned until she appears in the Apocalypse (John 3:29; Rev. 21:2, 9). The force of the 'nevertheless' in Eph. 5:33 depends on the fact that the Church is the *Body*, not the Bride. The earthly relationship is readjusted by a heavenly standard. Man and wife are *not* one body, but Christ and His church are one body, therefore a man is to love his wife 'even as himself.'" Each one of these arguments is easily refuted. (1) If Israel is the bride, then Israel must occupy heaven rather than the earth and surpass the Church in exaltation with no doctrinal understructure, such as is revealed respecting the New Creation, to sustain that superior position. (2) It is not strange that the Church is not referred to more often as the Bride, since she does not become the Bride until she is in the glory; and certainly no Scripture terms Israel as the Bride now or ever. (3) That the husband and wife are "one flesh" is the equivalent—within the latitude of a symbol—of the idea of one body.

A parallel between the Church as the Bride and Israel's relation to Jehovah is seen in the fact that Israel is said to be the apostate wife of Jehovah who is yet to be restored. Certainly a wide distinction obtains between an espoused virgin (2 Cor. 11:2) and a repudiated wife. Scriptures bearing on Israel as Jehovah's wife are: "For thy Maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel" (Isa. 54:5); "They say, If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, shall he return unto her again? shall not that land be greatly polluted? but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, saith the LORD. … Turn, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; for I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion. … Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the LORD" (Jer. 3:1, 14, 20); "For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband" (Gal. 4:27). Added to these, are two passages much too long for quotation, namely, Ezekiel 16:1–59 and Hosea 2:1–23. The former of these Scriptures

is Jehovah's scathing repudiation of the nation with whom He entered into covenant and whom He made His own (vss. 8, 59); yet Israel will be restored (vss. 60–63). Similarly in Hosea 2:1–23 Jehovah's repudiation of Israel is again described and the prophet is appointed to enact in his own home the situation of Jehovah in relation to His apostate wife, and as an object lesson to Israel. These passages should not be slighted. Several New Testament Scriptures deserve specific consideration:

John 3:29. "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled."

Such is the testimony of John the Baptist, the greatest of all prophets and the closest in personal relation to Christ; yet he disclaims a place in the Bride of Christ. What he did claim is well stated by Dr. Marvin Vincent thus: "Friend of the bridegroom. Or groomsman. The term is appropriate to Judaea, the groomsmen not being customary in Galilee. See Matt. 9:15, where the phrase *children o f the bridechamber* is used. (See on Mark 2:19). In Judaea there were two groomsmen, one for the bridegroom, the other for his bride. Before marriage they acted as intermediaries between the couple; at the wedding they offered gifts, waited upon the bride and bridegroom, and attended them to the bridal chamber. It was the duty of the friend of the bridegroom to present him to his bride, after marriage to maintain proper terms between the parties, and especially to defend the bride's good fame. … The Baptist represents himself as standing in the same relation to Jesus" (*Word Studies in the New Testament*, II. 105–6).

Romans 7:4. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

While the passage refers only to the individual in its first application, it does bear the essential truth of a union between Christ and the believers who comprise the Church.

2 Corinthians 11:2. "For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present *you as* a chaste virgin to Christ."

The force of this text is somewhat weakened by the insertion of the words "you as"—they being italicized, the translators admit by so much that the addition of these words is their own. The direct statement made by the

Apostle is, *that I may present a chaste virgin to Christ*. He certainly is not contemplating Israel.

Galatians 4:19–31. Here the Apostle distinguishes between the children of Hagar and the children of Sarah. The latter are wrought by promise and therefore free. It is true that the actual children of Hagar represent no divine purpose beyond that made to Abraham (Gen. 17:20), and that the children of Israel are of Sarah's line; but as an illustration of two groups—one under the law—and the other free from the law—these two women are symbolical. This reasoning is drawn from the fact that Hagar was a bondwoman and thus represents the Israelites under law. Sarah was free and represents those who through Christ are free (cf. Gal. 5:1–4). Israel is always under law when dealt with nationally by Jehovah, even in the coming kingdom age (cf. Deut. 30:8). The wife of a monarch is not under governmental laws any more than the king. To make Israel the Bride is to elevate Hagar to the place which Sarah occupies. The Church alone has been delivered from the law.

Ephesians 5:25-33. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

Doubtless the discussion of the Israel-bride theory centers more on this Scripture than on any other. Sir Robert Anderson, cited above, asserts that "the force of the 'nevertheless' in Eph. 5:33 depends on the fact that the Church is the *Body*, not the Bride"; but every sentence in this extended context refers to the relation which exists between the husband and the wife illustrating the union between Christ and the Church. The opening of the theme, where the subject would naturally be announced, is of husbands

loving their wives as Christ loved the Church (vs. 25). An unprejudiced reader would hardly be impressed with the claim that this Scripture refers to the relation suggested by the head and the body. Dr. C. I. Scofield supplies a clarifying note in his *Reference Bible*: "Verses 30, 31 are quoted from Gen. 2:23, 24, and exclude the interpretation that the reference is to the Church merely as the body of Christ. Eve, taken from Adam's body, was truly 'bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh,' but she was also his wife, united to him in a relation which makes of 'twain … one flesh' (Mt. 19:5, 6), and so a clear type of the church as bride of Christ" (p. 1255). The only reference in this context to the body is advanced with a view to asserting the fact that as a man naturally—as all do—loves his own body, in like manner should he love his wife who by the marriage union has been constituted a part of his flesh. It is significant that worthy commentators, almost without exception, have interpreted this passage as a developing to great fullness the truth that Christ is the Bridegroom and the Church the Bride.

Revelation 19:7–8. "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints."

This scene is in heaven—after the removal of the Church from the earth—where the marriage takes place. The Bride by her own soulwinning ministry has made herself ready. She is clothed in white and constituted *righteous*. Israel, as a nation, is never seen in heaven, nor are they as a people, as is true of the Church, constituted righteous. Though termed "a holy nation," that holiness is relative rather than absolute.

Revelation 21:1–22:7 and Hebrews 12:22–24. These extended Scriptures are cited at this point only that their testimony may be included relative to the new Jerusalem and its inhabitants. The fact that this marvelous city "comes down from God out of heaven"—three times stated (Rev. 3:12; 21:2, 10)—may well indicate that the city is not the heaven from which it proceeds. Its inhabitants are enrolled in Hebrews 12:22–24. Among these is an innumerable company of angels, the Church of the first-born, the spirits of just men made perfect, the Father, and the Son. The city is thus seen to be cosmopolitan to a large degree and, apparently, is more characterized by the Church than by the other created companies indicated. It is styled "the

bride, the Lamb's wife." If the earthly people as such are present they are indicated by the phrase, "the spirits of just men made perfect."

Matthew 25:1–13. This familiar context which sets forth Christ's own account of Israel's judgments under the figure of the ten virgins enters directly into the question concerning Israel as the Bride of Christ. The scene is on the earth and the time is the return of their Messiah in power and great glory to take the Davidic throne, to conquer and judge the nations (Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; Matt. 25:31–46; Rev. 19:11–16). It is then that the nation Israel will be judged relative to their worthiness to enter their covenanted kingdom on the earth. Since the realization of these covenant blessings in the kingdom have been held as an incentive before that people in all their generations, it is reasonable to believe that all Israel will be raised and pass through this great assize. The judgment of Israel is anticipated in many Old Testament predictions, notably Ezekiel 20:33–44 and Malachi 3:1–6. The first of these passages foresees this great judgment as determined by God and indicates that it will occur in the very wilderness in which Israel was detained in judgment when returning from Egypt (vs. 35). It is in this judgment that Israel will be purified by the purging out of rebels (vs. 38). The second passage—Malachi 3:1–6—announces the same final judgment, but declares it to be at the time and in connection with the second advent of Christ. Both advents are in view in this Scripture and, as in all Old Testament previews, they are seen as one vast divine undertaking. This prophecy foresees John the Baptist, and yet the actual judgment comes with the second advent (cf. Ps. 50:1–7; Mal. 4:1–2).

The central passage bearing on Israel's judgment is from the lips of Christ and is found in the Olivet Discourse, Matthew 24:37–25:30. Having predicted the oncoming tribulation (24:9–28) which concerns Israel, the Savior describes His second advent in power and great glory (24:29–31). This portion is followed with warnings to Israel and predictions respecting their judgment that will take place when the King returns. The passage which relates the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. 25:1–13) opens with this declaration: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom" (vs. 1). Old manuscripts—especially the Vulgate—add the words *and the bride*. That is, the ten virgins went forth to meet the Bridegroom and the Bride. Similarly, verse 10 which reads, "And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came;

and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut," should add—as in the R.V. and all corrected translations—the word *feast*. That is, they that were ready went in to the marriage feast—not the wedding, which will have already taken place in heaven (cf. the marriage supper of the Lamb—Rev. 19:9). Words of the Savior on this same theme, recorded in Luke 12:35–36, clarify this whole situation: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." That Israel is indicated by the term *virgins* is not confined to this context. The 144,000 of Revelation 14:1–5 are, in verse 4, said to be virgins; and in Psalm 45:8–17 a prophetic picture is drawn of the millennial palace, and announcement is made of those who will have right to be in it. These include the King, and on His right hand the Queen—the Church—and speaking of the Queen and her companions, the writer says, "She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of needlework: the virgins her companions that follow her shall be brought unto thee. With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought: they shall enter into the king's palace" (vss. 14–15). It is significant that the virgins will be presented to the King and Queen and that, to this end, they shall "enter into the king's palace." As Israel on the earth is indicated in the parable of the virgins and that such shall then—those that are found worthy—enter the palace, in like manner Israel is seen in Psalm 45—not as the Queen or Bride—but as companions who are the honored guests in the kingdom. The term *virgins* can be applied with propriety to a people now in chastisement for their unfaithfulness, only in the sense that they are a redeemed nation and under the unalterable purpose of God (cf. Rom. 11:29).

From these Scriptures the evidence is conclusive that the Church is the Bride of Christ and that Israel will have her place of honor in the kingdom as companions of the Bride.

II. A Delineation of Christ's Knowledge-Surpassing Love

The Apostle prayed that the Ephesian saints might be able to comprehend along with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge (Eph.

3:18–19). To him it was clear that only by divine illumination would such knowledge be attained. He had prefaced this petition with the request that they might be “rooted and grounded in love.” The love in which they might be rooted and grounded is not some feeble love these believers might experience toward God, but it is the love of God toward them—the love which has chosen them, which has predestined them, which has adopted them, which has made them accepted in the Beloved, which has redeemed them, which has provided an inheritance for them, which has sealed them by the Spirit, which has quickened them, and which has raised them and seated them in the heavenly in Christ Jesus. To be rooted and grounded in such love is to have entered sympathetically and understandingly into the measureless revelation of that love. So, also, with this experience of understanding of the divine love in general, there is to be a comprehending of the knowledgesurpassing love of Christ in particular. Graphic, indeed, is the language employed here which assigns to this particular love the dimensions of space—breadth, length, depth, and height—but these are dimensions which are infinite.

Twice in Ephesians 5, the Apostle cites the infinite sacrifice of Christ as the expression of infinite love: “And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour” (vs. 2); “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish” (vss. 25–27). It is the Good Shepherd that giveth His life for the sheep, and it is the privilege of each believer to come into the consciousness of the personal as well as limitless character of Christ’s love. The Apostle Paul could say, “who loved me, and gave himself for me” (Gal. 2:20). The Apostle John could think of no greater distinction by which he himself might be identified than that he was that disciple whom Jesus loved. When Jesus wept at the tomb of Lazarus, the Jews said, “Behold how he loved him!” (John 11:36). The very word *beloved*, as used often in the New Testament—as “brethren beloved of the Lord” (2 Thess. 2:13)—may be considered as an injunction, namely, *Be the object o f His love*. As a child in a normal home is not held accountable in the matter of paying the expense his presence creates but is fulfilling his

highest purpose as the object of the love of his parents, so the believer is the "beloved of the Lord." It is true that this love will "constrain" the one thus beloved to sacrificial service (2 Cor. 5:14) and the believer should love Him by whom he has first been loved, but such manifestations are only by-products or reflections of the infinite love of Christan unchanging, unending love; for "having loved his own which were in the [*cosmos*] world, he loved them unto the end" (John 13:1); but, in this relationship, there is no end, hence no cessation of His love. Here the Song of Solomon enters with its foreshadowing of the love that will exist forever between Christ and the Church. It is this incomprehensible love from which the child of God can never be separated. The Apostle writes, "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38–39).

III. An Assurance of the Consort's Authority

In that sense in which other citizens are subjects the wife of the king is not a subject of the king. As the word *consort* suggests, she is a cosharer in his reign. No actual responsibility may be allocated to her, but the fact remains that she is governing rather than being governed. This distinction becomes momentous when recognized in relation to the King of kings and His Consort, the Church. As the designation King-Priest indicates that Christ will reign as well as exercise priestly functions, so the title "royal priesthood" applied to the Church (1 Pet. 2:9) classifies that group as coreigners rather than subjects of the King. That the Church will reign is clearly asserted in Revelation 20:4–6, "And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. … but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

IV. A Revelation of the Bride's Position Above All Created Beings

The Church as Bride of the Lamb—the Second Person of the Godhead—attains to an exalted position by virtue of His infinite majesty which could

not be attained by any creature in any other way. The Lord Himself speaks of this sublime elevation when He said, “And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also” (John 14:3); “Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me” (17:24). The very place to which He refers is especially prepared, as though no existing realm of glory could be worthy of His Bride. A moment’s meditation on the exaltation of the Son of God and the incomparable reality of it in relation to time and eternity, to earth and heaven, and to men and angels, that the Church will have been called out and prepared without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, will compel the conclusion that the Church’s elevation is, like that of her Bridegroom, far above principalities and powers. Of His elevation it is said, “Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come” (Eph. 1:20–21).

V. A Surety of Infinite Glory

Closely related to the high and holy position which as Bride of the Lamb is accorded the Church, is the corresponding truth that she will be glorified with Him in His glory. A glance at an unabridged concordance will reveal the fact that a vast body of Scripture concerns this coming glory. Upwards of 180 times this word is used in the New Testament, and the major portion of the references bear on the glory of Christ. Due consideration should be given to the glory that He had with the Father before the world was (John 17:5), the glory which John testifies was manifest in the incarnation, the glory of the transfiguration, the glory of the resurrection, and the glory He now has in heaven (Rev. 1:13–18). When all this glory is estimated, it will not be difficult to understand why He is called *the Lord of Glory*, or what is meant when it is said that when He comes again it will be with power and great glory. Nevertheless, He who is crowned with glory and honor is bringing many sons into that glory (Heb. 2:9–10). Christ’s own petition is that believers may behold His glory (John 17:24); and that they will share that glory is asserted by the Apostle when he wrote, “if so be that we suffer

with him, that we may be also glorified together" (Rom. 8:17), and "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4). The believer's body is to be changed from a body of limitations to a body of glory (1 Cor. 15:43), even like His glorious body (Phil. 3:21) .

VI. The Bride Types

Whether they be designated types or only analogous incidents is of small moment compared to the fact that certain Old Testament marriages are, when devoutly contemplated, almost inexhaustible foreshadowings of the union between Christ and His Church. To the natural discernment, the records of the various brides of the Old Testament are artless tales of human love; yet, to the enlightened mind—and this is true of all typology—they are full of spiritual meaning. The human story is itself beautiful; but its typical outreach tends to unveil the deepest realities of divine grace as that grace may be seen in the union between Christ and His Church. The great field of typology and its place in the divine revelation cannot be introduced here, but is reserved for a later consideration. It may be observed, however, that a type is a divinely purposed anticipation which illustrates its antitype. It is not the prerogative of the type to establish truth; that function belongs to the antitype. On the other hand, it is the purpose of the type to enhance, as an illustration, the force of the truth belonging to the antitype. The Passover-lamb type floods the redeeming grace of Christ with richest meaning, while the redemption itself invests the type with treasures of truth which would not be dreamed of. In its scope, the type is a prediction of the antitype, and, being designed of God, is not to be rated as a mere speculation. It is a vital feature of inspiration. It is distinctly a divine arrangement and intention. He who declares anything to be a type is at once obligated to demonstrate that the similarities are more than accidental, that they display divine purpose. Such vital comparisons are anticipated in the field of truth indicated in 1 Corinthians 10:11 (Greek).

Of the various unions of the Old Testament which men have defended as being typical of the Church in her relation to Christ, only two will be considered at any length here. It is reasonable to suppose that when an account is given of the marriage of any man of the Old Testament who is

himself a type of Christ, that marriage may have typical signification. Moses is a type of Christ as Deliverer; thus Zipporah his wife, taken from the Gentiles while he was away from his brethren, is a suggestion of the calling out of the Church during the period between the two advents of Christ. David is a type of Christ, and, of all his wives, Abigail serves best to illustrate the true Bride. She left all to be joined to David. Boaz, too, is a type of Christ as Kinsman Redeemer; and Ruth, the poor Moabitess, discovering that Boaz would not rest until he had finished the redemption which would place her as coinheritor of all his position and wealth, gave herself to him as the one beloved. Solomon is also a type of Christ, and, in spite of his failure, stands as that son of David to whom the kingdom shall be given. Of all the marriage unions into which Solomon entered, the Shulamite of the Song of Solomon is the one who best expresses the love for her bridegroom. The "daughter" of Psalm 45 is not a type, but is rather the preview of the Church "all glorious within" as she stands with the Messiah-King in the millennial palace. The two brides who deserve specific attention are:

1. Eve. No discussion is herewith indicated relative to the fact that Adam is a type of Christ, though, apart from the truth that each is the head of a creation of God, all else between the two is contrast. Three passages are especially important, namely, Romans 5:12–21, 1 Corinthians 15:21–22, and 45–49. The first of these Scriptures draws the contrast between the ruin which came to the first creation by Adam's sin and the exalted blessing which comes to the new creation by the death and resurrection of Christ, the Last Adam. The second passage—1 Corinthians 15:21–22—contrasts death with life. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This is a reference, evidently, to the universality of resurrection as announced by Christ in John 5:25–28, since in the Corinthian text the Apostle goes directly on to name the succession of resurrections which includes all that ever live on the earth. The third passage, 1 Corinthians 15:45–49, contrasts the present body—adapted to the soul—with the glorious body that is to be—adapted to the spirit. No more could be said of the first Adam than that he was one who *received* life, while the Last Adam is the Source of all life. The outstanding features of this type are (a) that of derivation and (b) that of identity.

(a) Eve was formed out of a wound in Adam's side when he was submerged in a deep sleep (Gen. 2:21–22), which typically suggests the fact that the Church is made possible through the blood of Christ which flowed from His side in death. At this point the appropriateness of the symbol of the pearl as a representation of the Church (Matt. 13:45–46) is seen. As the pearl is formed in the shell of the fish by accretion—a vital formation from a living thing—and probably from a wound caused by the presence of an irritating foreign substance, so the Church owes her existence to that blood which the Savior shed. Likewise, though the pearl is formed in the triple darkness of the mud in which the shell is embedded, the darkness of the shell itself, and the darkness of the deep sea, yet as no other gem it, when brought to the light of the sun, has power to catch the rainbow glory of that light and to reflect its splendor. It is thus that the Church, though being formed in the darkness of the world, will, when ushered into His presence, reflect that surpassing glory which belongs to Christ alone.

(b) As Adam recognized Eve to be a living part of himself—"bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh" (Gen. 2:23)—thus the truth is foreshadowed that the Church is in Christ and has no existence apart from Him. Each believer has become a member of that new Headship and knows no identity apart from that relationship.

In the book, *The Brides of Scripture*, J. Denham Smith writes:

> In passing, let me suggest that the question of the Church's oneness with Christ involves the most important consequences, not only in our spiritual judgment, but also in our moral feelings and outward life; for unless we know what we are and what we have, we cannot know how to live. After all that is said by those who profess to believe in it, it is, I suggest, but little understood. It goes beyond all human and angelic blessedness. It was in God's purpose before all dispensations, and will, it would appear, continue when dispensations will have for ever ceased (Eph. 3:21). In its nature the Church is as Christ is. Can anything be more wonderful? It places us, as Paul says, "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world [age], but also in that which is to come." I know there may be a kind of interest, a hankering of the heart after the thought of a *kingdom*, or the idea of *bride*, in which there may lurk not a little of nature. Kingdom and bride are indeed dear to Christ—the purchase of His death. But in the truth of oneness, all else is lost in Christ Himself; the Church is as Christ. We shall be as Eve was with Adam, the twain without losing their identity counted as one person; so that even after being taken from him, and when raised up with him, the Lord called *their* names ADAM, just as Christ and His members are said to be "THE CHRIST," which they are—THE MYSTICAL CHRIST. There are few, I believe, who see it thus. The path of wisdom respecting it is a narrow one. What we desire here so especially is rightly to divide the Word of Truth. Let us dwell for a moment on the wonderful thought what we are thus in Him; yea, of being one

with Him from all eternity; and on all those rich blessings in John 17, and in Colossians and Ephesians, which language fails to describe; and then think of what a kingdom is. A kingdom is not one with him who is over it; but the Church being as Christ is, yea, one with Christ, will reign with Him over it.—3rd ed., pp. 12–13

2. Rebekah. In contrast with the type which Eve provides concerning the origin of the Church and her union with Christ, the type which is seen in Rebekah portrays the divine outcalling and the divine consummation of the Church. Isaac is an unmistakable type of Christ. He represents the Only Begotten Son (Gen. 22:2; Heb. 11:17), the Son of the Father's love who was obedient unto death, and whom the Father spared not (John 3:16; Rom. 8:32), and who was received from the dead (Heb. 11:19) . In another and wholly different connection, Isaac is also a type of the spiritual children of Abraham (Gen. 15:5; Gal. 4:28–29). The type which Rebekah supplies may be seen in seven details:

a. The Father Undertakes in Behalf of His Son. The Father, typified by Abraham, purposes to secure a bride for His Son, as in Matthew 22:2 where it is said that a certain king made a marriage for his son. That determining power of God is seen in John 6:44 where it is written: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day."

b. The Father Sends the Trusted Servant. In view of the fact that no name of the Holy Spirit other than descriptive titles is revealed in the Bible, it is significant that the name of Abraham's servant who took the journey to secure Isaac's bride is not given at the time. The task assigned to this servant was of imposing proportions. Not only did it involve the perilous journey of many weeks, but the responsibility also of selecting a bride for a prince. If guided by human wisdom, the results could at best be no more than accidental. The trusted servant typifies the Holy Spirit now in the world, who with infinite wisdom is calling out the Bride of the Lamb.

c. Election is Seen in the Particular One Chosen. Many damsels came out to draw water (Gen. 24:13), but only one is chosen, and that one is chosen with full respect to her own will in the matter (Gen. 24:5–8). There could be no failure in the securing of Rebekah as Isaac's bride. The whole program of God for Israel is involved; yet her will is not coerced in the least and she is chosen precisely as divinely determined.

d. Rebekah's Faith. Second only to Abraham who made that same journey when he at the call of God left his native land, is the sublime faith of this maiden. No more uninviting proposal could be advanced than to ask a maiden to leave her home never to return, to go with a servant she did not know, and to marry a man she had never seen. A gospel was preached unto her by the servant who described prince Isaac with all his wealth. To this she responded, "I will go" (Gen. 24:58), anticipating the meaning of the words of Peter, "whom having not seen, ye love" (1 Pet. 1:8). What perfection is disclosed in Genesis 24:16!

e. The Foretaste of Isaac's Riches. The gold ornaments (Gen. 24:22, 30, 47) are but a foretaste of Isaac's riches, which riches she was to share in full. Thus those blessings of the Spirit which the believer now receives are said to be an earnest of the glory that is to come (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:14).

f. The Journey. There is a pilgrim path for each child of God to pursue, which extends from the point of saving faith in Christ to the moment of meeting Him in the air. Death is not the normal experience, though it may be the usual experience and even the universal experience to the present hour. The Christian's hope is that he may without death meet his Lord in the air (1 Cor. 15:51–52; 1 Thess. 4:13–18). On this pilgrim pathway it is the work of the Spirit to reveal the things of Christ to the saints who are attentive (John 16:13–15; 1 Cor. 2:9–13). All of this was doubtless Rebekah's experience. Long days and weeks were required in that journey, but they were wonderful hours for the one who listened to the truth about a lover whom the faithful servant described.

g. The Union. There is no mere chance in the fact that Isaac is walking in the field in meditation or that Rebekah lifts her eyes and exclaims, "What man is this that walketh in the field to meet us?" or that the servant said, "It is my master." Such will be the climactic witness of the Spirit to the believer's heart when he sees his Lord, "It is my [and thy] master" (Gen. 24:62–67). Quoting again from J. Denham Smith:

> But what of Isaac? He had been all this while simply passive—waiting the result; like our coming Lord, who all these centuries has been in the presence of the Father waiting the result. When the divine Eliezer, the Spirit who is the great soul-gatherer, has done His present work, Christ will come. This now is where our divine tale deepens in interest; for the "day breaks, and the shadows flee away." Isaac has come; he is free, at sweetest leisure simply meditating. It was not in his home that he first met her, nor was it in that which she had left.

Their place of meeting was in the quiet field, and in the quiet hour of even—suited to the scene. Isaac had come from the well Lahai-roi, that is, “the presence of Him that liveth and seeth.” He came alone, as if he would have undisturbed joy in meeting with her who he knew had left all for him. He came at eveningtime, near the world’s night; but to her it was as a morning of joy. She had a veil, and had covered herself—self-hidden in the presence of Christ. And now see! she alights from the camel. You understand: there is no more desertruggedness now! No more dangerous steps and weary ways now! The time of her rest and joy has come; the longed-for moment has come. What a meeting! what a taking to each other! For Isaac now “took Rebekah, and she became his wife; and he loved her; and Isaac was comforted after his mother’s death.” How suggestive is all this! For it is the world’s evening now, but our “night is far spent, and the day is at hand”—“for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed” (Rom. 13:11) . And what reality it gives to our hopes when we know that He who was once a Saviour for us here will come again to us—as He said, “I will come again, and receive you unto Myself, that where I am, there ye may be also” (John 14:3). What a home-taking will that be! He will then be seen not, in His own Home, or down here in the wilderness where we now are, but in these lower heavens as the Morning Star, to herald the departure of this the long night of our separation and death. The Morning Star is that peaceful luminary which always precedes the rising of the sun; its scene is just above the horizon, but below the higher heavens. Thus, in like manner, the Lord when He comes will descend from heaven to the air, and we who are alive and remain, together with those who sleep in Jesus, will be caught up to meet Him in the air. Thence He will take us to the Father’s house, thence again to reign over His kingdom. We shall be for ever with the Lord. And then we too shall alight from all our care, from all suffering, and from sin; and from ourselves, as having within us this present evil root of sin, and this evil heart of unbelief. We shall alight from the last grief, the last pain, and the last sorrow.—*Op. cit*., pp. 36–38

VII. The Meaning of This Figure

The symbolism of the Bridegroom and the Bride as bearing on Christ in His relation to the Church speaks of His everlasting and knowledgesurpassing love, the unity between Himself and the Church, and the authority and position to be accorded to the Church in ages to come. Major features of truth are typified in the bride relationship which could be set forth in no other way. Much of divine blessing is determined for Israel all of which is anticipated in her covenants and prophecies; but no covenant or prophecy brings that nation into heavenly citizenship or into marriage union with Christ.

Conclusion

In consummating this analysis of the Pauline doctrine of the Church—that which properly appears as the foremost feature of a Biblical Ecclesiology—it may be reasserted that, as demonstrated, there are three divisions in the human family during the present age—the Gentile, the Jew, and the Christian; that there is a distinct earthly purpose for the Jew which Judaism discloses, and a distinct heavenly purpose for the Christians—the Church—which Christianity discloses; that the Church is related to Christ in various ways and these are summarized in seven figures, of which two are paramount, namely, the New Creation Headship in the resurrected Christ, and the Bridegroom and the Bride. The Church is an elect company called out from Jews and Gentiles and to be forever with Christ in His highest glory.

"The Church's one Foundation
Is Jesus Christ her Lord;

She is His new creation
By water and the word:
From heaven He came and sought her
To be His holy Bride;
With His own blood He bought her,
And for her life He died.

Elect from every nation,
Yet one o’er all the earth,

Her charter of salvation
One Lord, one faith, one birth;
One holy Name she blesses,
Partakes one holy food,
And to one hope she presses,
With every grace endued.

Yet she on earth hath union
With God the Three in One,

And mystic sweet communion
With those whose rest is won:
O happy ones and holy!
Lord, give us grace that we,
Like them the meek and lowly,
On high may dwell with Thee.”

The Organized Church

Chapter VII

THE ORGANIZED CHURCH

THE MANNER in which people of all generations have associated themselves together in church relationships, with their persecutions, their conflicts, and their benefits, constitutes a chapter in the history of the last nineteen hundred years second only in importance to the progress of government in the earth. In fact by the fourth century the church had so appropriated Israelitish Old Testament ideals of a conquered world with Messiah's rule becoming universal, that her officials dreamed of a governmental state under the authority of the church; and Rome perpetuates that ideal to this day. A modification of this ideal of governmental authority was introduced by Protestantism in the form of the postmillennial theory. This theory proposed a world rule by the church, but by the spiritual influences exerted, concluding that after a millennium of such Christian triumph over the forces of evil the Lord would return. The progress of a supposed world transformation by the spiritual influence of the church has met with such reverses and proved to be so hopeless that the postmillennial notion is dead, being without a living defense and existing only in a meager literature which it once created. The colossal failure of the church to convert, or even convince, the world is sufficiently evident to suggest to any candid mind that God never appointed the church to save the world, but rather to be a witness to the world to the end that the elect company might be called out. A certain type of church leadership has manifested a glaring inconsistency by contending that Christ died only for the elect and that none could possibly be saved outside this restricted group, but that the church, nevertheless, was at the same time commissioned to save the world to the last inhabitant.

Not much progress will be made in the study of Ecclesiology unless the Church which is an organism is distinguished from the church which is an organization. An organism is such because of the fact that it possesses one life-principle throughout all its parts—such is the human body—but an organization may be no more than a co-ordination of wholly independent parts unto united action. The organized church at best is restricted to living

persons of its own generation, with no greater binding force than articles of agreement on certain religious topics and with no assurance that all within the group are saved, whereas the Church which is an organism includes all believers—no more and no less—of all generations in the present age, and each one, being saved, is perfected forever in Christ. No more confusing practice in the general field of Ecclesiology is abroad than the application to the organized, visible church of those passages which belong to the true Church, the Bride of Christ. This inaccuracy is apparent when such a passage as Ephesians 5:25–27 is applied to the visible church with its staggering percentage of unregenerate persons in its fold. This error is easily made by men who have no comprehension of that vast body of truth respecting the Church which is Christ's Body.

The organized church is recognized in the New Testament. A church existed wherever a group of believers were met together in the bonds of fellowship. This meeting of Christians answered the fundamental meaning of the name *church*, by which they were identified. They were a called-out assembly. There were notable advantages then as now in the convocation of believers. The writer to the Hebrews exhorts, "… not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is" (Heb. 10:25).

Evidently some church organization was divinely intended since officers are named and their duties defined. These were to be chosen carefully from among men of good repute in spiritual matters. There is, however, no record of an enrollment of church members, nor is there any example in the New Testament of a person joining a church. On the other hand, church membership, as now conceived, is not interdicted. Naturally, much depends upon conditions existing at a given time or place; but the great emphasis of the present day upon church membership—almost equal to salvation itself—is not sustained in the Scriptures. Fortunately, or unfortunately, there is no record of any situation in the days of the apostolic church where believers became so numerous in one locality that more than one assembly was demanded. This could easily have been true in Jerusalem where such great multitudes were saved; but, had two centers of meeting been required, it is unthinkable that the believers would have made their particular group the center of their affection or that they would have been censored by others for lack of church loyalty if they fellowshiped with those of the other group. Closed communion which excluded believers from the assembly is that

sectarian sin which has been reserved for the enlightened days of the end of the age.

In general, truth relative to the organized church may be divided thus: (a) the church a local assembly, (b) a group of local churches, and (c) the visible church without reference to locality.

I. The Church a Local Assembly

It is at this point respecting the local church that theological writers extend their teachings. To them the local, organized church constitutes the major part, if not the whole theme, of Ecclesiology, and too often with a sectarian bias. It will be recognized that the local church supplies an exceedingly limited field of consideration as compared with the great reality of the true Church; but, regardless of its restricted character, the local church, almost universally today, constitutes the sum and substance of the Ecclesiology of professing Christendom.

In its simplest conception, the local church is no more than the assembly of professed believers in one locality. It may be as unimposing as “the church that is in their house” (1 Cor. 16:19), or it may be the gathering of vast multitudes in a grand cathedral built for that purpose. Simple designations are employed—“the church which was at Jerusalem” (Acts 8:1), “the church which is at Cenchrea” (Rom. 16:1), or “the church of the Thessalonians” (1 Thess. 1:1) . An attentive reading of the passages which refer to the local church—less than fifty in all—will supply very largely the legitimate basis for a right understanding of the Biblical importance of this aspect of Ecclesiology (cf. Matt. 18:17; Acts 8:1, 3; 11:22, 26; 12:1, 5; 14:23, 27; 15:3–4, 22; 18:22; 20:17, 28; Rom. 16:1, 5; 1 Cor. 1:2; 4:17; 6:4; 11:18, 22; 14:4–5, 12, 19, 23; 16:19; 2 Cor. 1:1; Phil. 4:15; Col. 4:15–16; 1 Thess. 1:1; 2 Thess. 1:1; 1 Tim. 5:16; Philemon 1:2; James 5:14; 3 John 1:6, 9–10; Rev. 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14).

To this simple conception of the church men have added their traditions —not unlike those imposed by Israel’s rulers upon the Mosaic system (cf. Matt. 15:2–3, 6; Mark 7:3, 5, 8–9, 13). However simple the church idea may have been at the first, it has now been expanded to include vast super-organizations and, as in the case of Rome and the Federal Council of the

Churches of Christ in America, there is an avowed intention to mold civil government.

The important features pertaining to the local church may be contemplated under five aspects: (1) the church and her doctrine, (2) the church and her service, (3) the church and her organization, (4) the church and her ordinances, and (5) the church and her order.

1. The Church and Her Doctrine. Disagreement in doctrine has been almost the sole cause of sectarian divisions with their tragic misrepresentations of that one Body of which Christ is the Head, and which is but feebly reflected in the visible church and apart from which the visible church has no reason for existence. How much of the present sectarian confusion and sin might have been obviated had there been a clear and primary emphasis upon the Pauline doctrine of the true Church cannot be determined. The New Testament exhorts to unity, to unbroken fellowship, and to brotherly love; but these have been neglected and rejected. The obligation to remain in fellowship, even when controversy arises, has been forsaken and often over exceedingly small issues. These differences could have been worked out by prayer and a due consideration of the rights of others; for all separations over doctrine are due to the inconsistency of one group claiming the right to interpret the Bible according to their own views, yet denying others the same inherent right. Of course, if it is a denial of fundamental truth, the New Testament directs in the matter of expelling such a one from the assembly; but the great group of orthodox denominations are not divided over heretical issues. The issues between Calvinists and Arminians do border on the vital factors of divine grace; but Calvinists are divided over much water or little water in baptism, and psalm-singing or the singing of man-made hymns, all of which, regardless of the emphasis a sectarian spirit places upon them, should not be allowed to break the fellowship of believers. Those who promote such divisions commit the sectarian sin of dividing Christ's Body. The enormity of that sin will appear when believers are gathered as one body into the presence of the Lord where no such divisions will be dreamed of and where the believer's mind will be centered on the things that are eternal. To exclude a believer because he is not properly baptized or because he does not restrict his note of praise to the Psalms of David, is to exclude the thief on the cross, whom

Christ accepted, and, so far as the record goes respecting baptism, to exclude the twelve apostles of the Lamb. It will not be pleasant to discover that while attempting to strain out the gnat of a minor issue in doctrine one has swallowed the camel of a severed unity, or while discovering a mote in some brother's eye respecting a mode of an ordinance one has failed to cast out the beam from the eye that in spirit would deny Christ the answer to His prayer "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee" (John 17: 21) .

There is but one body of revealed truth, which when rightly understood teaches but one system of doctrine. When men disagree over doctrine it is because one or both are wrong. Over against this, God has sent His Spirit into the hearts of believers to guide them into all truth (John 16:13); and had men been concerned to know the mind of the Spirit relative to truth as set forth in the Oracles of God, there could have been but one mind, and that the mind of the Spirit: yet hundreds of warring sects have come into existence more or less given to denominational conceit or self-satisfaction. It is a manifestation of human weakness to be satisfied to disagree with other believers. Even the Plymouth Brethren movement which started with high Biblical ideals and with the fullest recognition of the great unifying factors, specially the one Body of Christ, has not been able to save itself from many unhappy divisions with attending bitterness and strife; nor are these brethren inclined to be reunited when conscious of their great wrong in separations. The reason for all divisions cannot be found in a failure on God's part to provide a clear Biblical testimony, or in failing to provide the teaching ministry of the Spirit; nor can it be found in the fact of man's inherent weakness: it is rather to be found in the fact that there is unspiritual living among God's people—a failure to walk humbly and submissively with the Spirit of God. How searching are the words of Philippians 2:3, "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves," and the words "considering thyself" in Galatians 6:1 ! True brotherly love—such as is the insignia of Christian unity (John 13:35)—will not suffer separations; and when men are disunited and assuring themselves that they are contending for a righteous cause, let them contemplate the larger unrighteousness of sectarian sin. Believers are not appointed to separation, but to keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3).

The hymns of the church have usually proclaimed the faith of the people. Two men writing about the same time have set up what seems to be a contradiction. Sabine Baring-Gould (1865) wrote of the church:

"… We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in hope and doctrine,
One in charity."

In 1866 Samuel J. Stone wrote of the same church:

"Though with a scornful wonder
Men see her sore oppressed,
By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distressed…"

The fact remains that both declarations are true. The true Church is not divided, nor could it be; yet the visible church is a broken and shattered attempt at the manifestation of a Scriptural ideal.

The cure of a divided church is not to be achieved by mere union of organizations, though such a union would present a better appearance to the world. The cure lies in the attitude of the individual believer in his love for all other believers regardless of ecclesiastical connections or race. Such is the normal affection of one who is walking in the Spirit. The Apostle John declares: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14), and "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:7–10).

2. The Church and Her Service. No responsibility or service is imposed on the church per se. Service, like the gifts of the Spirit by whom service is wrought, is individual. It could not be otherwise. The common phrase, "the church's task," is, therefore, without Biblical foundation. It is only when individuals sense their personal responsibility and claim personal

divine enablement that Christian work is done. On the other hand, there is no word written which by implication would hinder believers from being associated in a common cause which may be for convenience considered in the light of a combined result. Relative to the mission of the visible church, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes: “Much is said concerning the ‘mission of the church.’ The ‘church which is his body’ has for its mission to build itself up until the body is complete (Eph. 4:11–16; Col. 2:19), but the visible church, *as such*, is charged with no mission. The commission to evangelize the world is personal, and not corporate (Matt. 28:16–20; Mark 16:14–16; Luke 24:47, 48; Acts 1:8). So far as the Scripture story goes, the work of evangelization was done by individuals called directly of the Spirit to that work (Acts. 8:5, 26, 27, 39; 13:2, etc.). Churches (Phil. 4:15) and individuals (Acts 16:14, 15; Rom. 16:6, 23; 2 Tim. 1:16, 17) helped on the work of these men, but there is no trace of any corporate responsibility attaching to ‘the church.’ Doubtless the local church may be called upon by the Spirit to ‘separate’ individuals to that work, as at Antioch (Acts 13:1–3)” (*Bible Correspondence Course*, III, 431).

3. The Church and Her Organization. There are three general principles in government whether it be church or state and in the field of church government there is (1) the episcopal, represented by Episcopalians and members of the denomination known as Methodist Episcopal; (2) the representative form of rule, represented by the Reformed churches that are governed by appointed boards; and (3) congregational, which classification includes all churches denominational and independent that are ruled directly by the congregation. This last class is represented by the Congregational, Christian, and Baptist churches.

All warrant for church government must be found in the New Testament Epistles and every existing form of church rule will claim that its procedure is justified by the Scriptures. This fact serves to emphasize the truth that church government is a mere convenience which serves a limited purpose. The harmful error arises when by the leadership of its ministers the membership come to consider the organization or sect to be the primary factor in the church’s life. The impression is created that loyalty to a particular church is paramount, that it exceeds in importance the issues of sound doctrine or a life devoted to Christ. Each sect must publish its own

literature, conduct its own missions, provide its members with no other information relative to Christian work at home and abroad than is related to that denomination, educate and ordain their own clergy, and call to their pulpits only men trained in the peculiar doctrines which give the group its distinctive character. Aside from the limited advantage which may be claimed for this general procedure, there is, notwithstanding, a constant development of the sectarian sin and an ever present neglect, if not resistance, of the glorious truth of the unity and fellowship of the one Body of Christ.

Organization is wisdom's first step for a people associated together in a common cause; but organization is for a purpose and therefore is not the purpose itself. Sectarianism tends to a neglect of the purpose—that which actuates every worthy church—and to magnify the organization.

4. The Church and Her Ordinances. It is generally agreed that two specific ordinances are committed to the believers who sustain church relationship—ritual baptism and the Lord's Supper. As each of these themes has an extended consideration in the later summarization of doctrine along with kindred church doctrines of ordination, laying on of hands, manifestation of gifts, and marriage, they are not to be discussed at this point.

5. The Church and Her Order. In his *Bible Correspondence Course*, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes thus at length of the functions of the organized church:

> The story of the development of the local church is gathered by inference from the Acts and Epistles. So gathered, two errors of men concerning church order are at once refuted. The first is the notion that the apostolic local churches were modeled in organization upon the synagogue. Doubtless resemblances may be traced, as the synagogue itself has shadowy resemblances to things in ancient Israel. But the synagogue organization was perfectly familiar to the church at Jerusalem, and yet that church consisted of thousands of believers before there was even the most rudimentary organization; when, at last, the work of administering the charity of the church became a burden beyond reason to the apostles, they based the direction to "choose seven men of good report," etc., not upon synagogue analogy, but upon the reason of the matter (Acts 6:1–4). The second error is that the Acts and Epistles contain such a doctrine concerning church organization as constitutes a binding rule, a new and rigid Leviticus. One body of believers, for example, erect the statement that the disciples at Troas came together on the first day of the week to break bread, into a law that all disciples everywhere should meet every Lord's day for that purpose. Surely a broad generalization from one instance! What seems clear from a consideration of all the passages is that

gradually the normal local church organization included elders and deacons. “Bishops” and elders seem identical (Titus 1:5; cf. vs. 7). It should be added that both the eldership and diaconate in the apostolic churches were plural. There is no instance of one elder in a local church. The functions of the elders were (1) to rule (1 Tim. 3:4, 5; 5:17); (2) to guard the body of revealed truth from perversion and error (Titus 1:9); (3) to “oversee” the church as a shepherd his flock (Acts 20:28, where “feed” is literally to “tend as a shepherd”; John 21:16; Heb. 13:17; 1 Pet. 5:2). Elders were (1) ordained (Greek, *cheirotoneo*, which may mean either “to create or appoint by vote,” or “to elect, appoint, create,” *Thayer*) by the apostles (Acts 14:23); or (2) they were so “ordained” by men appointed by an apostle (Titus 1:5); or (3) were made overseers by the Holy Spirit (Acts 20:28), an expression which is not explained unless that explanation is in Peter’s phrase (1 Pet. 5:2), “Taking the oversight thereof”; in which case it might mean that the Ephesian elders were so evidently in possession of the gift of government (1 Cor. 12:28), and of the qualifications afterward defined in the Epistles to Timothy and to Titus, that without note or apostolical appointment they “took” the oversight, etc. This seems far-fetched as interpretation, and is open to the objection that such a practice would fill the eldership with the most pushing, conceited, and self-seeking persons in the churches. The deacons seem to have been concerned with the offices of comfort and charity rather than with those of oversight, and to have been chosen by the people (Acts 6:1–6; 1 Tim. 3:8–13). It should be added that appointment to office in the apostolic church was with the laying on of the hands of the apostles (Acts 6:6; 13:3; 2 Tim. 1:6) or of the presbytery or eldership (1 Tim. 4:14). But a distinction of first importance to a correct understanding of the New Testament local church is that between *office* and *ministry*. Office was by appointment, ministry was by gift of the Spirit. Philip, one of the seven first deacons of the church in Jerusalem, is a sufficient illustration of this distinction. By *office* he was a deacon; by *gift*, an evangelist (Acts 6:5; 21:8). No doubt the appointment to office was, so long as the churches were spiritual, the recognition of spiritual gifts and graces in the men appointed, but nothing is more outstanding than that in the New Testament churches ministry was absolutely free. The abiding ministry gifts are enumerated in Ephesians 4:11: “And he gave some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.” These, it should be observed, are not gifts of the Spirit *to men*, as in 1 Corinthians 12, but gifts of Spirit-gifted men *to the church*. They belong to the whole “church which is his body.” No instance is found of the ordination of a prophet, or of an evangelist, or of a pastor and teacher “over” any local church, though local churches were ministered to by them (Acts 11:19–28), and often for years continuously. The laying on of bands was either for the impartation of spiritual gift (2 Tim. 1:6; 1 Tim. 4:14), or for setting apart to office (Acts 6:6). It should also be noted that, as ministry was by the Spirit and was free, so the ordering of place, time, and method in service was kept under the free authority of the Spirit (Acts 13:1–4; 16:6–10). It remains to add that the New Testament knows nothing of a priesthood other than the priesthood of all believers under the High-priesthood of Christ; nothing of a “clergy” as forming a body distinct from the “laity”; nor anything of certain men set apart to baptize and to administer the Lord’s supper, though doubtless it would be within New Testament liberty to designate one or more for these purposes.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 428–30

II. A Group of Local Churches

A limited number of New Testament passages refer to local churches (cf.Acts 9:31; 15:41; 16:5; Rom. 16:4; 1 Cor. 11:16; 14:34; 16:1, 19; 2 Cor. 8:1, 18–19, 23–24; 12:13; Gal. 1:2, 22; 1 Thess. 2:14; Rev. 1:4, 11, 20; 2:7, 11, 17, 23; 3:6, 13, 22; 22:16). However, in no passage is there an intimation that these churches were federated or under the authority of a super-government. On the other hand, nothing is said against the federation of churches provided it does not hinder the direct and immediate leadership of the Holy Spirit in the local church. That divine leadership is a priceless reality, if the church is willing to avail itself of it; yet unspiritual authorities too often dominate the church to the exclusion of all experience in the matter of the Spirit's guidance. As details in the believer's life under grace are left for the leading of the Spirit (Gal. 5:18), in like manner details in church life are accorded the same gracious latitude.

III. The Visible Church Without Reference to Locality

This distinction is set up by usage in the Sacred Text; however, no more than a passing reference need be given to it (cf. Acts 12:1; Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 4:17; 7:17; 11:16; 14:33–34; 15:9; 2 Cor. 11:28; 12:13; Gal. 1:13; Phil. 3:6; 2 Thess. 1:4). This is that church which Paul persecuted. It, too, is a theme of prophecy (cf. 2 Thess. 2:3; 1 Tim. 4:1–3; 2 Tim. 3:1–8; 4:3–4; 2 Pet. 2:1–3:18; Rev. 2:1–3:22).

The Believer's Rule of Life

Chapter VIII

Rules of Life in the Old Testament Period

Under this division of Ecclesiology, an approach is made to what is generally designated as the practical aspect of revealed truth. This embraces the whole field of human conduct. The art of living a daily life which is well-pleasing to God is second in importance only to the saving of the soul; yet, aside from a very few theologians who can see no further than to impose the Decalogue upon believers perfected in Christ with the assumption that that instrument prescribes the whole duty of people of all ages, this vast body of revealed truth, with all its obvious distinctions, is absent from works on Systematic Theology. The problem of living unto God not only confronts the preacher himself, but is the major issue in the lives of those redeemed ones to whom he ministers; however, so far as theological instruction extends, the supposedly trained minister enters upon his great responsibility wholly unprepared for one of its major requirements. As certainly as the Mosaic economy should not be considered as the sum and substance of human responsibility, just as certainly no other rule of conduct should be deemed the representation of the entire field of human obligation which rightfully enters into Systematic Theology. Being an attempt to set in order all that is found in the Scriptures, Systematic Theology should reach out in its contemplation to conditions which obtained in other ages and in all ages—particularly the Mosaic age now past, the kingdom age yet to come, and the present age. Since man is a moral being appointed to live his life before the infinitely holy Creator, the problem of right human conduct has stood foremost in all dispensations. It began in the Garden of Eden, even before the fall, and was intensified beyond measure by the sin of man. So real is this obligation to right conduct to all men that the majority can recognize little else and so conclude that by their works they must stand or fall before God. Standing upon worthy conduct is the principle that obtains in home life, in school life, and in civic life. The good are honored and the evil are disciplined. It is natural, then, for an individual who from childhood has been subject to these principles of personal worthiness to conclude that man’s relation to God is also one of

merit. In the light of the momentous reality of moral responsibility which is ever indited by conscience and sustained by high ideals, and in the light of the unceasing demands upon the mind and will of man in every hour of every day of his life, Systematic Theology can offer no valid excuse for its failure to enter fully into the analysis and exposition of this vast body of truth.

Though the holiness of the Creator has always made its reasonable demands upon the human creature, there have been varying situations and conditions which the student must recognize. Nothing is more evident in the Sacred Text than that Jehovah placed demands respecting conduct upon Israel which He did not require of the nations. The Mosaic Law was not given until human history had continued at least 2,500 years (Rom. 5:13; Gal. 3:19). It is written: "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant" (Neh. 9:13–14); "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them my statutes, and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the LORD that sanctify them" (Ezek. 20:10–12). Similarly, it is equally evident that the Mosaic system has been superseded by a new relationship which believers sustain to Christ and with it a new and higher requirement for daily living (John 1:16–17; Rom. 6:14; 7:2–6; 2 Cor. 3:1–18; Gal. 3:19–25; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14); and this, in turn, is yet to be replaced by a kingdom rule of life which, though in itself it is a reverting to the legal principle of the past Mosaic age, transcends to an immeasurable degree the requirements of the Mosaic system (Matt. 5:19–48). By so much it is evident that there are varying responsibilities both with regard to character and detail which the holiness of God must require.

Of the three major ages—the immediate past, the present, and the immediate future—the past and future introduce no great complications; but the present age is complex since the peculiar manner of life belonging to it does not arise in legal relationships, but, rather, in the perfect position of the saved individual in Christ. The objective is not to attain to a place of

acceptance with God, but to grace the position already attained by faith in Christ. This distinction presents principles and motives as far removed from each other as east from west or as light from darkness.

Likewise, but one of these three divine economies provides directly and purposefully divine enablement for every requirement which it places upon the individual; that is, no mention is made in two of these economies of a provision of divine enablement for their fulfillment. However, in the present economy, both supernatural standards of action are announced and complete ability by the Spirit is provided for their fulfillment.

Little reference has been made thus far in this work to the essential error of Covenant Theology. It may be mentioned at this point only as it bears on human responsibility before God. The theological terms, *Covenant of Works* and *Covenant of Grace*, do not occur in the Sacred Text. If they are to be sustained it must be wholly apart from Biblical authority. What is known as Covenant Theology builds its structure on these two covenants and is, at least, a recognition—though inadequate—of the truth that the creature has responsibility toward his Creator. Covenant Theology has Cocceius (1603–1669) as its chief exponent. "He taught that before the Fall, as much as after it, the relation between God and man was a covenant. The first covenant was a 'Covenant of Works.' For this was substituted, after the Fall, the 'Covenant of Grace,' to fulfil which the coming of Jesus Christ was necessary" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th ed., V, 938). Upon this human invention of two covenants Reformed Theology has largely been constructed. It sees the empirical truth that God can forgive sinners only by that freedom which is secured by the sacrifice of His Son—anticipated in the old order and realized in the new—but that theology utterly fails to discern the purposes of the ages; the varying relationships to God of the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church, with the distinctive, consistent human obligations which arise directly and unavoidably from the nature of each specific relationship to God. A theology which penetrates no further into Scripture than to discover that in all ages God is immutable in His grace toward penitent sinners, and constructs the idea of a universal church, continuing through the ages, on the one truth of immutable grace, is not only disregarding vast spheres of revelation but is reaping the unavoidable confusion and misdirection which part-truth engenders. The outworking of divine grace is not standardized, though the Covenant idea of theology

would make it so; and as certainly as God's dealings with men are not standardized, in the same manner the entire field of the corresponding human obligation in daily life is not run into a mold of human idealism.

These introductory intimations will receive a larger treatment in succeeding pages. Without extended consideration of human responsibility in earlier ages, this thesis will be centered upon four major economies and the distinctions to be observed between them.

I. The Pre-Mosaic Economy

The pre-Mosaic period, which extended at least 2,500 years, has been divided into (1) an age of innocence, (2) an age in which conscience was the dominant factor with its inherent necessity to choose between good and evil, (3) an age of the obligation to human government—which three ages not only became accumulative, but were imposed upon only one racial stock of humanity—and (4) the age of promise in which a new humanity is introduced with a responsibility upon them to remain in the place of blessing. The present consideration is more general, being concerned with the moral and religious obligations which were divinely required of men in the whole period between Adam and Moses. Whatever divine ruling was extant before Moses was evidently retained to a large degree and to this the Mosaic Law was "added" (Gal. 3:19). This scheme of building upon that which went before is precisely what is *not* done in the present age, though the Mosaic system with all its combined features is perpetuated, with suitable changes and additions, in the future kingdom age (cf. Deut. 30:8; Jer. 31:31–33).

Revelation respecting the divine government between Adam and Moses, outside of that which may be implied from the historical narrative, is restricted to three passages of Scripture.

Genesis 18:19. "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

This text implies an understanding of the mind and will of God. To do justice and judgment in keeping "the way of the LORD" indicates a large

responsibility reaching into every department of human life. It is evident that there had been some revelation about "the way of the LORD."

Genesis 26:5. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws."

This backward look upon Abraham's faithfulness reveals still more clearly in detail the understanding Abraham had of the divine requirements, and directly reveals that, whatever these requirements may have been or however disclosed to men, there existed a knowledge of God's voice, His charge, His commandments, His statutes, and His laws. This listing of human obligations should not be confused with the Mosaic system which was not announced until 430 years later (Ex. 12:40–41; Gal. 3:17).

Romans 5:13. "For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law."

The declaration is that there could be no transgression of the Mosaic Law before that Law was instituted. There is no assertion here that there were no divine requirements before the Mosaic system came into force. In fact, men were held accountable for their actions in the pre-Mosaic period, for it was in that period that the greatest divine judgment the world has yet seen fell upon men because of their want of conformity to the righteous will of God.

It is probable that the divine authority over men before Moses was of the nature of inherent law, which calls for a recognition on man's part—however revealed—of the inherent responsibility which the creature sustains to his Creator. That this is God's universe is a primary truth not to be slighted. Man is the creature of God's hand, not a creator, nor is he a potential rival of the Creator. By rights which are more equitable than any other could be, God must demand of the creature that he fill the place purposed for him in his creation. Human rebellion and unrighteousness do not answer the divine intention. The august edict, "Be ye holy; for I am holy" aims directly at inherent responsibility and not upon some published code of action. Inherent obligation differs from the Mosaic system in that the latter is reduced to written precepts and is a system which promises recognition in the form of blessings otherwise not available to those who comply with its terms, while inherent law is that to which the creature is inseparably related by creation, being essential to the specific thing which he is. It is binding upon every human being in every age. To it the Mosaic

system was “added,” and for the believer it has had its perfect fulfillment in Christ along with every necessity which could have been laid upon him.

II. The Mosaic Economy

When exhibiting in Chapters I, III of this volume the essential features of Israel in her relation to Jehovah, some treatment of the Mosaic system was necessary. That discussion, however, was advanced by drawing the distinctions between two peoples each of which represent a divine purpose. The present consideration of the Mosaic Law is to place it in contrast with other divine economies, especially that of grace. The Law which came by Moses is declared to be an ad interim dealing which served its purpose during the interval of 1,500 years extending between its enactment and the death of Christ. Its purpose is defined as that of a παιδαγωγός—a child disciplinarian—to lead to Christ (Gal. 3:24). The immediate service of the Law of Moses was to provide a redeemed people, who are under covenants, with divine instruction for their civil, religious, and moral life. Two truths are of primary importance, namely, (1) that the Mosaic Law was nerver addressed to Gentiles, except those who became Israelites as proselytes, and (2) that the Law of Moses did not serve to institute right relations between an Israelite and God. The law was instruction to people concerning God’s will for them who are elect, redeemed, under covenants and, by so much, basically in right relation with God. In case of failure to do the law, sacrifices were accepted as a means to restoration. As the Christian may be forgiven and cleansed on the ground of confession of his sin to God (1 John 1:9), so Israelites both individually and nationally were restored by sacrifices. Too much importance cannot be placed on the fact that an Israelite was physically born into an elect race, a redeemed nation, and made an heir of the everlasting covenants. While an Israelite was inducted by his physical birth into all privileges of the chosen people, there was in the law an element of merit because of its attending blessings for compliance and judgments for failure. This merit feature is published throughout the Bible wherever the law appears, but nowhere more drastically by Moses than in his last words to Israel as recorded in Deuteronomy 28:1–68. The first fourteen verses of this extended passage announce the blessing that would be theirs for doing “all his

commandments," and in the rest of the context—verses 15–68—there is an unqualified declaration of curses and judgments to fall upon those who fail to do "all his commandments." Yet far more important than the immediate blessings or cursings is the disclosure that future privileges in the covenanted kingdom were made conditional upon their faithfulness to the Mosaic system. It was predicted by Moses that the whole nation would apostatize (Deut. 4:26–28); but this defection, though enough even at his time, did not involve other generations of Israelites who were in measure adjusted to the will of Jehovah. Therefore the future holds in store for all Israel, as once they suffered who lived in the past age, a judgment. The Scripture bearing on this should be considered with unusual attention (cf. Ezek. 20:33–44; Mal. 3:1–6; Matt. 24:37–25:30). This judgment conditions that form of life which is to be received in the kingdom of Messiah (Dan. 12:2; Matt. 7:13–14; Luke 10:25–28; 18:18–21). It is true in general of any law that the one who complies with it is justified in its sight (Rom. 2:13); but that form of justification which is secured on the ground of a perfect righteousness, being in Christ, cannot be gained by any works whatsoever (cf. Acts 13:39; Rom. 3:20, 28; 4:5; Gal. 2:16; 3:11). The precise nature of the salvation which is to be accorded to Israel when entering her kingdom and after those are dismissed who come under divine judgments is described in Romans 11:26–27: "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

The word *law*, as used in the Bible, does not always refer to the Mosaic system or to a part of it. It may be observed (1) that the Decalogue is the law (cf. Luke 10:25–28; Rom. 7:7–14); (2) that the entire governing code for Israel as recorded in Exodus is the law; (3) that the rule of life yet to be applied in the coming Messianic kingdom is law; (4) that any rule of conduct prescribed by men is law (1 Tim. 1:8–9; 2 Tim. 2:5; cf. Matt. 20:15; Luke 20:22); (5) that any recognized principle of action is a law and sometimes equivalent to power (Rom. 8:2; 7:21); (6) that the whole will of God reaching to every detail of an individual believer's life is the law of God (Rom. 7:22; 8:4); and (7) that the will of Christ for the believer is "the law of Christ" (cf. John 13:34; 15:10; 1 Cor. 9:21; Gal. 6:2).

The Mosaic economy, which was a complete system in itself requiring no additions to the end that it might set forth the entire will of God for an individual Israelite or for the whole nation, is composed of three parts, namely, (1) the commandments, which regulated moral issues (Ex. 20:1–17), (2) the judgments, which regulated civic issues (Ex. 21:1–24:11), and (3) the ordinances, which regulated religious issues (Ex. 24:12–31:18). It is obvious that both the judgments and ordinances ceased with the close of the Jewish age. There are misunderstandings, however, respecting the Decalogue which call for consideration. Two features of truth concerning the Mosaic system, and more specifically the Decalogue, are to be emphasized, which are (1) the relation that the Mosaic Law sustained to the time of its reign and (2) the application of the Mosaic system.

1. The Relation the Mosaic Law Sustained to the Time of Its Reign. The Scriptures teach that the law given by Moses, which was a covenant of works, was given from God to man at a particular time. The human family had walked before God upon the earth for upwards of 2,500 years prior to the imposition of the Mosaic Law. Thus it had been demonstrated that God is able to deal with men in the earth without reference to the Law of Moses. The pertinent question—"Wherefore then serveth the law?"—is both propounded and answered in the Scriptures (Gal. 3:19). Continuing, it is said that the law "was added because of transgressions." That is, it was "added" to give to sin the augmented character of transgression. Sin had always been evil in itself and in the sight of God; but it became *disobedience* after the holy commandments were disclosed. The fact of the sin nature is not changed by the introduction of the law; it was the character of personal wrongdoing which was changed. It was changed from sin which is not imputed where there is no law, to sin which is rebellion against the command of God, and which must reap all the punishment attendant upon broken law. Israel, to whom the commandments were given, being a chosen, exalted people, were, by the imposition of the law, constituted a more responsible people before God; but they were wholly unable to keep the law. The giving of the law to Israel did not result in an obedient people; it rather proved their utter sinfulness and helplessness. The law became a ministry of condemnation to everyone who failed to keep it. Nor did the giving of the law really tend to their betterment of heart, or retard the power

of sin; it provoked them to sin. As the Apostle says: “But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence” (Rom. 7:8). There can be no question about the righteous character of the law; for it is written: “Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful” (Rom. 7:12–13). Thus the purpose of the giving of the law is stated: “that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.”

Apart from the Man Christ Jesus, there was universal failure in the keeping of the law. This is not to say that the law was imperfect in itself. The universal failure in keeping the law is the revelation of the helplessness of man under the power of “sin in the flesh.” Two passages give evidence relative to the failure of the law through the weakness of the flesh to which it made its appeal: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh” (Rom. 8:3); and, “But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly [poverty-stricken] elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” (Gal. 4:9). The appeal is strong: Why, after having come to know the power of God through the Spirit, do ye turn to a relationship to God which as a means of victory and blessing has always been, and must always be, “weak” and “poverty-stricken”? The law was never given as a means of salvation or justification: “Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin” (Rom. 3:20; cf. Gal. 3:11, 24). Though given as a rule of conduct for Israel in the land, it, because of the universal failure in its observance, became a curse (Gal. 3:10), condemnation (2 Cor. 3:9), and death (Rom. 7:10–11). The law was effective only as it drove the transgressor to Christ. It became a means of turning the people to God for His mercy as that mercy is provided in Christ. The law was a “schoolmaster” (παιδαγωγός), or child-trainer, to bring the offender to Christ. This was immediately accomplished in his turning to the sin offerings which were provided, and which were the type of Christ in His death; but more fully was this accomplished when the dispensation itself came to its end in the death of Christ. “The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope,” and the law was a

“shadow of good things to come” (Heb. 7:19; 10:1). The reign of the law is limited to a period of about 1,500 years, or from Sinai to Calvary—from Moses to Christ. These boundaries are fixed beyond question in the Word of God.

a. The Law Began Its Reign at Mount Sinai. The law was never imposed upon any people or generation before it was given to Israel at the hand of Moses. “And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them. The LORD our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The LORD made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day” (Deut. 5:1–3). When the Law was proposed, the children of Israel deliberately forsook their position under the grace of God which had been their relationship to God until that day, and placed themselves under the Law. The record is given thus: “And Moses went up unto God, and the LORD called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the LORD commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the LORD hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the LORD” (Ex. 19:3–8).

While it is certain that Jehovah knew the choice the people would make, it is equally certain that their choice was in no way *required* by Him. His description of the relation they had sustained to Him until that moment is most tender and pleading: “Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself.” Such is the character of pure grace. By it the sinner is carried on eagles’ wings and brought to God. It is all of God. Until that hour they had been sustained in the faithfulness of Jehovah and in spite of their wickedness; His plan and purpose for them had remained unchanged. He had dealt with them

according to the unconditional covenant of grace made with Abraham. The marvelous blessedness of that grace-relationship should have appealed to them as the priceless riches of the unfailing mercy of God, which it was. The surrender of the blessings of grace should have been allowed by these people on no condition whatever. Had they said at the hearing of the impossible law, "None of these things can we do. We crave only to remain in that boundless mercy of God, who has loved us, and sought us, and saved us from all our enemies, and who will bring us to Himself," it is evident that such an appeal would have reached the very heart of God. And the surpassing glory of His grace would have been extended to them without bounds; for grace above all else is the delight of the heart of God. In place of the eagles' wings by which they were carried unto God, they confidently chose a covenant of works when they said: "All that the LORD hath spoken we will do." They were called upon to face a concrete choice between the mercy of God which had followed them, and a new and hopeless covenant of works. They fell from grace. The experience of the nation is true of every individual who falls from grace at the present time. Every blessing from God that has ever been experienced came only from the loving mercy of God; yet with that same blasting self-trust, people turn to a dependence upon their works. It is far more reasonable and honoring to God to fall helpless into His everlasting arms, and to acknowledge that reliance is on His grace alone.

Upon the determined choice of the law, the mountain where God was revealed became a terrible spectacle of the unapproachable, holy character of God. "And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the LORD descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. … And the LORD said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the LORD to gaze, and many of them perish" (Ex. 19:18–21). He who had brought them to Himself under the unconditional blessings of His grace, must now warn them lest they break through unto the LORD and perish. That the burning mountain was a sign of the unapproachableness of God under the new covenant of works, is again declared in Hebrews 12:18–21. Speaking there too of the glory and liberty of grace, it is said: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the

voice of words, which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: (For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake:). But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." By this passage, the great contrast between the relationship to God under the law covenant of works and the relationship to God under grace is set forth clearly. Under their works, Israel could not come unto God lest they die, but under grace they were carried on eagles' wings unto God; and so, under grace, all come unto God, and to Jesus, and to the blessed association and glory of heaven itself.

The children of Israel definitely chose the covenant of works, which is law, as their relationship to God. In like manner, every individual who is now under the law is self-placed, and that law under which he stands is self-imposed. In every case such relationship is clung to in spite of the appeal of pure grace. Had the legalists minds to understand and hearts to feel, they would realize that there is no access to God by a covenant of works and merit. To such as seek to come to Him by the law, God is as unapproachable as flaming Sinai.

b. The Reign of Law Was Terminated with the Death of Christ.

The truthfulness of the statement that the reign of the law was terminated with the death of Christ is to be determined by the Word of God, rather than by the traditions and suppositions of men. The law, when given, was only a temporary, or ad interim, dealing "till the seed should come" (Gal. 3:19), and the "seed" is Christ (3:16). This conclusive passage (vss. 22–25) continues: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." The distinction between Jew and Gentile is broken down and *all* are "under sin." There is provided and offered in Christ a new access and relationship to God. It is *through Christ* and *in Christ*. It is gained upon a principle of faith

alone. Christ is the object of faith. It is nothing less than the "promise by faith of Jesus Christ," and it is given to them who believe. Thus the new covenant of grace through faith in Christ is placed in contrast to the old covenant of works. The passage goes on to state: "But before faith [the new principle in grace] came, we [Paul is here speaking as a Jew of his own time] were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster [child-leader] to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith [the new principle in grace]. But after that faith [the new principle in grace] is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster" (the law).

As a standard of holy living, the law presented the precise quality of life which was becoming a people who were chosen of God and redeemed out of the bondage of Egypt. At the cross, a new and perfect redemption from sin was accomplished for Jew and Gentile alike. The redemption from Egypt was a type of the redemption from sin. As the redemption from Egypt created a demand for a corresponding holy life, so the redemption from sin creates a demand for a corresponding heavenly walk with God. One is adapted to the limitations of the natural man; the other is adapted to the infinite resources of the spiritual man. One is the teaching of the law; the other is the teaching of grace.

2. The Application of the Law. The law was given only to the children of Israel. This statement permits no discussion when the Scriptures are considered. A very few passages from the many are here given: "And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" (Mark 12:29–30); "And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I have set before you this day?" (Deut. 4:8); "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them. The LORD our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The LORD made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day" (Deut. 5:1–3). The message given from the mount was that great covenant of works of the law contained in the Ten Commandments, which is here included in the "statutes and judgments" (Ex. 19:5). This covenant was

never made with any other nation or people; for God made no covenants with people other than Israel. “The LORD gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant” (Deut. 9:11). Speaking of the covenants in relation to Israel, it is said: “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever” (Rom. 9:4–5). Speaking of the Gentiles it is said: “Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, … that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:11–12). It is expressly declared that the Gentiles have not the law: “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature [usage] the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves” (Rom. 2:14). In harmony with this, Pontius Pilate, a Gentile ruler, denied any responsibility to Israel’s law: “Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law” (John 18:31).

It may be concluded, then, that the law which was given by Moses was a covenant of works, that it was “added” after centuries of human history, that its reign was terminated by the death of Christ, that it was given to Israel only, and that, since it was never given to Gentiles, the only relation that Gentiles can sustain to it is, without any divine authority, to impose it upon themselves. Additional proof of these facts concerning the law are yet to be presented.

Chapter IX

The Future Kingdom Economy

With seeming disregard for the vast body of truth bearing on the future kingdom age, some who have written on Biblical doctrine have failed to see the fact and importance of that age. It has been assumed that the features of the coming kingdom constitute a phase of blessing in store for the visible church when she shall have achieved the conversion of the world. Over against this idealism is the fact which alone conforms to the Word of God, that the world program as determined by God is consummated in the age to come, the present age being an intercalation—a period thrust in which is wholly unrelated to that which went before and to that which follows. The earthly story is taken up at the end of this age precisely where it was left off when, in fulfillment of Old Testament expectation, the kingdom was "at hand" by the coming of the Messiah to Israel, and when the covenants and earthly glory of that people were pending. Even the tribulation which must precede the coming of the King (cf. Matt. 24:29–30) is in sequence the completion of Daniel's 490 years, or 70 weeks—483 years, or 69 weeks, of which were completed with the death of Christ. The law system is not introduced again at the beginning of the kingdom age; it is continued with certain additions directly from the Mosaic system with no reference to, or contributions from, this intercalation age. The fact that all Old Testament anticipation of the coming Messiah could blend, as it did, both advents into one preview (cf. Isa. 61:1–3; Mal. 3:1–6), and that even Gabriel when addressing Mary relative to the birth and mission of Christ gave no intimation that there would be a time interval between those features which belong to the first advent and those which belong to the second advent (Luke 1:31–33), demonstrates the truth that the second advent is a direct and unbroken continuation of that which, with respect to the earthly program, was accomplished in the first advent. At this point Peter's word regarding the experience of the Old Testament prophets is illuminating. He speaks thus of their inability to discern the time element intervening between the sufferings of Christ (His first advent) and the glory that should follow (His second advent): "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired

and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow" (1 Pet. 1:10–11).

In view of the misunderstanding which obtains relative to the isolated and unrelated character of the present age, the strongest emphasis is demanded upon that truth. Let no would-be interpreter of the Sacred Text assume that this is a minor issue. On it hangs a right understanding of "the law and the prophets," as well as a worthy comprehension of the precise nature of the divine purpose in the present age. Postmillennialism, amillennialism, post-tribulationism, and all other unscriptural world-program systems are traced directly to this colossal blunder. More moderate terms might be employed of a doctrinal fallacy which left less destruction and wreckage in its path. Those who have embraced these distortions of truth are called upon, if candid, to face the fact that the Old Testament story runs directly into the kingdom age without the slightest recognition of the present age or its purpose, and that the present age is, therefore, wholly dissociated from, and contributes nothing to, the Old Testament program. It should also be recognized that every Old Testament Scripture which declares anything respecting future events—and these are on the lips of every Old Testament prophet—demands, not this age, but the oncoming kingdom for its fulfillment. Admixtures and partial recognitions of the doctrinal distinction here set forth tend but little to the dissolution of the dire confusion which exists.

This whole introductory theme, intended as it is to prepare the way for the simple statement that the Bible sets forth a rule of life which is complete in itself, adapted and peculiar to the kingdom age, belongs to Eschatology and will yet receive a more orderly treatment in Chapters XIII–XXVII of this volume. However, the present discussion must continue at some length that the character of the kingdom economy may be discerned.

Due recognition of the essential character of each of the three crucial ages is the key to the understanding of the exact manner of the divine rule in each age. The rule of God in each case is adapted to the conditions which obtain. Since the respective characteristics of the ages are widely different, the manner of the divine rule is correspondingly different. The practice of confusing these three ages in respect to their characteristics and the manner

of the divine rule in each is common, and is, doubtless, the greatest error into which many devout Bible interpreters fall. It is perhaps easier to confuse the present age with that which immediately precedes it, or with that which immediately follows it, than to confuse it with conditions which are more remote, although there need be no confusion of these immediately succeeding but sharply separated periods of time, for they are divided by age-transforming events. The age of the Law of Moses is separated from the present age of grace by the death of Christ, when He bore the curse of the law and finished the work by which man may stand justified before God forever, and justified as he could not have been justified by the Law of Moses; likewise by the resurrection of Christ; the advent of the Spirit; and the dispersion of Israel. The age of grace is separated from the age of the kingdom by the second coming of Christ to the earth—the time when He comes to remove the Church, to reign, to bind Satan, to regather Israel, to terminate human governments, to lift the curse from creation, and to cause righteousness and peace to cover the earth as the waters cover the face of the deep. The divine government could not remain the same in the earth after the world-transforming, spiritual victories of the cross, as it had been under the Law of Moses. Likewise, the divine government cannot remain the same in the earth after the world-transforming temporal victories of the second coming, as it has been under the reign of grace. All this is reasonable; but, what is far more impelling and compelling, this is what is precisely revealed by God in His Word. There are, then, three separate and distinct systems of divine government disclosed in the Scriptures, corresponding to three separate and distinct ages to be governed.

Kingdom teachings will be found in those Psalms and prophecies of the Old Testament which anticipate the reign of Messiah in the earth, and in the kingdom portions of the Gospels. These teachings as found in the Old Testament and the New are purely legal in essence, both by their inherent character and by the explicit declaration of the Word of God. The legal requirements of the kingdom teachings are greatly advanced, both in severity and detail, beyond the requirements of the Law of Moses. Though incorporating much of the Mosaic system, the kingdom teaching is a system complete and perfect in itself. Moreover, this intensification of legal requirements in kingdom revelation does not move the teachings of the Mosaic Law nearer the heart of the teachings of grace. On the contrary, it

removes them still further in the opposite direction, inasmuch as the teachings of the kingdom increase the burden of works of merit over those that were required by the Law of Moses. In the kingdom law, anger is condemned in the same connection where only murder had been prohibited in the Law of Moses, and the glance of the eye is condemned where only adultery had previously been forbidden.

The kingdom Scriptures of the Old Testament are occupied largely with the character and glory of Messiah's reign, the promises to Israel of restoration and earthly glory, the universal blessings to Gentiles, and the deliverance of creation itself. There is little revealed in the Old Testament Scriptures concerning the responsibility of the individual in the kingdom; it is rather a message to the nation as a whole. Evidently the details concerning individual responsibility were, in the mind of the Spirit, reserved for the personal teaching of the King, at the time when the kingdom would be "at hand." As for the reign of the King, two important disclosures are made in the kingdom portions of the Old Testament: (1) His will be a rigid reign of righteousness that shall go forth from Jerusalem with swift judgment upon the sinner (Isa. 2:1–4; 11:1–5); and (2) according to the new covenant which He will have made with His people, He will have put His laws into their minds, and will have written them on their hearts (Jer. 31:31–40; Heb. 8:7–12). The writing of the law upon the heart is a divine assistance toward the keeping of the kingdom law, which enablement was in no wise provided under the reign of the Law of Moses. However, the written law on the heart, as it will be in the kingdom, is not to be compared with the power of the indwelling Spirit which is the present divine enablement provided for the believer under grace. Under the new covenant, God will have put away the former sin of the nation forever. This, it is revealed, He is free to do through the blood of His Son who, as God's Lamb, took away the sin of the world (Matt. 13:44; Rom. 11:26–27).

The great key words under the Mosaic system were "law" and "obedience," the great key words in the present age are "believe" and "grace," while the great key words in the kingdom are "righteousness" and "peace." The following are brief excerpts from the Old Testament Scriptures bearing on the kingdom:

Isaiah 2:1–4. "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the

mountain of the LORD's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Isaiah 11:1–5. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins."

Jeremiah 23:3–8. "And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase. And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the LORD. Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. … And they shall dwell in their own land."

Hosea 3:4–5. "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days" (cf. Ps. 72:1–20; Isa. 4:2–6; 9:6–7; 14:1–8; 35:1–10; 52:1–12; 59:20–60:22; 62:1–12; 66:1–24; Jer.

31:36–37; 33:1–26; Joel 3:17–21; Amos 9:11–15; Zeph. 3:14–20; Zech. 14:16–21).

Turning to the New Testament Scriptures bearing on the kingdom, it is important first to consider again the twofold character of the work and teachings of Christ. He was both a minister to Israel to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and a minister to the Gentiles that they might glorify God for His mercy (Rom. 15:8–9). These two widely different revelations are not separated in the Scriptures by a well-defined boundary of chapter and verse; they are intermingled in the text and are to be identified wherever found by the character of the message and the circumstances under which it is given. This, it should be remembered, is the usual divine method of presenting truth. To illustrate: there is no chapter and verse boundary in the prophetic books of the Old Testament between that portion of the Scriptures which presented the *immediate* duty of Israel, and that portion of the Scriptures which presented their *future* obligation in Messiah's kingdom. The prophets, while unfolding both of these widely differing obligations, commingle these messages in the text and the different messages are discerned only through an observance of the character of the truth revealed. Likewise, there is, to some extent, a commingling in the Gospels of the message of the kingdom and the teachings of grace. Moreover, these teachings were given while the Law of Moses was in full authority. In harmony with the demands of that dispensation, many recognitions of the Mosaic system are embedded in the teachings of Christ. The Gospels are complex almost beyond any other portion of Scripture, since they are a composite of the teachings of Moses, of grace, and of the kingdom.

From a brief consideration of the four Gospels it may be concluded that those teachings of Christ which confirm the covenants made unto the fathers, or Israel, will be found primarily in the Synoptic Gospels, and that the kingdom teachings are crystallized in the first portion of the first Gospel. The position of this kingdom portion in the context of the Scriptures is also significant—following immediately, as it does, on the Old Testament. The Old Testament closed with its great hopes unrealized and its great prophecies unfulfilled. These hopes were based on covenants from Jehovah, to which He had sworn with an oath. These covenants guarantee to the nation an earthly kingdom in their own land, under the abiding reign of

Messiah, sitting on the throne of His father David. No such promise was fulfilled in the Old Testament period. The kingdom as provided for in the faithfulness of Jehovah was revealed in the Old Testament only in predictive prophecy. No such kingdom situation existed when Christ was born. It is expressly declared that Israel's great hope and consolation was yet in expectation when Christ came (Luke 1:31–33; 2:25). The children of Israel were then largely scattered among the nations and their land was under the authority of Rome. At this point and under these circumstances, a new message went forth: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." It was proclaimed by the forerunner—John the Baptist (Matt. 3:1–2), by Christ (Matt. 4:17), and by His disciples (Matt. 10:5–7). The strongest prohibition was imposed against the giving of this message to any Gentile, or even to a Samaritan (Matt. 10:5–6; cf. 15:24). The message, though brief, was calculated to arouse all the national longings of the people to whom it was spoken. The messengers needed no analytical training to sense the exact meaning of their theme. As instructed Israelites, the kingdom hope had been their expectation and meditation from birth. Later on, and in contrast to this, their utter slowness of heart to understand the new facts and teachings of grace is most obvious. Even when, after His resurrection, Christ had given forty days of instruction in things pertaining to the kingdom of God, they said: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6), so little had they at that time grasped the meaning of His death and the immediate purpose of grace. On the other hand, there is no record that the messengers needed or received one moment of exposition on the meaning of the message relative to the gospel of the kingdom before they were sent forth to deliver it. It was evidently Israel's hope.

The phrase, *the kingdom of heaven*, is peculiar to the Gospel by Matthew, and refers to the rule of God in the earth. In that particular, it is to be distinguished from the kingdom of God, which is the rule of God throughout the bounds of the universe. One, in certain aspects, is included in the other, and there is, therefore, much that is common to both. The Messianic rule of God in the earth was the theme of the prophets; for the prophets only enlarged on the covenants which guaranteed a throne, a King, and a kingdom over regathered Israel, in that land which was sworn to Abraham. The term, *the kingdom of heaven,* was used by Christ to announce the fact that the covenanted kingdom blessings were "at hand." This good

news to that nation was the “gospel of the kingdom,” and should not be confused with the gospel of saving grace.

The national hope was centered in the genuineness of the claims of both the King and His forerunner. The evidence was carefully weighed, it may be believed, and it was found unimpeachable; but wickedness of heart prevailed. They imprisoned the forerunner, who was later beheaded by Herod, and they crucified the King. Both the forerunner and the King fulfilled prophecy in respect to the office of each in every detail. The forerunner was the voice of one crying in the wilderness. The King was of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, a son of David born of a virgin, in Bethlehem of Juda. He came out of Egypt, and was called a Nazarene. At His birth He was proclaimed, “King of the Jews.” In His public ministry He took up the message of a King. At His entrance into Jerusalem He was hailed as Israel’s King. At His trial before Pilate, He claimed to be a King. And He died under the accusation, “THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.” The crown of thorns had no significance in relation to His sacrificial death for sin: it was the emblem of the nation’s derision for His kingship claim. They thus fulfilled by act the very prophecy the King had made: “We will not have this man to reign over us.” There should be no confusion at this point. The rulers of the nation who demanded His death were not personally rejecting a Savior, as sinners are rejecting Him now; they were rejecting their King. They did not say, “We will not believe on the Savior to the salvation of our souls”; they said, “We have no king but Csar.” The rejection of the King was according to “the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God” (Acts 2:23); for His rejection and humiliation were foreshadowed in the types, and foreseen in the prophecies of the Old Testament: He was the “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” At every step in the record His rejection and death are said to be the fulfilling of the Scriptures. It is recorded of Him in sixteen New Testament passages that He, by His rejection and death, fulfilled the Old Testament Scriptures. It is also recorded of Him in nine New Testament passages that He was the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies concerning the King.

The first ministry of Christ was, then, to Israel as her King. In this He appeared, not as a personal Savior, but as her long-expected Messiah; not as a Lamb, but as a Lion; not as a sacrifice by which a Church—the spotless Bride—might be purchased to Himself from among all nations, but as the

Son of David, with every right to David's throne, over Israel, at Jerusalem, in the land of promise. In the Synoptic Gospels, there is, therefore, no record of any step toward the formation of the Church, or any reference to that great purpose, until, from His own nation, His rejection as King is evident. According to the Synoptic Gospels, the early teachings of the King were of that nation, and were in nowise related to the great results which would afterwards be accomplished through His death and resurrection in the calling out of His Church from all the nations of the earth. Upon His rejection, He began to speak, in anticipation of His death, of the formation of His Church, and of His coming back again to the earth. He likewise related the sure fulfillment of every covenant with Israel to the time of His return.

Was, then, the gospel of the kingdom, as announced by John, by Christ, and by His disciples, a bona fide message? Did it really mean what it announced? Was Israel's long-predicted kingdom at hand? If so, and had they received their King, what would have become of the divine purposes of redemption as they were to be accomplished through His death? These questions are insistently asked today; but the answers are not difficult.

Much has been presented on this important question in the first chapter of this volume, which will not be restated here. However, the gospel of the kingdom was a bona fide message to Israel. To treat it otherwise is to accuse God of trickery and deception. It is likewise a serious misrepresentation of all related Scriptures to apply the message and teaching of the King to the present purposes of God in this age of grace. All confusion concerning the kingdom message in its relation to the cross arises from the failure to recognize the important distinction between the divine viewpoint and the human viewpoint. It is only another application of the rationalistic trick of playing the free will of man against the sovereignty of God. On the human side, there was a clear-cut issue with unrestrained power to choose, or reject, the King. On the divine side, there was a genuine offer of the kingdom in the Person, presence, and ministry of the King; but back of this was the sovereign determination of God which was absolute. Their choice would be but the outworking of the eternal purpose of God in Christ, and for that choice they would be held guilty. On the divine side, it is said: "Therefore they could not believe" (John 12:39), and on the human side, it is said: "They hated me without a cause" (John 15:25).

Turning to the Old Testament, the student is confronted with the problem of the right adjustment with regard to the time of fulfillment of two great lines of prophecy concerning Christ. On the one hand, He was prophesied to come as a Monarch whose reign and kingdom would be everlasting (cf. 2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 72:1–20; 89:35–37; Isa. 9:6–7). The thought of His death is foreign to this body of prophecy. It is no function of a king to die—"Long live the king!" But, on the other hand, there is prophecy equally as explicit regarding the sacrificial, substitutionary death of Christ (Ps. 22:1–21; Isa. 53:1–12). Manifestly, these two lines of undertaking could not be accomplished simultaneously. Christ could not be the resistless, undying King and be an unresisting sacrifice, at one and the same time. It was this very time-element in the problem, which Peter declared was not disclosed to the prophets. Added to this is the prediction that Israel's King would come to them in lowly guise, riding on an ass and upon a colt the foal of an ass (Zech. 9:9; cf. Matt. 21:1–7; John 12:12–16). Thus it was clearly indicated to Israel that the King would come in lowly guise, and they were without excuse. Since the present age of grace and its purpose were not revealed to the writers of the Old Testament, the time-element relating these two lines of prophecy could not be disclosed. When the fullness of time came, it pleased God to present His King in fulfillment of prophecy and according to all His covenants to Israel. Both by the "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" and by the free choice of the nation, the King was rejected and crucified. It is evident, therefore, that the prophecies concerning the King and His earthly kingdom remain unfulfilled to this hour. They are not forgotten or abandoned. Neither are they receiving a *spiritual* fulfillment. They are yet to be fulfilled when the King returns to the earth. In like manner, the same clear light on the divine purpose is revealed through Daniel when he predicts the order of events to be fulfilled in the period between his own time and that of the reign of Messiah. In this prophecy the "cutting off of Messiah" precedes the reign of the King. Thus did God anticipate what would take place; but this in no wise lessens the exercise of free choice on the part of the nation Israel in rejecting the King. It is puerile to assert that the cross of Christ was held in jeopardy until Israel's choice concerning the King had been consummated. Let those who traffic in such tricks of argument be consistent to the point of applying their rationalism to all the great issues wherein the sovereignty of God and the

free will of man are found to meet. The ministry of Christ was genuine. He was a minister to the circumcision to confirm the promises made unto the fathers. He was likewise the open door into the grace of God that Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy. Though real sin, His rejection as King was the necessary step in all redemption, and God in faithfulness will yet fulfill every covenant related to the throne, the King, the nation, and the land. This He will do when the King comes back to the earth again.

It has been necessary to outline the relation of the covenanted, earthly kingdom to the first advent of Christ, in order that the kingdom teachings of Christ may be seen in their true setting.

Referring to the first section of the Gospel by Matthew (chapters 1–12), wherein the gospel of the kingdom is preached to Israel, it will be found that this precise message of the kingdom gospel was first announced by John the Baptist, of whom it is said: "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (Matt. 3:1–3); it was announced by the King Himself (Matt. 4:17), and by the disciples (Matt. 10:5–7). Embedded in this context wherein only the gospel of the kingdom is in view, and completely bounded by the records of these proclamations, is the "Sermon on the Mount," which is evidently the manifesto of the King (Matt. 5:1–7:29). In this manifesto the King declares the essential character of the kingdom, the conduct which will be required in the kingdom, and the conditions of entrance into the kingdom. This kingdom rule of life is purely legal, both in its inherent qualities and by its own claim (Matt. 7:12). It is, however, very different from the law as given by Moses. In the kingdom teachings, as has been stated, the commands of Moses are advanced into requirements vastly more impossible with respect to detail, and this does not relieve, but rather intensifies, its character as strictly legal. Christ does not disown the principles of the law in the unfoldings of kingdom requirements, any more than He does in all His dealings with Israel before His death. He is rather presenting a new degree and standard of law which is adapted to the conditions which shall obtain in the kingdom, and which He *contrasts* with the Law of Moses. The great kingdom words—*righteousness* and *peace*—are dominant, and there is never a reference either to salvation or grace. Nor is there the slightest reference to those great realities of relationship which belong to the New

Creation wrought by Christ through His death and resurrection. Such a complete omission of any reference to any feature of the present age of grace is a fact which should be carefully weighed.

The minute accuracy of the Scripture is seen in Christ's use of the phrase *my commandments*. During the days of His ministry to the nation Israel, He enforced the commandments of Moses, and spoke of the new principles which were to be applied in the kingdom as "these sayings of mine" and "I say unto you"; but at no time did He use the term *my commandments* until He used it with His disciples in the upper room, and at the time when He was unfolding the new principles which were to condition the daily living of those who should stand on resurrection ground, in the New Creation, and under grace. It is also significant that the *first* use of the term *commandment* in this grace message is when He said, "A new commandment I give unto you" (John 13:34). There is, therefore, a possible limitation to be placed on the extent of the responsibility imposed by Christ in His great commission wherein He said: "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). It is hardly probable that He intends all the Mosaic Law, the governing principles of the kingdom, and the teachings of grace to be combined and applied to those who receive the message of the great commission. In the teachings of the kingdom, the characterizing phrase is "hear and do" (Matt. 7:24), while the characterizing phrase under grace is "hear and believe" (John 5:24). The essential character of the teachings of the kingdom as they are contrasted with the teachings of Moses, and as they are contrasted with the teachings of grace, will be considered at length in Chapter XI of this volume.

There is a sense in which the kingdom of God, as the rule of God in the hearts of individuals, is present in the world today. This should not be confused with the Messianic kingdom which is to be set up over a nation, and extended through them to all nations with the King ruling, not in the individual heart, but on the throne of David, in the city of Jerusalem. As the King came nearer to His death, and the rejection became more evident, He made mention of that aspect of the rule of God in the individual heart which was to characterize the hitherto unannounced age of grace. The following passage (like Matt. 13:1–52), taken from the later teachings of Christ as recorded by Luke, is an example: "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and

said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation [outward show]: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you" ('in your midst,' Luke 17:20–21). In no sense could it be truthfully said that the kingdom of God was *in* the hearts of those Christ-rejecting Pharisees. There was, however, a real sense in which the kingdom of God was to be, as it is now, in the hearts of individual believers; but the direct statement of Christ is to the effect that the kingdom was then, in the Person of the King, in their midst. So, also, the phrase, *the kingdom of God cometh not with outward show,* anticipates the present aspect of the rule of God in the individual heart; but after this, and according to all prophecy, the kingdom of heaven will come with outward show. There is much promise of a transformed earth, which condition will be ushered in, not by unseen forces and processes, but through the resistless power and presence of the returning King. So, also, He could say to Israel: "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke 10:9). As certainly as the King was before the nation, so certainly their kingdom was before them, and this was the appeal of the gospel of the kingdom which was given to "the children of the kingdom" only. When the King was rejected, His kingdom was rejected. When His kingdom was rejected and its realization delayed until the return of the King, the application of all Scripture which conditions life in the kingdom was delayed as well, and will be delayed as long as the King tarries. This necessary delay is easily accepted with reference to the earthly, national glory, which is the theme of the kingdom teachings of the Old Testament; but it is equally true that there is a necessary delay in application of the last detail of human obligation related to the earthly kingdom as set forth in the New Testament.

The kingdom teachings are a sufficient and complete statement of all that is necessary for one to know concerning the terms of entrance into, and conduct in, the Messianic kingdom on the earth. Much in these kingdom teachings is similar to that which is found in the teachings of Moses. Much is similar, also, to the teachings of grace; but these facts do not constitute these teachings an indivisible whole, nor do they justify a careless commingling of these great systems of rule in the earth. The characterizing elements in each will be found to be those principles which are peculiarly applicable to the dispensation to which they belong, rather than the

principles wherein they are similar. The kingdom teachings will be more fully identified under the contrasts that are yet to be drawn in Chapter XI.

Chapter X

The Present Grace Economy

The salvation in grace which God accomplishes for those who believe includes, among other things, the placing of the saved one in position as a son of God, a citizen of heaven, and a member of the family and household of God; and, since every position demands a corresponding manner of life, it is to be expected that a rule of conduct as exalted as heaven itself will be committed to the believer. This is precisely what is found; for grace not only provides a perfect salvation and eternal keeping for the one who believes on Christ, but grace provides, as well, the instruction for the daily life of the one who is saved, while he is being kept through the power of God. This instruction for the daily life, it will be found, is a particular revelation from God to Christians only. As it is wholly gracious in character, it is entirely separate from, and independent of, any other rule of life which is found in the Word of God. The Bible, being the one Book from God for all people of all the ages, contains the detailed expression of the will of God concerning the manner of life of various dispensational classes of people as they are related to God in different periods of time, and under the several corresponding covenants. Among these revelations is the rule of conduct regarding the daily life of those who are saved by grace in this dispensation which occupies the time between the cross and the second coming of Christ. This gracious rule of life is complete in itself and stands alone in the Scriptures, dissociated from any other and uncomplicated. It is the teachings of grace.

No careful reader of the New Testament could fail to observe the fact that doctrinal strife obtained at the very opening of the Christian dispensation. This controversy was concerned mainly with the question of whether law or grace furnishes the governing principle for Christian conduct. Although the New Testament contains specific and lengthy warnings against both the legalizers and their teachings, and their systems are therein proved to be opposed to the doctrines of pure grace, their successors from generation to generation to the present time have ever sought to discredit the grace of God. Their messages, though steeped in error, have often exhibited great zeal and sincerity; but zeal and sincerity, greatly to be desired when well directed, fail utterly in God’s sight as

substitutes for a consistent presentation of the truth. The only hope of deliverance from the false doctrines of legalizing teachers is through unprejudiced consideration of the exact revelations of Scripture. This examination of the Scriptures should be free from a blind following of the teachings of men, and should be made with a heart willing to receive "reproof" and "correction" from the Word of God as well as "instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16). Only the one to whom these teachings are crystal clear can appreciate the transcendent value of understanding the teachings of grace.

In presenting this introductory consideration of the extensive theme of the teachings of grace, it is necessary in some instances to assume conclusions the fuller proof of which is taken up in subsequent treatments of the discussion. Likewise, in completing the various lines of argument, repetition at certain points is unavoidable.

The classification of the present age as *the age of grace* does not imply that divine grace has not been exercised in past ages. This age is thus designated because of the revealed truth that God is now making a specific and supreme demonstration of His grace through the outcalling of the Church from both Jews and Gentiles. In this connection it may be seen that Old Testament saints were in right and acceptable relation to God, but it could not be said that they were in the new federal Headship of the resurrected Christ, nor that their lives were "hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:1–3). The Apostle writes: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed" (Gal. 3:23). As for the estate of the Jews in the old dispensation it may be observed: (a) They were born into covenant relation with God wherein there were no limitations imposed upon their faith in Him nor upon their fellowship with Him. This fact was in itself a demonstration of superabounding grace. (b) In case of failure to meet the moral and spiritual obligations resting upon them because of their covenant position, the sacrifices were provided as a righteous basis of restoration to their covenant privileges, which fact is another demonstration of immeasurable grace. (c) The individual Jew might so fail in his conduct and so neglect the sacrifices as, in the end, to be disowned of God and cast out (Gen. 17:14; Deut. 28:58–61; Ezek. 3:18; Matt. 10:32–33; 24:50–51; 25:11–12, 29–30). (d) The national salvation and forgiveness of Israel is yet a future expectation

and is promised to occur when the Deliverer comes out of Sion (Rom. 11:26–27). Who could fail to recognize the eternal grace of God revealed in Isaiah 60:1–62:12 toward Israel, in all ages to come? If any clarity is to be gained with respect to the difference between Israel's privileges under the Mosaic system and the present privileges of the Church, distinction must be made between the law as a *rule of life* which none were able to keep perfectly, and the law as a *system* which not only set forth high and holy demands upon personal conduct but also provided complete divine forgiveness through the sacrifices. The final standing of any Jew before God was not based on law observances alone, but contemplated that Jew in the light of the sacrifices he had presented in his own behalf. The major passage bearing on the truth that divine grace has its paramount manifestation in this age and through the Church is Ephesians 2:7. This notable passage, which consummates the exalted revelation respecting the Church, reads: "That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." It is thus asserted that by means of the Church the exceeding riches of divine grace are to be exercised as they could not otherwise be and exhibited before the entire universe. More important than all, however, is the satisfaction to God in the realization of one of His greatest attributes.

In chapter 2 of the Epistle by Paul to Titus, beginning at verse 11, it is written: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world [age]; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Two widely different ministries of grace are set forth in this passage: First, the grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto *all* men. This, it is clear, refers to the saving grace of God which has come into the world by Christ Jesus, and is now to be proclaimed to all men. It is a message for all men, since its provisions are universal and its invitation is to "whosoever will." Grace upon grace is bestowed both now and unto the consummation of the ages upon those who believe. Second, the passage reveals, as well, that it is the same grace which has brought salvation to all men, that teaches *us*. The word *us*, it should be observed,

does not refer to the wider class of all men mentioned before; but it refers only to the company of those who are saved. The importance of this distinction is evident; for, whatever grace proposes to teach, its teachings are addressed only to those who are saved by grace. This qualifying aspect of the teachings of grace is not limited to this one passage, though that would suffice; it is an outstanding characteristic of the whole body of grace teachings as they appear throughout the New Testament. These teachings, being addressed to Christians only, are never intended to be imposed on the Christ-rejecting individual, or the Christ-rejecting world. This fact cannot be emphasized too forcibly. The Word of God makes no appeal to the unsaved for a betterment of life. There is but one issue in this dispensation between God and the unregenerate man, and that is neither character nor conduct; it is the personal appeal of the gospel of the grace of God. Until the unsaved receive Christ, who is God's gift in grace, no other issue can be raised. Men may moralize among themselves, and establish their self-governments on principles of right conduct; but God is never presented in the unfoldings of grace as seeking to *reform* sinners. Every word regarding the quality of life is reserved for those who are already rightly related to Him on the greater issue of salvation.

The teachings of grace, it will be found, comprise all of the teachings of the Epistles, the Acts, and also certain portions of the Gospels apart from their mere historical features. Returning to the passage already quoted from Titus, it is discovered that only a portion of the whole appeal of the teachings of grace is mentioned in this Scripture; but here the believer is taught that he is to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, looking for the personal return of his Lord from heaven. This describes a life of peculiar devotion and sweetness. Thus would God "purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

In all this investigation, attention should not be diverted from the fundamental truth, already stressed, that there are three ages—that of law, that of grace, and that of the kingdom—which are separated from each other by world-transforming events, and that each age sets up that requirement in human conduct which is in harmony with the precise relationship between God and men obtaining in each age. These economies are complete in themselves, needing no additions whatsoever, and each is as holy and pure in itself as the Creator who is the Author and Designer of

them. These conduct-regulating disciplines not only vary in the arduousness which each imposes, but they vary likewise in the degree of divine enablement which is vouchsafed in each. The Mosaic system, being void of any reference to divine enablement, made its appeal to the limited resources of the natural man and was circumscribed to that extent. The kingdom system, though advancing its demands far beyond the requirements of the Mosaic code, makes no reference in its text to divine enablement; yet in other Scriptures it is asserted that the kingdom law will be written on the heart to the end that it might be realized, and the Holy Spirit will be poured out upon all flesh. It is then that Israel will actually *do* the Law of Moses (Deut. 30:8). The grace economy presents utterly superhuman ideals—that which will accord with heavenly citizenship—and with these supernatural standards of living provides no less than the infinite power of the indwelling Holy Spirit, to the end that the whole will of God—as demanding as it is—may be fulfilled in the child of God.

Probably it is because the Law of Moses came first in order of time and because it stood alone with no possible complications, that theologians have given it more consideration than the two other systems combined. In fact, the kingdom and grace systems are not recognized in their separate characters, but the matter they present has been looked upon as an extension or addition to the original Decalogue. The Westminster Confession of Faith gives many pages to the Decalogue with application of it to the Christian, but fails to recognize the distinctive character of injunctions which are clearly the instructions addressed to believers under grace.

The very nature of grace precepts precludes them from being reduced to a decalogue. They are free in character in the sense that they are not required for acceptance with God. They are, rather, directions and divine beseechings addressed to accepted persons regarding their walk before God. Twice these appeals are termed *beseechings* (Rom. 12:1; Eph. 4:1); not the command to a mere servant, but the polite and considerate request to a member of the household and family. They consist in information and persuasion extended to those who could not otherwise learn regarding that which, from a heavenly viewpoint, is rightfully expected of them. In all this, there is a fundamental dissimilarity between these teachings and both the Mosaic system which imposed a curse on those who failed (Deut. 28:15–68) and the kingdom injunctions which hold over its subjects the danger of

hell fire (Matt. 5:22, 29–30). No excuse is available for the failure to observe the difference between either a system which proposes a curse or a system which proposes hell fire and a system which declares that “there is therefore now no condemnation” (Rom. 8:1), that God who has already justified will not condemn (Rom. 8:33), and that there can be no separation of the believer from the love of God (Rom. 8:38–39). There is however, a price which the believer pays for his failure to walk worthy of his high calling. That price does not arise with God as a punishment to be imposed, but is the unavoidable loss of communion and fellowship with God, and the loss of power in life and service. The pernicious practice of attempting to merge the two legal systems with the teachings of grace results in a forceless law and a defeated grace. The student’s problem is not one of striking an average between law and grace, but rather that of separating these systems to the end that each may retain its intended effectiveness. What other interpretation could be put on Romans 11:6 than that these diverse systems are as far removed from each other as the east is from the west. The passage reads, “And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.” Similarly, what meaning could be given to Hebrews 4:9, which text with its context declares that the believer has ceased from his own works: “There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God”; or Romans 3:31, which declares that every requirement of a holy God upon His believing child is answered forever by Christ and on the principle of faith in Him? The last half of the Galatian Epistle is the divine declaration that the legal system is not the means to the believer’s sanctification in daily life. The order in at least three doctrinal epistles—Romans, Ephesians, Colossians—is first to assert the believer’s exalted position in Christ through faith alone and then to make an appeal for a walk which corresponds to that exalted position. This sublime arrangement is a reversal of every feature in a legal system.

The grace teachings are not, for convenience, isolated in the Sacred Text. The three economies appear in the four Gospels. The grace teachings are rather to be identified by their intrinsic character wherever they are found. Large portions of the New Testament are wholly revelatory of the doctrine of grace. The student, like Timothy, is enjoined to study to be one approved of God in the matter of rightly dividing the Scriptures.

A general analysis of the grace teachings may be made under two divisions: (1) three specific features and (2) the grace relationships.

I. Three Specific Features

While the details of that which enters into the believer's walk and service are varied and extensive, three features are important: the independent and uncomplicated character of grace teachings, their exalted requirements, and the divine enablement.

1. The Independent and Uncomplicated Character of Grace Teachings. As before indicated, the governing principles which belong to this age are by their nature to be distinguished from the two legal systems. They recognize the foundational truth that Christ has died, is risen, is ascended, and that the Spirit is now resident in the hearts of all who believe. These age-transforming events with all that they engender, at once create an entirely new relationship between God and man and especially between God and those who are saved. The independent and uncomplicated character of grace teachings presents a challenge to every earnest student to identify and organize this vast body of Scripture, and the more, since it has been so neglected in the past. Though good men have not given attention to these distinctions, the dissimilarities appear in almost every injunction offered under either kind of system. The practical value of an unprejudiced study of these principles, with the attending isolation of that which belongs to each, cannot but serve a great purpose to Christians who, for the most part, have been led to believe that they must observe all the precepts and commandments found in the Bible, whether they be legal or gracious.

2. Their Exalted Requirements. It may be well stated again that the standard of conduct prescribed under the teachings of grace is immeasurably more difficult to maintain than that prescribed either by the Law of Moses, or the law of the kingdom. It is as much higher than these as heaven is higher than the earth. Similarly, the divine enablement provided under grace is nothing less than the infinite power of the indwelling Spirit. The teachings of grace are addressed only to the supernaturally endowed man, who is both born of the Spirit and indwelt by the Spirit. These teachings are such as naturally belong to a citizen of heaven. Since the

saving work of God places the believer in the heavenly positions in Christ, and transfers his citizenship from earth to heaven, it is only consistent that he should be required to walk as it becometh a citizen of heaven. This, it is evident, must be a supernatural life. Turning to the Scriptures which reveal the position and responsibility of the child of God under grace, it is found that a *superhuman* manner of life is proposed. This aspect of the teachings of grace may be seen at every point. A very few passages will suffice by way of illustration: "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5); "That ye should shew forth the praises [virtues] of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2:9); "Giving thanks always for all things unto God" (Eph. 5:20); "That ye walk worthy of the vocation where-with ye are called" (Eph. 4:1); "Walk in the light" (1 John 1:7); "Walk in love" (Eph. 5:2); "Walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:16); "Grieve not the holy Spirit of God" (Eph. 4:30); "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5:19). There is no question about the superhuman character of these injunctions. What human resource is able to reproduce the very virtues of Christ? Who is able to give thanks *always* for *all* things? Who would be able so to live that he would not grieve the *Holy* Spirit, nor quench the Spirit? This demand is for a *superhuman* manner of life, and the passages quoted are only representative of the whole character of the teachings of grace. These teachings surpass the standards of the Law of Moses in the measure in which infinity surpasses the finite. When unfolding the high character of the teachings of grace, Christ said: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another"; "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you" (John 13:34; 15:12). The new commandment is in contrast to an old commandment of Moses: "Love thy neighbour as thyself." These Scriptures may be taken as a fair illustration of the difference between the standards of the Law of Moses and the standards of grace. Under the Mosaic system, love for others was to be in the degree in which one loved himself; under grace it is to be in the degree in which Christ has loved the believer and given His life for him (1 John 3:16). Again, the standards of the teachings of grace surpass the standards of the laws of the kingdom. The same example—of love one for another—will illustrate. The requirement in the kingdom on this point is

stated thus: “Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?” (Matt. 5:43–46). This is a great advance over the standard of love demanded under the Law of Moses. There love was required to a limited degree; but nothing was said concerning the necessary attitude toward the enemy. The degree of love expected under the ideals of the kingdom is only such as might reasonably be expected from the heart that has been inclined to do the kingdom law. It bears no comparison to the standards of love which are proposed under grace. Consider, first, that love under grace is the “fruit of the Spirit” (Gal. 5:22). Literally, “the love of God is shed abroad [gushes forth] in our hearts by [out from] the Holy Ghost which is given unto us” (Rom. 5:5). This guarantees the exact reproduction in the child of God of the love of Christ—“as I have loved you.” Consider, also, that love, as anticipated in the teachings of grace, is the very heart of the evangel and of evangelism. By the imparted, divine compassion for the lost which brought Christ from heaven to earth and took Him to the cross to die, under grace, men are to be impelled to win souls. Such divine compassion for souls has been the dynamic of all soul-winning work from Pentecost until now. It was the experience of the Apostle Paul as disclosed in his testimony: “I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:1–3). There was no occasion for the Apostle to be accursed from Christ, nor did he expect to be; but he was *willing* to be. Thus was the love of Christ, who bore the sin of others, definitely reproduced in the one in whom the Spirit wrought. True passion for the salvation of men is not a manifestation of love springing out of human nature. It must be *imparted* from God. Therefore evangelism is neither expected nor required in either the Law of Moses or the law of the kingdom.

3. The Divine Enablement. A supernatural power is provided for the exact and perfect execution of the superhuman rule of life under grace. There is no aspect of the teachings of grace which is more vital than this, or which so fully differentiates these teachings from every other rule of life in the Bible. Under grace, the all-powerful, abiding, indwelling, and sufficient Holy Spirit of God is given to every saved person. This statement is abundantly established by revelation (John 7:37–39; Rom. 5:5; 8:9; 1 Cor. 2:12; 6:19; Gal. 3:2; 1 Thess. 4:8; 1 John 3:24; 4:13—careful study will disclose the fact that Luke 11:13; Acts 5:32; 8:12–17; 19:1–7; Eph. 1:13 do not contradict this positive doctrine of Scripture), and is assumed in every teaching of grace. The superhuman manner of life under grace is not addressed to some spiritual company alone within the whole Body of Christ; it is addressed to all believers alike. The imposition of this superhuman manner of life upon all believers alike carries with it the revelation that all have the supernatural power by which to live according to the superhuman standards. This, it is evident, is according to the teaching of the Word of God.

The character of pure grace is destroyed when the reception of the Spirit into the individual heart is made to depend on any human merit, goodness, or personal consecration whatsoever. In 1 Corinthians 6:19–20 it is written: “What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.” The law element is excluded here. Under the law, it would have been written: “Glorify God in your bodies and spirits and ye shall become temples of the Holy Spirit.” Under grace, believers *are* temples of the Spirit without reference to merit; and this is true of every aspect of their salvation. The fact that they *are* temples of the indwelling Spirit is the basis of this appeal for a holy life. A consideration of 1 Corinthians 5:1–2, 13; 6:1–8 will give abundant evidence of the meritless condition of the Corinthian saints at the time the Spirit addressed this appeal to them through the Apostle Paul. The earnest supplication is for a daily life which corresponds to the wonderful fact that they are *already* temples of the Spirit. There is an important distinction to be noted between the *indwelling* and the *infilling* with the Spirit. No Scripture asserts that all believers are filled with the Spirit. The filling with the Spirit, which is the requirement for

an experience of blessing and the exercise of divine power, is an issue which should be considered wholly apart from the revelation concerning the indwelling Spirit.

The fact that the Spirit indwells every believer is peculiar to the age of grace. In the law dispensation, for particular divine purposes, certain individuals were, at times, filled with the Spirit; but there is no revelation stating that *every* Israelite, being under the law, was a temple of the Spirit. In like manner, under the law, there was no *abiding* character to the relationship between the Spirit and individuals upon whom He came (Ps. 51:11). The Spirit came upon them, or departed, according to the sovereign purpose of God. Under grace, the Spirit is not only given to *every* believer, but He never withdraws. This assurance is based on the unfailing prayer of Christ (John 14:16; cf. 1 John 2:27). This is in precise accordance with the conditions embodied in the covenant of grace. Should human merit determine His abiding presence, then, under that relationship, the basic principle of grace would be superseded by the principle of law-works. The entrance of the Spirit into the heart and His abiding presence there, is a part of the saving and keeping power of God which is by grace alone. The revelation of the New Testament with regard to the indwelling, abiding Spirit in every believer is in full agreement with the doctrine of pure grace. When considering the question of the enabling power of the Spirit in the individual lives of the children of the kingdom, it will be seen from the Scriptures that, at the opening of that period at least, the Spirit is to come upon all flesh, and the individual will prophesy, dream dreams, and see visions (Joel 2:28–32; Acts 2:16–21); but there is no revelation to the effect that this will be an *abiding* presence and ministry, since it is related to mighty signs and wonders in nature which accompany the second advent of Messiah. And, in like manner, there is no revelation concerning the enabling power of the Spirit for conduct in the daily life of the individual in the kingdom. The kingdom teachings of the Scriptures do not emphasize the work of the Spirit. Any divine provision for personal enablement in daily life, it would seem from a careful examination of the Scriptures, is foreign to every aspect of law-rule, whether it be that of Moses, or that of the kingdom.

So vital is the fact that the enabling Spirit is now given to *every* believer as a part of salvation by grace, that it is presented as a fundamental

characteristic of this age. This is the dispensation of the indwelling Spirit. It is recorded: “But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit [Spirit], and not in the oldness of the letter” (Rom. 7:6). Thus the new enabling power of the Spirit characterizes this age, as the “oldness of the letter” characterized the age that is past. Likewise circumcision is now “of the heart,” in the Spirit, and not in the “letter” (Rom. 2:29), or as it was in the flesh under the law. Again, “Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit [Spirit]: for the letter killeth, but the spirit [Spirit] giveth life” (2 Cor. 3:6). Reference in this passage is not made to different methods of interpreting Scripture—a spiritualizing, or a literal method; but to two dispensations with their different methods of divine rule. “The letter killeth”—such is the inevitable ministry of the law. “But the spirit giveth life”—divine life, spiritual vitality, energy, and power are provided for the believer under grace, and for every believer alike. Thus it is revealed that the blessing of the indwelling Spirit is an essential characteristic of this age.

If the manner of life under grace is superhuman, so, also, the provided enablement is supernatural, and is as limitless as the infinite power of God. Since God has proposed a humanly impossible manner of life, He has, in full consistency, provided the Spirit who giveth life. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the fact that, since God has proposed the impossible rule of life and provided the sufficient Spirit, the believer’s responsibility is thereby changed from being a *struggle* of the flesh to being a *reliance* on the Spirit. Grace thus introduces a new problem for the believer’s life which is wholly foreign to every aspect of the law. It is the problem of the adjustment of the heart to the holy presence of the Spirit, and of maintaining the unbroken attitude of dependence on Him. The new principle of achievement consists in getting things accomplished in the believer’s daily life and service by trusting the power of Another, rather than by trusting the energy of the flesh. The revelation concerning this new problem of life under grace constitutes the major part of the teaching of the Epistles. Not only is the faith principle directly taught in the Epistles, it is implied and assumed in every injunction under grace. The unfolding of the precise relationship between the personality of the Spirit and the personality of the believer, is not omitted. Experimentally, the believer, when empowered by

the Spirit, will be conscious only of the exercise of his own faculties. The Spirit does not disclose His presence directly; His ministry is to reveal and glorify Christ. His presence will be evidenced, however, by the victory that is wrought, which victory could be wrought only by the Spirit.

Thus, either the by-works principle of the law or the by-faith principle of grace, may be chosen by the believer as a method of achievement even within the deepest issues of Christian conduct and service. If these heaven-high demands are undertaken in the energy of the flesh, they become purely legal in character; if they are undertaken in full reliance on the provided energy of the Spirit, they are purely gracious in character. One is wholly within the scope of the covenant of the law, which covenant is based on works; the other is wholly within the scope of the covenant of grace, which covenant is based on faith. Thus the teachings of grace, when attempted in the energy of the flesh, become a legal code, the demands of which are the most impossible to meet. How very many Christians are under this aspect of law, even those who give same attention to the actual precepts of grace!

There are two inseparable revelations given in the grace teachings of the New Testament. Each one is the counterpart, complement, and supplement of the other, and untold violence is done to the whole revealed purpose of God in this age when either one of these themes is made to stand alone. One theme is presented in that body of Scripture which sets forth the character of conduct that is becoming to the one who is already saved and safe in the grace of God; the other theme is presented in that body of Scripture which sets forth the fact that the life in grace is to be lived in sole dependence on the enabling power of the indwelling Spirit. The latter body of Scripture includes all the details and instructions concerning the life of faith and the walk in the Spirit. It is obviously imperative that these two revelations shall not be separated. Otherwise, on the one hand, the teachings of grace will seem to be an impossible law-code, or, on the other hand, the walk in the Spirit will seem to be an uncharted, aimless procedure. In the grace teachings of the New Testament, these two aspects of truth are never separated. Proceeding from the fact that the superhuman manner of life under grace is taught in all the New Testament books beginning with the Gospel by John, there is space for only one quotation from each of these up to, and including, the Epistle to the Colossians. This body of Scripture

discloses the truth that the life in grace is to be lived only by the enabling power of God:

John 7:37–39. “In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)” Here the superhuman outflow of rivers of living water is distinctly said to be the result of the energy of the Spirit.

Acts 1:8. “But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me.” The revelation here is that, apart from the power of the Spirit, there can be no vital witness unto Christ.

Romans 6:14; 8:4. “For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” No enabling power was provided for the doing of the law; but such power is provided under grace. “That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” No passage in the teachings of grace is more decisive than this. “The righteousness of the law,” referred to, is evidently no less than the whole will of God for His child under grace. This divine will is to be fulfilled *in* the believer, but never *by* the believer.

1 Corinthians 12:4–7.“Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh [energizeth] all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man [Christian] to profit withal.” As all Christian service is by the exercise of a spiritual gift, these gifts are wholly realized by the energy of the power of God.

2 Corinthians 10:3–5.“For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal [fleshly], but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.” For this superhuman manner of life, the believer is to be “mighty through God.”

Galatians 5:16. “This I say then, Walk in [by means of] the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” This promise is as sure as it is far-reaching.

Ephesians 6:10–11. “Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.” True overcoming strength is none other than the imparted “power” of God.

Philippians 2:13. “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” Here the divine enablement reaches to the very molding of the desires of the heart, and to the full accomplishment of those desires.

Colossians 2:6. “As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him.” In this Scripture the very same faith-principle, by which alone a soul can be saved, is continued as the principle by which alone he is to walk.

The whole aspect of grace, which provides a supernatural sufficiency for the superhuman, heavenly conduct, and which is the believer’s reasonable life and service, is summed up in two great doctrines of the New Testament:

(1) The superhuman manner of life is to be Christlike. Christ is the pattern: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 2:5); “As he is, so are we in this world” (1 John 4:17); “Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps” (1 Pet. 2:21); “For to me to live is Christ” (Phil. 1:21). To be inlawed to Christ (1 Cor. 9:21) is to be committed to the very standard of which He is the ideal. Therefore the Christian’s standard is superhuman and beyond the power of human achievement.

(2) It is the supreme purpose of the indwelling Spirit to reproduce Christlikeness in the believer. The most comprehensive statement of the reproduction of Christ in the believer is found in Galatians 5:22–23: “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance” (self-control). Every word, as here used, represents a superhuman quality of life. It is an exact description of the life of Christ; but Christlikeness is never gained by the energy of the flesh. These virtues are not found in human nature; they are the “fruit of the Spirit.” Under the law, that degree of love is required which is possible to the natural man; under grace, the divine love is wrought in the heart by the

Holy Spirit. This is true of all the superhuman demands under grace. They are wrought into the life by the Spirit. The heavenly standard requires: “Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice” (Phil. 4:4). This is humanly impossible, but the fruit of the Spirit is “joy,” and the Lord prayed “that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves” (John 17:13). The standard of grace requires that “the peace of God” shall “rule in your hearts” (Col. 3:15). Man has never achieved this, but the fruit of the Spirit is “peace,” and Christ has said: “My peace I give unto you” (John 14:27). The ninefold fruit of the Spirit represents the true Christian graces, since, under grace, this fruit is produced in the heart and life by the Spirit (Gal. 5:22–23). Likewise, Christian service is to be superhuman. It is the outflow of “rivers of living water”; but “this spake he of the Spirit” (John 7:37–39). It is the full proof of “that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God” (Rom. 12:2); but “it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Phil. 2:13). It is all supernaturally wrought; for it is the exercise of a spiritual gift—a “manifestation of the Spirit” (1 Cor. 12:7). As Christian character is the composite of the inwrought graces, so Christian service is an imparted “grace.” “But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ” (Eph. 4:7); and, “But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal” (1 Cor. 12:7).

Divine grace, inwrought and imparted by the indwelling Spirit, results in a manifestation of the very graciousness of God in and through the heart of the believer. It is in no sense an *imitation* of God’s graciousness; it is a *reproduction* by the indwelling Spirit of that graciousness in the life and service of the believer. This truth is one of the most extensive doctrines of the New Testament (cf. Rom. 12:3–6; 15:15; 1 Cor. 1:4; 3:10; 15:10; 2 Cor. 1:12; 4:15; 6:1–3; 8:1, 6–7, 9; 9:8, 14; 12:9; Gal. 2:9; Eph. 3:2–8; 4:7, 29; Phil. 1:7; Col. 3:16; 4:6; 2 Thess. 1:12; 2 Tim. 2:1; Heb. 4:16; 12:15; James 4:6; and 2 Pet. 3:18).

II. The Greace Relationships

The daily life of the Christian is one of adjustments to certain particularized relationships, and the grace injunctions are largely the divine directions on how these relationships should be sustained. This recognition

of relationships is equally true in each of the legal systems. The distinctive features of the grace order are based on the threefold truth that the believer is appointed to uphold (1) relationship with the Persons of the Godhead; (2) relationship to the world-system; and (3) relationship to other Christians who are fellow members with him in the Body of Christ. The relative importance of these three separate relationships may be seen in the fact that they comprehend practically all the hortatory portions—about one-half—of the Epistles of the New Testament. Considering this Biblical emphasis, there is no apology offered for dwelling at length upon these aspects of truth. The three general spheres of relationship named above may now be examined.

1. Relationship to the Persons of the Godhead. Supreme above all other obligations which rest upon the Christian are those he sustains to the Persons of the Godhead. This field of accountability embraces the entire sphere of moral and spiritual responsibility: the bonds of fellowship with these Persons, the exercise of praise and prayer, and the entire domain of obedience to the mind and will of God. Since this is the primary relationship accorded the believer, an induction of all in the New Testament bearing upon it would be out of bounds.

2. Relationship to the *Cosmos* World System. It has been asserted before that the Christian is not of this world system: Christ Himself declared this revealing truth twice in His High Priestly prayer (John 17:14, 16). That He, while talking to His Father, to whom repetition is certainly uncalled for, should say a thing twice and in the same words, constitutes an emphasis upon the thing stated that should not be overlooked. He said, "They are not of the world [*cosmos*], even as I am not of the world." No more complete separation could be possible than to be disengaged from this world as Christ is disengaged from it. The believer is a citizen of heaven—one who is related to the *cosmos* as an ambassador, a stranger and a pilgrim, and a witness against the *cosmos* and its god. He is therefore given complete instructions about the conflict he is to wage against Satan and his world system. The believer's world-relationship is fourfold:

a. To Satan and His Emissaries. In this relationship there is only enmity and conflict, and since the foe is superior—even more exalted than Michael the

archangel (cf. Jude 1:9)—the battle must be waged upon a faith principle which avails the contestant of the infinite power and resources of God. The Scripture is clear on this point: “Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places” (Eph. 6:10–12); “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world” (1 John 4:4).

b. To the World System. This system embraces the whole sphere of human life with its institutions, ideals, and projects. Concerning this world system the believer is thus warned: “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever” (1 John 2:15–17); “And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them” (Eph. 5:11); “Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time. Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man” (Col. 4:5–6).

c. To Human Governments. What seems a strange admixture is thus presented: first, that the believer is set to wage a warfare against the world, and, second, that he is directed at the same time to be under allegiance to world governments. It is true that Satan holds the world governments in control (cf. Matt. 4:8–9; Luke 4:5–7), and that they are exercised under Gentile authority throughout this age (cf. Luke 21:24); yet the believer must be in subjection while in this world. Human government is of God only to the extent of His permissive will and the realization of His purpose; nevertheless the citizen of heaven is instructed to be in subjection to governments: “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation [judgment]. For rulers are not a

terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour" (Rom. 13:1–7); "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king" (1 Pet. 2:13–17).

d. To the Unsaved as Individuals. The consistent attitude of the Christian is the same as that of his Lord who died for lost men. As He is, so are we, and therefore we are to manifest His spirit in this world. Of his own attitude toward lost men, the Apostle Paul wrote: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead [all died—in the Substitute] … Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Cor. 5:14–16). Having beheld Christ as God's Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world, and the One who died for all, and in whose death all have partaken, the Apostle says: "Henceforth know we no man after the flesh." The usual distinctions among men, of Jew and Gentile, rich and poor, bond and free, are submerged in the overwhelming estimation of that which is accomplished for all men through the death of Christ. The Apostle now recognizes them only as men for whom Christ has died. This conception of the estate of the unsaved is the normal one for all Christians, and it leads on to a reasonable service for Christ in soul-winning.

3. Relationship to the Body of Christ. The Epistles of the New Testament disclose the basis for a fellowship and kinship within the company of the redeemed which exists in no other association of people in this world, and this union calls for a corresponding manner of conduct from the Christian toward fellow believers. This relationship is sevenfold:

a. A Christian's Relation to Other Christians in General. Love is revealed as the underlying principle of this relationship. It is embodied in the first commandment of Christ in the grace teachings of the upper room: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John 13:34–35). This same truth is set forth in many passages. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14); "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it" (1 Cor. 12:26); "And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us" (Eph. 5:2); "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God"; "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another" (1 John 4:7, 11); "Let brotherly love continue" (Heb. 13:1); "Let love be without dissimulation"—this is one of the great passages on Christian love and care one for another. The whole context should be read (Rom. 12:9–16); "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye" (Col. 3:12–13); "Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous: not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing" (1 Pet. 3:8–9); "And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves: for charity shall cover the multitude of sins. Use hospitality one to another without grudging" (1 Pet. 4:8–9).

The Christian is called upon to recognize the vital union into which he has been brought by the baptism with the Spirit: "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one

another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:1–3).

Special emphasis is given as well to Christian kindness: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. 4:31–32); "That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter: because that the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you and testified"; "But as touching brotherly love ye need not that I write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another" (1 Thess. 4:6, 9); "Wherefore comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as also ye do" (1 Thess. 5:11); "Speak not evil one of another, brethren" (James 4:11) .

Christians are to submit one to another and in honor to prefer one another: "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God" (Eph. 5:21); "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others" (Phil. 2:3–4); "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble" (1 Pet. 5:5).

The Christian's gifts are to be directed especially to the need of the children of God: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10); "But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John 3:17).

Prayer is to be offered for all saints: "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Eph. 6:18); "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed" (James 5:16).

b. A Christian's Relation to Those Who are in Authority in the Assembly of Believers. On this important question the Word of God is explicit and comment is unnecessary: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end

of their conversation" (Heb. 13:7); "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you" (Heb. 13:17); "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. And be at peace among yourselves" (1 Thess. 5:12–13).

c. The Relation of Christian Husbands and Wives. The grace teaching on this aspect of Christian relationship is also explicit: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it"; "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord" (Eph. 5:22, 25; cf. Eph. 5:21–33; Col. 3:18–19; 1 Pet. 3:1–7).

d. The Relation of Christian Parents and Children. "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"; "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right" (Eph. 6:1, 4; cf. Eph. 6:1–4; Col. 3:20–21). From this body of revelation it will be seen that the children of Christian parents are to be governed as *in the Lord*. One of the conditions which will characterize the last days of this age will be the disobedience of children (2 Tim. 3:2).

e. The Relation of Christian Masters and Servants. "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God";"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven" (Col. 3:22–4:1; cf. Eph. 6:5–9).

f. A Christian's Obligation to an Erring Brother. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (Gal. 6:1); "Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feebleminded, support the weak, be patient toward all men" (1 Thess. 5:14); "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us"; "For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. … Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother" (2 Thess. 3:6, 11–15). A sharp distinction must be drawn at this point between a disorderly

brother who is a busybody, shirking his honest toil, and careless in matters of Christian conduct, on the one hand, and a sincere believer who may disagree with another on a matter of interpretation, on the other hand. Endless confusion and disgraceful contention have followed the exercise of unwarranted freedom among sincere believers in separating from each other over minor questions of doctrine. Should one fail to hold the true doctrine of Christ (2 John 1:9–11), that one can have no rightful place in a Christian communion; but men have divided over secondary issues and have gone so far as to exclude earnest Christians from their fellowship with whom perchance they disagree in a minor question of doctrine. Such separation is unscriptural, a violation of the priceless unity of the Spirit, and foreign to the order of grace. There is Scripture teaching concerning Christian discipline, but it does not necessarily impose a penalty of separation. The brother who may have been overtaken in a fault is to be restored, and only by one who is himself spiritual. This he must do in the spirit of meekness considering his own utter weakness apart from the enabling power of God. No other may undertake this important service. If the erring brother proves to be persistent in his fault, it is required that he be debarred from the fellowship of believers until he has seen the error of his way. (Equally sincere brethren must not break fellowship, however, over minor issues.) Of those who are thus disposed, the Apostle writes: “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple” (Rom. 16:17–18).

g. A Christian’s Obligation to a Weak Brother. The tender conscience of a weak brother must be considered. This important principle applies to very many questions of the day. In the Apostles’ time there was a grave question concerning the eating of meat which had been offered to idols and was afterwards placed in the public market for sale. There were those who had only recently been saved and rescued from the grip of the power of idol worship. There were others who were so deeply prejudiced by their former experiences with idols that, while saved and free, they were not willing even to touch anything connected with an idol. It would be natural to say that the first class should know better than to be drawn back to idols, and

that the second class should be made to give up their prejudice; but this is not according to the "law of love." It is written: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand" (Rom. 14:1–4). From this passage it is clear that instruction is also given to the weaker brother to the intent that he shall not "judge" the Christian who, through years of Christian training and deeper understanding of the liberty in grace, is free to do what he himself in his limitations may not be able to do. There is hardly a more important exhortation for Christians today than this. The cure is clearly revealed: God reserves the right to correct and direct the life of His own child. Much hurtful criticism might be avoided if Christians would only believe this and trust Him to do with His own child what He purposes to do. God is the master before whom alone the servant standeth or falleth. The passage continues: "But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. … For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence [to his own convictions]. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak. Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is damned [condemned] if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:15–23). "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ (Gal. 6:2).

Due regard for the conscience and liberty of others is twofold: On the one hand, let the strong be charitable toward the weak. On the other hand, let the weak desist from judgment of the strong. The result will be a mutual fellowship and an exercise of all the liberties of grace.

Chapter XI

Contrasts Between Law and Grace

The theme of human action and responsibility which, directly or indirectly, occupies the major part of the Sacred Text, whether attended by theologians generally or not, must, when carefully considered, employ many pages. The present aspect of the theme, like that which follows, cannot be taken up with even a degree of completeness without extended discussion. It is doubtless true that confusion, perplexity, and misunderstanding are engendered as much by a partial contemplation of this theme as is engendered by its total neglect.

Having considered the fact that God provides different rules of life, as recorded in the Scriptures, to fit His succeeding dispensational dealings with man, it is important to consider the wide difference which exists between the principle of law and the principle of grace, as applied to the divine government of man. While the purpose of this section is to emphasize the fact that the three systems of divine government are essentially separate, each one from the others, and each one, being wholly complete and sufficient in itself, is in no wise exchangeable for either of the others, and cannot be commingled—it should be observed that there are important fields of Bible interpretation and instruction besides the limited aspect of truth which is suggested by the various rules of conduct. The Scriptures unfold many highways of truth with unbroken development as true in the case of "the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." The important features of this unity in the Scriptures are:

The Revelation concerning God. He is first revealed in the Old Testament by His names and works, and to this the New Testament adds the fuller emphasis upon the Trinity, the relation of the Persons of the Godhead to mankind, and the various aspects of saving grace. The continuity of the Old Testament testimony concerning Christ was proved by Him on the Emmaus road, as it is recorded: "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27).

Prophecy and Its Fulfillment. Every recorded instance of the fulfillment of prophecy shows that each detail of the prediction was fulfilled to the letter.

The Union between Type and Antitype. Almost every important truth of the New Testament was typified and foreshadowed in the Old Testament. This fact proves the symmetry of all Scripture (see 1 Cor. 10:1–11).

The Revelation concerning Satan and Evil. In this body of revelation, likewise, the Bible story is uninterrupted, save for the new material added in the development of the divine message.

The Doctrine of Man and His Sin. The exact manner of the application of the divine remedy for sin varies from dispensation to dispensation; but there is no variation in all the record concerning the essential facts of human failure, and the gracious divine remedy through blood alone.

The Requirement of Holiness in the Conduct of Saints. While there is wide difference between the rules of conduct which are imposed in the various ages, there is unity in the revelation that a holy manner of life is the divine requirement in every age.

The Continuity of Purpose in the Program of the Ages. In this aspect of the truth it should be observed that, while each age possesses a character exclusively its own, the divine purpose throughout all the ages is one, ending in the ultimate consummation which God has decreed. The fact is stated in Hebrews 1:2. Speaking of God as revealed in, and related to, the Son, it is written: *by whom also he programmed the ages* (Greek).

Such is the wonderful unity of the Scriptures throughout; but in no sense are the various systems regulating human conduct the same, and the exact application of these systems must be guarded at every point. If truth for the children of God under grace is to be drawn from the teachings of the Law of Moses, or the kingdom, it should be acknowledged that it is taken from a system foreign to grace, and that it is suitable only by way of a secondary application.

These governing principles or systems differ in three particulars: (1) They present independent, sufficient, and complete systems of divine rule in the earth. (2) In these systems the order varies with respect to the sequence of the divine blessing and the human obligation. (3) These systems differ according to the degree in which the divine enablement has been provided.

I. Independent, Sufficient, and Complete Systems of Divine Rule in the Earth

As has been stated, there are three of these systems of divine government: (1) the teachings of the Law of Moses, (2) the teachings of grace, and (3) the teachings of the kingdom. Naturally there is field here for wide expansion, since these three systems of authority occupy the major portion of the Bible. A brief review only of the essential character of these systems is here given:

1. The Teachings of the Law of Moses. This rule of life was revealed from God and accepted by Israel at Sinai, and was at no time addressed to the nations of the world. It was a peculiar form of government for a peculiar people, and accomplished a peculiar purpose in condemning the failure of man and in leading him to Christ. Its full detail is revealed in the writings of Moses; but the history of Israel under the law occupies the rest of the Old Testament, and the major part of the Gospels up to the record of the death of Christ. In the doctrinal teachings of the New Testament, very much additional light is given on the character and purpose of the Law of Moses. There the law is held in contrast with the teachings of grace. There, also, as will be seen more fully in the later discussion, the law is represented as having passed out of force through the death of Christ; and it may be observed that, after the death of Christ, the law is in no instance treated as being directly in force.

The Law of Moses was complete within itself. It was sufficient to regulate the conduct of an Israelite under every circumstance that might arise. No other rule of life had been revealed during the days in which the Law of Moses was in effect, hence there was no temptation for Israel to complicate her governing principle with any other. In her relation to God, that nation remained for fifteen hundred years under pure law. “The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”

2. The Teachings of Grace. Like the teachings of the Law of Moses, the teachings of grace have not applied to men in all ages. These teachings were revealed from God through Christ and His apostles. Moreover, they are never addressed to the world as applicable to it in the present age; but are addressed to a peculiar people who are in the world, but are not of the world. These teachings constitute the divine instruction to the heavenly citizen and unfold the exact manner of life that such a citizen is expected to

manifest even here in the earth. The full detail of this rule of life is found in portions of the Gospels, portions of the Book of Acts, and the Epistles of the New Testament. As light is given in these particular Scriptures of the New Testament by way of contrast, concerning the character and purpose of the Law of Moses, in like manner the very foundations of grace and its relationships are laid in the types and prophecies of the Old Testament. It is revealed that God dealt graciously with the human family from Adam to Moses; but it is also revealed that the precise form of divine government which is the present teaching of grace was not then disclosed, nor was it applied to men until the reign of the law had been terminated in the death of Christ. It is likewise revealed that the death of Christ was the necessary foundation for the present, full manifestation of superabounding grace. It is equally as certain from revelation that the teachings of grace will apply to the children of God under grace as long as they are in the world, and these principles will cease to rule, of necessity, when the people to whom they alone apply are gathered out and taken from the earth at the coming of Christ. This period between the death of Christ and His coming again is not characterized in the Scriptures as a time when the supreme purpose of God is the governing of the nations of the earth; this age is rather spoken of as "the times of the Gentiles" in all matters of human government in the earth. Nor is this age the period in which God is realizing the fulfillment of His unchanging covenants with the nation Israel; that nation is now said to be scattered, peeled, blinded, broken off, and hated of all nations, and they are to remain so to the end of the age. This age is not the time of the salvation of society; that great undertaking is clearly in the purpose of God, but it is reserved for the age which is yet to come. The present age is characterized by a unique emphasis on the individual. The death of Christ contemplated above all else the need of the individual sinner. The gospel of grace, which the death of Christ made possible, is an appeal to the individual alone, and the very faith by which it is received is exercised only by the individual. The message of grace is of a personal faith, a personal salvation, a personal enduement of the Spirit, a personal gift for service, and a personal transformation into the image of Christ. The company of individuals thus redeemed and transformed, are to be in the ages to come the supreme manifestation of the riches of God's grace. Unto this eternal purpose the whole universe was created and all ages have been programmed by God.

The glory of this dispensation is lost to a large extent when the reign of the law is intruded into this age which followed the death of Christ, or when the social order of the kingdom, promised for a future age, is expected before the return of the King. The Bible affords no basis for the supposition that the Lord will come to a perfected social order. At His coming He will gather the saved to Himself, but the wicked He will judge in righteousness. The transcendent glory of this age is that very grace which will have been either accepted or rejected by the individual.

The teachings of grace are perfect and sufficient in themselves. They provide for the instruction of the child of God in every situation which may arise. There is no need that they be supplemented, or augmented, by the addition of precepts from either the Law of Moses or the teachings of the kingdom.

3. The Teachings of the Kingdom. The teachings of the kingdom have not been applied to men in all the ages; nay, more, they have not yet been applied to any man. Since they anticipate the binding of Satan, a purified earth, the restoration of Israel, and the personal reign of the King, they cannot be applied until God's appointed time when these accompanying conditions on the earth have been brought to pass. The kingdom laws will be addressed to Israel and beyond them to all the nations which will enter the kingdom. It will be the first and only universal reign of righteousness and peace in the history of the world. One *nation* was in view when the Law of Moses was in force in the earth; the *individual* is in view during this age of grace; and the whole *social order* of mankind will be in view when the kingdom is set up in the earth.

The reign of the King is never said to be ushered in by a gradual process of world improvement; it is introduced suddenly and with great violence. The return of the King to rule is like a smiting stone, and will demolish the structure of world empires, will grind them to powder, and will scatter them as the wind scatters the chaff of the summer threshing floor (Dan. 2:31–45). Satan and the satanic deception will have been removed from the earth, Israel will have realized the glory of her covenants, and the long-predicted blessing will have come upon all the Gentiles, and upon creation itself. The Church is not once mentioned in relation to the teachings of the kingdom, nor are those teachings applied to her; for her part in the kingdom is not to

be reigned over, but to reign with Christ—her Head. She, being the Bride of the King, is His Consort. She will still be under the heavenly teachings of grace, and her home will be in the bosom of the Bridegroom in the ivory palace of the King. The King will reign with a rod of iron. Sin and iniquity will be rebuked instantly and judged in perfect righteousness. Clear conception of the glory of the kingdom is lost if it is confused with the age of grace which precedes it, or with the sinless new heavens and new earth of the eternal state which follows it. The kingdom closes with a demonstration of the failure of man and thus it adds the last message of the converging testimony to the wickedness of the fallen heart, and to the fact that in the exceeding grace of God alone is there salvation.

Under God's classification, there are only three major divisions of the human family—"the Jews, the Gentiles, and the church of God." Wherever they are mentioned in any portion of the Bible they are recognized as distinctly separate peoples, and it is important to follow the divine record concerning each from its beginning to its end. The Jew, or Israel, began with Abraham, was favored in relationship to God above all the nations of the earth for fifteen hundred years in the promised land, is the object of all of Jehovah's purposes and covenants in the earth, is now as free from the law and is as effectually shut up to the gospel of the grace of God as are the Gentiles, and will yet inherit the limitless blessings of all the kingdom covenants in the earth. The Gentile began with Adam, received no direct instruction or covenant from Jehovah in all the ages past since Abraham, is now the object of appeal, with the Jew, in the gospel of grace, and will share in the glory of the kingdom to come, when the divine blessing will be poured out on all the Gentiles (Acts 15:17). The Church began with the death of Christ and the descent of the Spirit, is the divine objective in this age, is a heavenly people taken from both Jews and Gentiles, and will reign with the King as His Bride, in the ages to come. Since there is so wide a difference in the character of these ages—of law, of grace, and of the kingdom—and in the peoples of the earth—the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church—as they stand related to God throughout the ages, it is to be expected that there will be a variation in the divine government according to the essential character of the several ages. This is not only reasonable; it is the precise teaching of the Bible. Since these great governing systems are wholly separate and sufficient in themselves, and since there is much which

is held in common in them all, a brief comparison of the systems is here undertaken:

a. The Similarity and Dissimilarity Between the Teachings of the Law of Moses and the Teachings of Grace. In this discussion, the Law of Moses will be limited to the Decalogue; for no legalist proposes to carry forward into grace the judgments which governed the social life of Israel, or the ordinances which governed their religious ritual in the land. However, the moral commandments of the Decalogue are almost universally imposed upon the church by these legalists. In justification of this imposition, the plea is usually made that apart from the direct application of the Decalogue there could be no divine authority or government in the earth. In no sense does this question involve the issues of world government; for God has never addressed either the teachings of the law or the teachings of grace to the whole world. The world has borrowed certain moral precepts from the Bible for its self-government; but it does not follow that God has accepted the world on the basis of the teachings of the law or the teachings of grace. In reality, the world is shut up to the one appeal of the gospel of grace. Until this appeal is heeded, the individual is neither under law nor grace, as a rule of life; but is "under sin." The issue is, therefore, between law and grace as governing principles in the life of the Christian. Must Christians turn to the Decalogue for a basis of divine government in their daily lives? Scripture answers this question with a positive assertion: "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." If this be true, are the great moral values of the Decalogue discarded? By no means; for it will be seen that every moral precept of the Decalogue, but one, has been restated with increased emphasis in the teachings of grace. These precepts do not reappear under grace in the character and coloring of the Law, but, rather, in the character and coloring of pure grace. The following brief comparison will demonstrate the fact that the moral values of the Law are reincorporated in the teachings of grace.

1. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."	1. "We … preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God" (Acts 14:15).
2. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, … Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them."	2. "Little children, keep yourselves from idols" (1 John 5:21).

3. “Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain.”	3. “But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath” (James 5:12).
4. “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.”	4. No such command is found in the teachings of grace.
5. “Honour thy father and thy mother.”	5. “Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right” (Eph. 6:1).
6. “Thou shalt not kill.”	6. “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him” (1 John 3:15).
7. “Thou shalt not commit adultery.”	7. “Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers … shall inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor. 6:9–10).
8. “Thou shalt not steal.”	8. “Steal no more” (Eph. 4:28).
9. “Thou shalt not bear false witness.”	9. “Lie not” (Col. 3:9).
10. “Thou shalt not covet.”	10. “Covetousness, let it not be once named among you” (Eph. 5:3).

While some principles of the Mosaic Law are restated under grace, those aspects of the law which are foreign to grace are omitted. The command to keep the seventh day is omitted wholly. This fact and the reason thereof has been considered at length in Chapter V. So, also, the one promise of the Decalogue is omitted. This promise occurs in connection with the precept concerning the obedience of children. It reads: “Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.” The fact that the law presented a promise to obedient children

is pointed out in the New Testament (Eph. 6:2), with no inference that the promise is in effect now, but as a reminder of that which obtained under the law. It would be difficult for any individual, or child, in the Church to establish a claim to a God-given land, or to demonstrate that any law now obtains by which long life is guaranteed to those who are now obedient to parents. Again, concerning Israel and her relation to the land it is written: "Trust in the LORD, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed"; "The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever"; "For the upright shall dwell in the land" (Ps. 37:3, 29; Prov. 2:21). No land has been given to the Christian. He is a "stranger and pilgrim" here, an "ambassador," a citizen of heaven. If he is taught in the Scriptures, he is not looking for a long life here; but he is looking for the coming of his Lord. He is not clinging to this life; for "to depart, and to be with Christ … is far better." The serious manner in which people apply an Old Testament promise, impossible under grace, to themselves is a revelation of the measure of inattention with which the Scriptures are too often read and quoted. Since every adaptable precept of the Law is restated in grace, it is not necessary to violate the Scriptures by forcing the law into the sphere of grace. The Decalogue, in its moral principles, is not only restated in grace, but its principles are greatly amplified. This is illustrated, again, by the same precept concerning the obedience of children. In the teachings of grace, the whole issue of obedience is taken up at length, and to this is added the instructions to parents as well. Under the teachings of grace, the appeal of the first commandment is repeated no less than fifty times, the second twelve times, the third four times, the fourth (about the sabbath day) not at all, the fifth six times, the sixth six times, the seventh twelve times, the eighth six times, the ninth four times, and the tenth nine times. Yet further, that which is even more vital should be noted: The teachings of grace are not only gracious in character and of the very nature of heaven itself, but they are extended to cover the entire range of the new issues of the life and service of the Christian. The Ten Commandments require no life of prayer, no Christian service, no evangelism, no missionary effort, no gospel preaching, no life and walk in the Spirit, no Fatherhood of God, no union with Christ, no fellowship of saints, no hope of salvation, and no hope of heaven. If it is asserted that we have all these because we have both the law and grace, it is replied that the law adds nothing to grace

but confusion and contradiction, and that there is the most faithful warning in the Scriptures against this admixture. A few times the teachings of the law are referred to by the writers of the Epistles by way of illustration. Having stated the obligation under grace, they cite the fact that this same principle obtained under the law. There is, however, no basis here for a commingling of these two governing systems. The Law of Moses presents a covenant of works to be wrought in the energy of the flesh; the teachings of grace present a covenant of faith to be wrought in the energy of the Spirit.

b. The Similarity and Dissimilarity Between the Teachings of the Law of Moses and the Teachings of the Kingdom. As will be seen more fully further on, these two systems of divine government are both legal in character and order. If this is true, it is to be expected that there is much in common between them. (1) They are similar because they are both based on a covenant of works. (2) They are similar because of elements which are common to both. (3) They are dissimilar because of certain points in which they differ.

(1) *They are Similar Because They are Based on a Covenant of Works.* The nature of a covenant which is based on human works is obvious. Whatever God promises under such a covenant, is conditioned on the faithfulness of man. Every blessing under the Law of Moses was so conditioned, and every blessing in the kingdom relationship will be found to be so ordered. Turning to the kingdom teachings of Christ wherein the issues of personal conduct and obligation in the kingdom are taken up, it will be seen that all the kingdom promises to the individual are based on human merit. The kingdom blessings are reserved for the poor in spirit, the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, and the peacemaker. It is a covenant of works only and the emphatic word is *do*. “This do, and thou shalt live” is the highest promise of the law. As men judge, so shall they be judged. A tree is approved, or rejected, by its fruits. And not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of “my Father” which is in heaven. As the individual forgives, so will he be forgiven. And except personal righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, there shall be no entrance into the kingdom of heaven. To interpret this righteousness which is required to be the imputed righteousness of God, is to disregard the teaching of the context, and to introduce an element which is not once found in this whole system of divine

government. The kingdom teachings of the Sermon on the Mount are concluded with the parable of the house built on the rock. The key to this message is given in the words, “Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them.”

Turning to the Law of Moses, we discover that it presents no other relation to God for the individual than this same covenant of works: “And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day [including the Decalogue], that the LORD thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee … Blessed shalt thou be …” (Deut. 28:1–14); “But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee: Cursed shalt thou be …” (Deut. 28:15–68); “Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee” (Ex. 20:12); “All that the LORD hath spoken we will do” (Ex. 19:8); “Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God … And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live” (Luke 10:25–28).

By these references to the Law of Moses and the law of the kingdom, it may be seen that both of these systems are based wholly on a covenant of works.

(2) *They are Similar Because of Elements Which are Common to Both.*

In the law of the kingdom, the Mosaic Law is carried forward and intensified. “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. … Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill … but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment. … Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her

hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5:17–28; cf. 31–48; 6:1–18, 25–34); "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matt. 7:12).

By these illustrative passages it is clear that the Law of Moses and the law of the kingdom are similar in that they contain elements which are common to both.

(3) *They are Dissimilar Because of Certain Points in Which They Differ.* In the law of the kingdom, certain features are added which are not found in the Law of Moses. These new features can be mentioned here only in part.

It has been revealed in the Scriptures above quoted that the law is intensified in the kingdom teachings. From these no element of the Law of Moses has been subtracted. Rather, to the Mosaic revelation are added the kingdom teachings of Christ concerning marriage and divorce, the taking of an oath, and the personal obligation to others. The law demanding "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth" is replaced by required submission. The other cheek is to be turned, the second mile is to be traveled, and to him that asketh, there is to be no refusal. Even the enemies are to be loved. These things are to be done "that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven," and are only further evidences that in fact and force they issue from the covenant of works. There is a new appeal for sincerity in almsgiving, in prayer, and in fasting. There is a new revelation concerning prayer; but it is prayer for the kingdom and according to conditions in the kingdom alone. Special instruction is given concerning the use of riches in the kingdom and also concerning anxiety and care.

C. The Similarity and Dissimilarity Between the Teachings of Grace and the Laws of the Kingdom. The importance of an unprejudiced consideration of these Scriptures which disclose the whole field of comparison between the teachings of grace and the laws of the kingdom cannot be too strongly emphasized. The theme is extensive. While this study of contrasts should be extended into all the kingdom teachings of the Gospels, the plan will be to follow a brief analysis of the Manifesto of the King as recorded in Matthew 5–7, and to compare the various precepts there revealed with the precepts given to the believer under grace. It will be necessary, also, to compare these precepts with the kingdom teachings of the Old Testament; for it will

be found that the teachings of the kingdom presented in Matthew 5–7 are in exact accord with the Old Testament predictions regarding the kingdom, and are almost wholly in disagreement with the teachings of grace.

In Luke 16:16 it is written: “The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.” The message of John the Baptist was something new. It was in no sense the preaching of “the law and the prophets” as a direct application of the Mosaic system. Nevertheless, his preaching was purely legal in character. An important exception to this is found in the Gospel by John. In that Gospel, the characterizing words selected from all the sayings of John the Baptist are, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (1:29). The Gospel by John is distinctly of salvation and grace through believing, and the selection of this one message from John the Baptist beautifully illustrates the mind and purpose of the Spirit in the choice of material for the construction of that gospel of divine grace. This exceptional word from John the Baptist, fitted to the message of grace in the Gospel by John, should not be confused with his legalistic preaching as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, where his real ministry as the forerunner is set forth. What he preached is clearly stated in Luke 3:7–14: “Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance … And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then? He answereth and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise. Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.”

The intense emphasis on the covenant of meritorious works is obvious in this message; but John did not preach Moses and the prophets. The law and the prophets were *until* John. It is to be concluded that the preaching of John the Baptist was wholly new, and was according to his mission as herald of the King; but that message is legalistic and not gracious. It is a covenant of works and not a covenant of faith. Added light is also given in Luke 16:16 relative to the kingdom character of John’s preaching. The divine rule in the earth which Matthew terms “the kingdom of heaven” is by Luke termed “the kingdom of God.” This is justified since the kingdom of God includes

the kingdom of heaven, or the earth-rule of the King. Since Matthew and Luke are so evidently referring to the same divine rule in the earth, and often reporting the same message when employing these two phrases, it is conclusive that Luke's use of the term, "the kingdom of God," here and elsewhere is with reference to the limited divine rule in the earth. Into that kingdom, men who enter are said to be "pressing in." "To crowd oneself in" is the literal meaning, and the word suggests intense human effort, and implies the need of merit which is required for entrance into the kingdom. There are at least three major distinctions which appear when the teachings of grace are contrasted with the teachings of the kingdom.

First, In the kingdom message, hope is, in the main, centered in the kingdom of heaven, and, in Mark and Luke, in that aspect of the kingdom of God which corresponds with the kingdom of heaven. This, it should be remembered, is not heaven: in this connection, it is the rule of the Messiah-King in the earth. However, the larger rule of the kingdom of God is mentioned once (Matt. 6:33), and at a point when all the divine interests are in view, and three times the kingdom message holds the anticipation of heaven itself before its children (Matt. 5:12; 6:20; 7:23). In the teachings of grace it is heaven itself which is in view, with never a reference to the kingdom of heaven, other than that the saints shall reign with the King. Christians, on the other hand, are often related to the larger sphere of the kingdom of God (see John 3:3).

Second, These two lines of teaching may be identified, also, by the use of the great words they employ. According to both the Old Testament and the New, *righteousness* and *peace* are the great words of the kingdom. The Sermon on the Mount is the expansion of the full meaning of the personal righteousness which is required in the kingdom. The great words in this age are *believe* and *grace*. Not once do these words appear in connection with the kingdom teachings of Matthew 5–7. Mercy is unfolded in grace rather than in righteousness.

Third, The kingdom teachings, like the Law of Moses, are based on a covenant of works. The teachings of grace, on the other hand, are based on a covenant of faith. In the one case, righteousness is demanded; in the other it is provided, both imputed and imparted, or inwrought. One is of a blessing to be bestowed because of a perfect life, the other is of a life to be lived because of a perfect blessing already received.

Too often it has been supposed that the kingdom reign of Messiah will be a period of sinlessness on the earth, corresponding to the new heavens and new earth which will follow. Every Scripture bearing on the kingdom emphasizes the moral conditions which will obtain in the kingdom. Because of the binding of Satan, and the immediate judgment for sin, the high moral requirements in the kingdom will be possible; but there will be evil to judge, the enemy will persecute, and many who have professed will fail because they have not actually *done* the will of the King. So great will be the moral advance in world conditions in the kingdom over the present age, that righteousness will then "reign," while at the present time righteousness "suffers" (2 Tim. 3:12).

The various topics presented in the Sermon on the Mount are here considered in order:

(1) *The Beatitudes.* This kingdom message opens with the record of the ninefold blessing which is promised and provided for the faithful child of the kingdom (Matt. 5:1–12). These blessings are won through merit. This is in sharp contrast to the blessings in the exalted position of the Christian to which he instantly attains through Christ at the moment he believes.

(a)"Blessed are the poor [humble] in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of heaven." As Christ declared of the little child, "of such is the kingdom of heaven." In the Old Testament vision of the coming manifestation of the King, it is said: "I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (Isa. 57:15). To the Christian it is said: "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind" (Col. 3:12). These virtues are not put on by the Christian to gain heaven, much less the kingdom of heaven. They are put on because these elements of character belong to the one who is already "elect of God, holy and beloved." Christ is the pattern (Phil. 2:8), and God resists aught but humbleness of mind (James 4:6). In the teachings of grace, "put on" does not mean to pretend, or assume; it is the manifestation of the regenerate life through the power of the Spirit (see Eph. 4:24; 6:11; Col. 3:12).

(b)"Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." Mourning does not belong to the Bride of Christ. To her a different message has been given: "Rejoice, and again I say, Rejoice." Mourning is the portion of Israel

until her King comes, and when He comes, it will be "to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness" (Isa. 61:2–3; cf. Isa. 51:3; 66:13; 35:10; 51:11; Zech. 1:17).

(c) "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Under grace, meekness is wrought in the believer by the Spirit, and is never rewarded; but the judgments of the King will be to "reprove with equity for the meek of the earth" (Isa. 11:4; cf. Isa. 29:19; Zeph. 2:3; Ps. 45:4; 76:9). The earth is to be inherited in the kingdom reign. The glory of the King will be in the earth. It could hardly be supposed that the meek are inheriting the earth now, or that this is any promise to the Church, to whom no earthly promise is made. Those who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time, have an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven.

(d) "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." The Christian may crave a closer walk with God; but he is already "made the righteousness of God in him." In distinction to this, righteousness is that quality which must be *attained* in the kingdom (Matt. 5:20). "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory" (Isa. 62:1–2; cf. Ps. 72:1–4; 85:10–11, 13; Isa. 11:4–5).

(e) "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." The exact condition revealed in this promise should be carefully considered; for, in this passage, mercy from God is made to depend wholly on the exercise of mercy toward others. This is pure law. Under grace the Christian is besought to be merciful, as one who has already obtained mercy (Eph. 2:4–5; Titus 3:5). The mercy of God will go forth in grace to the nation Israel when He gathers them into their own land (Ezek. 39:25); but He will, at the same time, deal with them as individuals by law: "But the mercy of the LORD is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children; to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them" (Ps. 103:17–18).

“Therefore hath the LORD recompensed me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands in his eyesight. With the merciful thou wilt shew thyself merciful; with an upright man thou wilt shew thyself upright; with the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure; and with the froward thou wilt shew thyself froward” (Ps. 18:24–26). Under grace, He is rich in mercy, even when we were “dead in sins.”

(f) “Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.” Opposed to this, and under grace it is written: “But we see Jesus” and “God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (Heb. 2:9; 2 Cor. 4:6). In Christ, God *now* is revealed to the believer, while the kingdom promise to the pure in heart is that they *shall* see God. The kingdom promises continue: “He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly. … Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty” (Isa. 33:15–17). “Who shall ascend into the hill of the LORD? or who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart” (Ps. 24:3–4).

(g) “Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.” *Peace* is one of the two great words in the kingdom. The King, who is “The Prince of Peace,” shall so reign that righteousness and peace shall cover the earth as waters cover the face of the deep (cf. Ps. 72:3, 7). In that kingdom there will be special distinction given to the one who promotes peace. “They shall be called the children of God.” Under grace, no one is constituted a child of God by any works whatsoever. “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:26).

(h) “Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for their’s is the kingdom of heaven.” Again, the issue is *righteousness*. The Christian, on the contrary, suffers with Christ and for His sake, and his reward is in heaven. “But all these things will they do unto you for my name’s sake” (John 15:21) . “All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution” (2 Tim. 3:12).

(i) “Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.” The believer is called to suffer for Christ’s sake: “For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake” (Phil. 1:29); “If we suffer, we

shall also reign with him" (2 Tim. 2:12). It should be noted that when the children of the kingdom are compared to any class of men in suffering, they are taken back to prophets which were before them, and not to the saints who comprise the Body of Christ.

Concluding these observations concerning the nine beatitudes, attention should be given to the fact that, in contrast to the ninefold, self-earned blessing of the kingdom, the believer under grace is to experience a ninefold blessing which is produced *in* him by the direct power of the indwelling Spirit. A careful comparison should be made of the ninefold blessing which is promised under the kingdom, with the ninefold blessing which is prepared under grace. It will be seen that all that is *demanded* under the law of the kingdom as a condition of blessing, is, under grace, divinely *provided*. The two aspects of life which are represented by these two groups of characterizing words are most significant. The total of all the blessings in the kingdom is not comparable with the superabundant "fruit of the Spirit"—"love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (self-control, Gal. 5:22–23). The very tense of the verb used is important. Under grace, the fruit of the Spirit *is*, which indicates the present possession of the blessing through pure grace; while under the kingdom, the blessing *shall be* to such as merit it by their own works.

(2) *The Similitudes of the Righteous in the Kingdom.* In this portion of Scripture (Matt. 5:13–16) the children of the kingdom are likened to the salt of the earth, and the light of the world. "Salt," as a figure, is not so used in the teachings of Moses or in the teachings of grace. However, the Christian is said to be "light in the Lord," and is exhorted to "walk" as a child of light (Eph. 5:8). Again, "Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day" (1 Thess. 5:5). But, concerning Israel in her coming kingdom blessing, it is said: "I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles"; "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth"; "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning"; "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising"; "The LORD shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended" (Isa. 42:6; 49:6; 58:8; 60:3, 20). Still another contrast appears in this connection: The

Christian is appointed to manifest Christ (1 Pet. 2:9), but the children of the kingdom are appointed to manifest their good works (Matt. 5:16).

(3) *Christ Interprets the Law in Its Relation to the Kingdom.* This Scripture (Matt. 5:17–48) declares that the law shall not pass until it is fulfilled. This has to do with observance, for it is added: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments … shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." It is the Law of Moses intensified. In so doing, Christ transfers the obligation from the outward act to the attitude of the heart. This intensifies, rather than relieves, its legal character. It carries with it the most scorching condemnation possible to law. The Christian is not under law. He has no "altar" other than Christ (Heb. 13:10). The altar is always related either to the Mosaic system or to the coming kingdom and is intensely legalistic in character. Concerning the kingdom it is said: "Their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar" (Isa. 56:7; cf. 60:7; Ezek. 43:13–27; Zech. 14:20). The child of the kingdom must agree with his adversary quickly, lest he be cast into prison where there is no degree of mercy available (Matt: 5:25–26). To the child of God it is said: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men" (Rom. 12:17–21). The high standard of generous submission is, in the kingdom teachings, substituted in place of the exact equity of the Law of Moses (Matt. 5:38–48). In place of the principle of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," the other cheek is to be turned, the cloke is to be added to the coat, the second mile is to be traveled, no goods are to be withheld from him that asketh, and enemies are to be loved. This is not to be done as an expression of a high position already received in grace: it is to be done *meritoriously* that "ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Such relations between men will be required and practiced in the day when the King shall reign in righteousness and Satan is bound. The teachings of grace concerning murder, adultery, divorce, and swearing are all clearly stated in the Scriptures. In this portion of the Sermon on the Mount, the extreme legal penalty for wrongdoing is imposed (5:20–22, 29–30). Is any child of God, under grace, in danger of judgment or the awful penalty of hell fire? Argument is uncalled for in the light of the Scriptures: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation [judgment]; but is passed from death unto life" (John 5:24);

“And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man [created thing] pluck them out of my hand” (John 10:28); “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1). It is quite true that believers will be judged by Christ with reference to the character of their life and service, that the Father chastens every son whom He receiveth, and that the Apostle Paul suggested that he might visit a certain church with a rod; but how different is all this from the penalty of hell fire which is unconditionally imposed on the children of the kingdom because of their sin! How imperfectly believers realize, when they turn from grace, the awful penalties of the law and the meaning of eternal damnation! How precious, too, that such ignorance of the law does not change the abiding, divine covenant of grace into which the believer has been brought through faith in Christ!

(4) *Mere Externalism Rebuked.* In the kingdom, a spirit of vain show as the actuating motive in almsgiving, offering of prayer, and professions of devotion will be judged instantly (Matt. 6:1–7, 16–18; 7:21–29). On the other hand, these things, if done in secret, will be rewarded “openly.” Such recompense should not be confused with the rewards for service which are promised the Christian at the judgment seat of Christ. Humble faithfulness in the kingdom will receive its immediate recognition from the King.

(5) *Prayer for the Kingdom, and in the Kingdom.* What is commonly called “The Lord’s Prayer,” but what is, in reality, the prayer that the Lord taught His disciples when contemplating the kingdom, is not intended to be a ritual prayer. He said (Matt. 6:8–15; 7:7–11): “After this manner therefore pray ye.” The prayer is directly concerned with the issues of the coming kingdom. “Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.” Of the great themes mentioned in this model kingdom-prayer, but one is taken up for special comment and emphasis. It is as though the Spirit of God were seeking to save the reader from any confusion at this point. This special comment amplifies the one petition: “And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.” The divine comment on this reads: “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.” This, again, is purely legal. Forgiveness on the part of the Christian is enjoined; but it is enjoined in agreement with the exalted principle of grace: “Tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for

Christ's sake hath forgiven you"; "Even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye" (Eph. 4:32; Col. 3:13; cf. 1 John 1:9). The legal character of this great kingdom-prayer should not be overlooked because of sentimental reasons growing out of early training.

Attempts have been made to relate this divine forgiveness, which is conditioned on a forgiving attitude of the sinner, with the Father's present forgiveness toward the believer who is under grace. Such an interpretation is as foreign to the precise relationships which belong to grace as it would be if the passage were said to teach the present divine forgiveness of the unsaved. Present forgiveness for both the unsaved and the saved is a matter of pure grace, and the divine conditions which are imposed are in perfect harmony with this fact. In this age, the unsaved are forgiven as a part of the entire accomplishment in salvation on the one condition that they *believe* (Eph. 4:32), and the saved are forgiven on the one condition that they *confess* (1 John 1:9). These two words do not represent meritorious works; they represent the simple adjustment of the heart to that which is already provided in the grace of God. The cross has changed things for all. A covenant purely of law-works is stated in the passage in question. Such a covenant is the very foundation of all kingdom teaching; but it is wholly foreign to the teachings of grace. Christ, as some claim, must not be presented as a stern, austere Ruler. The marvel is that He is ever anything else. God's holiness is not subject to gracious leniency toward sin. Apart from the cross where redemption's price has been paid, there could be nothing but the consuming fire of judgment; but, since God in infinite love has provided a Substitute, there is boundless grace. In this age, God is dealing with men on the ground of His grace as it is in Christ. His dealings with men in the coming age are based on a very different relationship. At that time, the King will rule with a rod of iron. There is no word of the cross, or of grace, in the kingdom teachings. This prayer is, by its own expression, a kingdom prayer. The whole basis of appeal in this prayer, as in Matthew 7:7–11, is the faithfulness of the Father to His children in the kingdom. The basis of appeal in prayer during the days before Christ, or under Moses, was the faithfulness of Jehovah to His covenants. The basis of appeal in prayer under grace is that of the believer's present union and identification with Christ. Access is provided only through Christ (Heb. 10:19–20), and the new argument of appeal in prayer is, in the name, and

for the glory, of Christ. Long after He had taught His disciples the kingdom form of prayer, and after He had turned to the teachings of pure grace He said: “Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full” (John 16:24). The kingdom form of prayer omits every feature of the essential note of prevailing prayer under grace.

(6) *The Law Governing Riches in the Kingdom.* The right use of riches (Matt. 6:19–24), as under grace, will be rewarded in heaven, and there is no compromise: “Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

(7) *The Father’s Care Over the Children of the Kingdom.* This portion of the Scriptures (Matt. 6:25–34) is one of surpassing sweetness. As God clothes the lilies of the field, so will He clothe those who rest in Him by faith; but here His care is only for such as seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, while, under grace, His care is unconditioned by any human work or merit: “Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you”; “Be careful for nothing” (1 Pet. 5:7; Phil. 4:6). The same principle of divine care was presented under the Law of Moses, but in the form of pure law: “Cast thy burden upon the LORD, and he shall sustain thee: he shall never suffer the righteous to be moved” (Ps. 55:22).

(8) *Warning Against Judgment of Others.* This kingdom law is unyielding (Matt. 7:1–6): “Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.” One under grace has passed beyond all judgment, by virtue of his acceptance in Christ who died for him (John 5:24). He may be chastened by his Father, which is a form of judgment (1 Cor. 11:27–32); but such judgment is never said to be the return of his sin back upon his own head, as is prescribed in this portion of the kingdom teaching.

(9) *Warning Against False Prophets.* “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits” (Matt. 7:15–20). The warning here is against false prophets who are to be discerned by the quality of their lives. The warning to the children of God under grace is against false teachers who are to be discerned by their doctrine concerning Christ (2 Pet. 2:1; 2 John 1:7–11): never by their lives; for outwardly, false teachers are said to appear as the “apostles of Christ,” and to be directly under the power of

Satan who himself appears as an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:13–15). The attractive personality of the false teacher affords great advantage as a background for the appeal he makes for his doctrine.

(10) *Three Determining Statements Concerning the Kingdom.* (a) "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). Exposition of this passage is unnecessary. It is the foundation of all the demands for entrance into the kingdom of heaven. It should in no wise be confused with the believer's entrance into heaven through the finished work of Christ: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us" (Titus 3:5).

(b) "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matt. 7:12). This passage stands as a conclusion of the whole appeal of this kingdom teaching. It is as a key to all that has gone before. The legal principle, restated in this passage, is not said to be any part of the teachings of grace: it is rather "the law and the prophets."

(c) "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it" (Matt. 7:13–14). Under the conditions laid down in the kingdom teachings, life is entered by a personal faithfulness (Matt. 5:29–30; 18:8–9; Luke 10:25–28). When this same exhortation is stated in the Gospel by Luke (13:24), it opens with the words, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." The word *strive* is a translation of ἀγωνίζομαι, which means 'agonize.' It suggests the uttermost expenditure of the athlete's strength in the contest. Such is the human condition that characterizes all the kingdom passages which offer entrance into life. An abrupt change is met after turning to the Gospel by John, which Gospel was written to announce the new message of grace, which is, that eternal life may be had through *believing*. No two words of Scripture more vividly express the great characterizing relationships in law and grace than *agonize*, and *believe*. Grace is the unfolding of the fact that One has agonized in our stead, and life is "through his name," and not by any degree of human faithfulness or merit.

There is a dangerous and entirely baseless sentiment abroad which assumes that every teaching of Christ must be binding during this age simply because Christ said it. The fact is forgotten that Christ, while living under, keeping, and applying the Law of Moses, also taught the principles of His future kingdom, and, at the end of His ministry and in relation to His cross, He also anticipated the teachings of grace. If this threefold division of the teachings of Christ is not recognized, there can be nothing but confusion of mind and consequent contradiction of truth.

Again, it is not unreasonable to recognize that these kingdom teachings should directly apply to a future age. The Bible is the one revelation from God to all peoples of all the ages. It is not difficult to understand that much of the Scripture applies to conditions which are now wholly in the past; nor should it be difficult to understand that some of the Scripture applies to conditions which are wholly of the future. How else shall we know of the future? Certain revelations are of the coming tribulation period and are in no sense applicable to the present time. Who has ever prayed that his flight should not be on a Sabbath day? Yet Christ commanded that prayer to be prayed (Matt. 24:20).

In like manner, the use of the word *whosoever* in Matthew 7:24 does not imply that all the people of all the ages are addressed. It is more reasonable to believe that it applies to the people living under the conditions of the period which the passage describes. The all-inclusive word *he* is used by Christ when He said, “But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved” (Matt. 24:13); but nothing could be more contradictory to the teachings of grace than the principle set forth in this passage. There will be a salvation in the tribulation for those who endure its trials to the end. Under grace, the believer endures because he *is* saved. If the word *whosoever* in Matthew 7:24 includes those who are saved by grace, then they have been thrust into the blasting covenant of works which that passage proposes, and grace is wholly sacrificed.

Thus it may be concluded that the teachings of the law, the teachings of grace, and the teachings of the kingdom are separate and complete systems of divine rule which are perfectly adapted to the varied conditions in three great dispensations. The teachings of Moses and the teachings of the kingdom are purely legal, while the instructions to the believer of this dispensation are in conformity with pure grace. There is much that is held in

common within all these rules for conduct, but this is no justification for their admixture. All that in the law appertains to life under grace is preserved and restated from the law in the great injunctions and beseechings of grace. To transgress these bounds is to frustrate grace, and to complicate the individual with the system of law in such a manner as to make him a debtor to do the whole law. The law cannot be broken or divided. It stands as a unit. To undertake any part of it is to be committed to it all. Nothing could be more unreasonable or more unscriptural than to borrow some portions from the law system, either that of Moses or of the kingdom, and, at the same time, reject other portions. He who will choose the law must, to be consistent, do the whole law (Rom. 10:5), and if he shall break it at one point, he is guilty of all (James 2:10). How precious are the riches of grace in Christ Jesus! How sweet and fitting to the child of God in grace are the heavenly beseechings of grace!

II. The Sequence of the Divine Blessing and the Human Obligation

The second major distinction between the teachings of law and the teachings of grace is seen in the varying order between the divine blessing and the human obligation. This variation is found to exist when the principle of grace is compared with the principle of law in any form of the law whatsoever. It is equally true of the Law of Moses, the law of the kingdom, or, when legally stated, of the larger conception of the law as being the whole revealed will of God. When the human obligation is presented first, and the divine blessing is made to depend on the faithful discharge of that obligation, it is of and in conformity with pure law. When the divine blessing is presented first, and the human obligation follows, it is of and in conformity with pure grace. The varying orders under law and grace may be stated in the words “do and live” or “live and do.” In the case of the law, it is *do* something with a view to being something; in the case of grace, it is be *made* something with a view to doing something. Is the Christian who is under grace saved and kept *by* good works, or is he saved and kept *unto* good works? The law said “If you will do good, I will bless you”; grace says “I have blessed you, now do good.” Under the law, man lives well to *become* accepted of God; under grace man lives well since it *becomes* one to live well who is already accepted. The law presents first a

human work to be *done*; grace presents first a divine work to be *believed*. Law begins with the question of what man ought to *do*; grace begins with the question of what God has already *done*. Every word of the law revelation is thus made to be a conditional covenant of *human* works, while every word of the grace revelation is made to be an unconditional covenant of *divine* works. The instructions given to Israel under Moses, and the instructions proposed for the government of the future kingdom in the earth are purely legal in their character. The farewell word of Moses to Israel as recorded in the closing chapters of Deuteronomy is the crystallization of the whole law of Moses. One passage is the heart of this message: "And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the LORD thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God. Blessed shalt thou be … But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee: Cursed shalt thou be…" (Deut. 28:1–68). Every teaching of the kingdom which contemplates the responsibility of the individual is, in like manner, based on a covenant of human works, and is, therefore, purely legal in character. This may be observed in all the kingdom teachings of the Old Testament and the kingdom teachings of the New Testament. Grace is extended to the *nation* when, apart from all merit, she is placed in her land, and restored to divine blessing; but the rule of the King will be on the basis of pure law, and the responsibility of the *individual* to that rule necessarily will be in conformity to the same. Beyond what has gone before in the discussion, this fact will need but a passing illustration from the kingdom teachings of the New Testament: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth"; "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy"; "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven"; "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses"; "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be

measured to you again"; "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven … Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man …" (Matt. 5:5, 7, 20; 6:14–15; 7:1–2, 21–24). To this may be added all other kingdom teachings of the New Testament.

The kingdom teachings, likewise, are to be distinguished from the teachings of grace by the order which each presents between the divine blessing and the human obligation. The word of the kingdom is, He that heareth my words and *doeth* them shall be blessed (Matt. 7:24). The word of grace is, He that heareth my words and *believeth* them shall be blessed (John 5:24). In the teachings of grace, the gracious, divine blessing always precedes, and is followed by the human obligation. This is the order maintained throughout the great doctrinal Epistles of the New Testament. These Epistles are therefore subject to a twofold division. In the first division, the mighty undertakings of God for man are disclosed, while in the second division the saved one is besought and exhorted to live on the plane to which he has been brought in the exceeding grace of God. The first division of the Book of Romans is the unfolding of the saving grace of God toward sinners, which is extended to them on the sole condition that they *believe* (1:16; 3:22, 26; 4:5; 10:4); the second division is an appeal for a corresponding manner of daily life, which life is "reasonable" in view of the results which God has already achieved in sovereign grace. This appeal is stated in the first verse of the second section: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1). The book of Ephesians opens with three chapters in which there is not one requirement for human conduct; it *is* the unfolding of the marvelous grace of God in bringing the believer to the exalted heavenly positions which are his in Christ. The opening verse of the second section is a condensation of all that follows: "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation [calling] wherewith ye are called" (Eph. 4:1). In like manner, the book of Colossians opens with a portion which is devoid of even a semblance of an appeal in matters of conduct, since it is occupied with the unfolding of the glory of Christ and the fact of the perfect standing of the believer in Him. The second portion is

an appeal, not for the human works which might induce God so to bless the sinner, but for works which are consistent with the present, God-wrought, glorious union with Christ: “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God” (Col. 3:1).

The grace order between the divine blessing and the human obligation is preserved in every offer of salvation to the sinner and in every purpose looking toward the preservation of the saint. Since this is the basis of the divine purpose in the ages and the only hope of the sinner, or the saint, it should not be questioned upon a superficial consideration of the Scriptures. There is the widest possible difference between the two replies of Christ to practically the same question: “What shall I do to inherit eternal life?” Answer: “This do, and thou shalt live.” Again: “What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?” Answer: “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.” One answer is related to the law of the kingdom; the other is related to grace, wherein Christ is seen as the “living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.”

It is to be concluded, therefore, that the sinner is saved by grace apart from every human demand other than that he receive that grace as it is for him in Christ, and that the saint is kept by grace *unto* good works but not *by* good works. The righteous Father must insist on the good works in the life of His child; but He does not make these works the condition of His faithfulness. This is the vital distinction, then, between the order relating divine blessing with human obligation in the two systems—law and grace. One is a covenant of pure works; the other is a covenant of pure grace. Consideration should be given to the fact that rewards, which are bestowed in addition to the blessing of the saving grace of God, are offered to the saved one on the principle of merit; and, on the other hand, grace was offered to the people under the law, in addition to the demands of the law, in the provisions of the sacrifices. In no case do these added blessings condition the exact character of the covenant of grace, on the one hand, or the covenant of works, on the other hand.

Since the covenant of grace which is based on human faith was established in the promises made to Abraham, the covenant of the law, made four hundred years later, and added only for a temporary purpose,

cannot disannul it. The reign of law, with its covenant of works, ceased with the death of Christ. Its purpose had been accomplished, and its appointed time had expired. Thus the by-faith principle which was announced in the Abrahamic covenant is brought again into force, through the death of Christ. The divine blessing is now unto him that "worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly." "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:3, 5, 23–25). By this Scripture it is announced that the by-faith principle of the Abrahamic covenant is continued and now offered through the sacrificial death of Christ. This fact is restated thus: "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. … The law is not of faith" (Gal. 3:9–12). The law was a covenant of works; but the works always failed through the weakness of the flesh, and the law then became, of necessity, a condemnation and curse. According to this same Scripture, the holy will of God is not ignored in grace: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (3:13). This, it must be observed, was wrought under the one great purpose: "That the blessing of Abraham [acceptance in the imputed righteousness of God] might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ" (3:14).

After declaring that the law has passed, either as the ground of the justification of the sinner (Gal. 3:24), or as the rule of life for the believer (Gal. 3:25), the Apostle challenges the law-ridden Christians of Galatia to consider the fact and force of two great covenants which can in no wise coexist. He therefore points out that one gave way to the other: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law [and he is writing to Christians only, concerning the law as a rule of their lives], do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants [the by-works covenant which would depend on

the flesh and the by-faith covenant which would depend only on God]; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar [the bondmaid]. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia [where the Mosaic Law was given], and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children [Israel]. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all [typified by Sarah, who illustrates the by-faith principle which depends on God alone]. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not [suggesting the utter helplessness of the flesh before God]; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband [or the arm of flesh on which one might depend]. Now we, brethren [Christians], as Isaac was, are the children of promise [we have been saved by faith]. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman [not merely her offspring, but the whole by-works principle which she represents] and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free" (Gal. 4:21–31).

It was concerning the promise of the supernatural birth of Isaac that Abraham believed God, and that belief was counted unto him for righteousness. Afterwards, Abraham turned to the flesh in the birth of Ishmael (Gen. 16:1–4). This twofold fact illustrates, with all the perfection of the Word of God, the two covenants—the one of faith, and the other of works. The lapse in Abraham's faith typified the intrusion of an age of law. So, also, the relationship with Hagar represents what man can do in his effort to be accepted of God. The supernatural relationship with Sarah represents what God can do for one who will believe. The marvels of grace are indicated by the multitudinous offspring of Sarah: not that her physical seed, Israel, are the children of faith; but they, being more exalted than the children of Hagar, typify the surpassing victory of God through grace. There can be no commingling, or compromising, of these two great covenants. "What saith the Scripture?" should be the end of discussion. The testimony is, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." The by-works principle of the law, and the by-faith principle of grace cannot

cooperate, or coexist, either in the salvation of the sinner, or in the rule of life for the believer.

The by-works principle of the law is not limited to the fleshly effort to do the particular things found in the Law of Moses, or the law of the kingdom. It is the fleshly effort to do *anything* by which one seeks to become acceptable to God. Therefore, when the teachings of grace are attempted with a view to being accepted of God, they become purely legal in their character. In like manner, when the elements which are contained in the law and restated under grace are attempted in the power of the Spirit and on the basis that acceptance with God is already gained through Christ, these precepts become purely gracious in their character. This principle may be extended to the larger sphere of any and all self-imposed law, regardless of Bible injunctions. In which case it will be seen that the doing of any good works with a view to being accepted of God, is purely legal in character; contrariwise, the doing of any good works because one believes himself to be accepted through Christ, is purely gracious in character. The legalist may thus enter the field of the teachings of grace and suppose himself to be subject to the whole Bible, when, in reality, he has no conception of the blessings and relationships in grace. A person either chooses to accept Christ in the confidence that Christ is *all* he will ever need to make himself acceptable to God, or he chooses to depend on the best that he can do for himself by good works. The latter is the normal bent of the natural mind. The proposition of becoming acceptable to God by being good, appeals to the fallen heart as the only reasonable thing to do and, apart from that which it has pleased God to reveal concerning grace, it is the only reasonable thing to do. It therefore becomes a question of believing the record God has given concerning His Son (1 John 5:10).

Since there is so much delusion in a counterfeit, the person most difficult to reach with the gospel of divine grace is the person who is *trying* to do all that a Christian ought to do, but is doing it as a means of becoming accepted before God. His willing acknowledgment of the value of the Christian life, his unquestioned reception into the fellowship of believers, and his real sincerity in all Christian activities constitute his greatest hindrance. Such a one is more deluded than the person who acknowledges no relationship to God. Both fall short and are lost through their failure to believe on Christ as the all-sufficient Savior; but, naturally, the person who has no false hope is

more apt to become conscious of the fact that he is lost than is the person who believes he is a Christian. The law cannot save, and the one who transforms the teachings of grace into a legal system by attempting to do them in order that he may be right with God, and has not believed on Christ, is still unsaved. Turning to meritorious works as a basis of salvation, be those works a precise counterfeit of a true Christian life, is to be under a by-works relation to God, and therefore to be under condemnation; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight. Turning to meritorious works as the basis of keeping after one is saved, or as a rule of life for the saved, is to return to a by-works relation to God, from which one has already been saved. It is to fall from grace, and to lose the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. The by-works principle can no more avail for our keeping, than it can avail for our salvation. As God could provide Abraham with a seed under an unconditional covenant, so, under the same unconditional covenant, He could guarantee the future of that seed even to the time when their number should exceed the stars of the heavens. Likewise, under the present unconditional covenant of grace made in the blood of Christ, God can guarantee the future security of every child of His under grace. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be *sure* (Rom. 4:16).

Lastly, the covenant of works is "cast out" because it is fulfilled and superseded by the fuller and more perfect covenant of faith. All that the covenant of works contemplated as a result of a lifetime of human struggle, is instantly accomplished in the power of God through the covenant of faith. By faith in Christ, the believer is *made* the righteousness of God in Him, and *made* accepted in the Beloved. This is a perfection of relationship with God to which no human works could ever attain, and to which human works can add nothing. Being related to God through the by-faith principle, the whole object of law-works is more than fulfilled. Thus the law is ended in the death of Christ. The bondwoman is cast out. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that *believeth*.

Amazing, indeed, is the blindness of heart that is not instructed by the tragic experience of failure on the part of the countless millions who have been lost under the by-works covenant! Yet men are still turning to their own works, both moral and religious, in the vain hope that through them they may be accepted of God. To such He must ever be as unapproachable

as the mountain of awful fire, thunder, lightning, and earthquake; but to the one who turns to the sufficiency which is in Christ, God becomes the Father of all mercies, and His power and grace are exercised in the behalf of that one for all time and eternity. The awful throne of God's holy judgments becomes a throne of infinite *grace*. To one thus saved, and whose security is guaranteed, the by-works covenant of the law is in no wise adapted as a rule of life; for that covenant looks beyond to a time of acceptance still future, when the flesh shall have completed its task. Only the teachings of grace are consistent for one who is saved by grace. Those teachings alone counsel him about that manner of life which is in accord with his present position in grace.

The second major distinction between the rule of law and the rule of grace is, then, that these two systems are opposites in reference to the order between the divine blessing and the human obligation, and this holds true for any life or service whatsoever which may be undertaken.

III. Different Degrees of Difficulty and Different Degrees of Divine Enablement

Since much has been presented on this feature of grace and since it must yet be considered at length under Pneumatology (Vol. VI), it will not receive added treatment here beyond the declaration that the truth that this is one of the most vital characteristics of the whole grace system and, at the same time, one which is most neglected. The student is urged to review what has been written earlier on this theme, and to become aware of the revelation that the Christian is called to live a superhuman life and is expected to accomplish that end by the supernatural enabling power of the indwelling Holy Spirit, who is given for that purpose and whose ministry may be realized on the principle of faith. The utter want of any reference to the Holy Spirit or to His enabling power in behalf of the individual characterizes both the Mosaic system and that of the kingdom. This divergence between the legal systems and the system of grace is the complete and final evidence that they are distinctive to the last degree and that attempts to combine them will be undertaken only by those who do not observe the most elementary things that are involved.

Chapter XII

The Law Systems and Judaism Done Away

Since law and grace are opposed to each other at every point, it is impossible for them to coexist, either as the ground of acceptance before God or as the rule of life. Of necessity, therefore, the Scriptures of the New Testament which present the facts and scope of grace, both assume and directly teach that the law is done away. Consequently, it is not in force in the present age in any sense whatsoever. This present nullification of the law applies not only to the legal code of the Mosaic system and the law of the kingdom, but to every possible application of the principle of law. The larger conception of the law, as before defined, is threefold: (1) the actual written instructions of both the teachings of Moses and the teachings of the kingdom; (2) the law covenant of works in all of its applications, which conditions blessing and acceptance with God on the ground of personal merit; and (3) the law principle of dependence on the energy of the flesh, in place of the faith principle of a dependence on the power of the indwelling Spirit. It will be seen also that (4) Judaism is done away.

That the law, in the widest threefold meaning of the term, is now set aside, is revealed as a fundamental fact in the divine economy of grace. That the law has now ceased, even in its widest meaning, should be considered with unprejudiced attention.

I. The Actual Written Instructions of Both the Teachings of the Law of Moses and the Kingdom are Done Away

These actual written commandments, either of Moses or of the kingdom, are not the rule of the believer's life under grace any more than these systems are the basis of his salvation. The complete withdrawal of the authority of these two systems of law will now be considered:

1. The Passing of the Law of Mosses is the Explicit Teaching of the New Testament Scriptures. An important and determining feature of this truth is found in the difference which is revealed between the abiding,

eternal character of the Abrahamic covenant and the temporal, limited character of the law covenant of Sinai. The Abrahamic covenant anticipated both the earthly seed through Israel and the spiritual seed that would stand related to God on the principle of faith. This covenant, being without human condition, simply declares the unchanging purpose of Jehovah. It will be achieved in pure grace, apart from every human factor, and its accomplishments are eternal. On the other hand, the covenant of the Mosaic Law was a temporary, ad interim dealing with God, which was deliberately chosen by the nation Israel, and which applied to them only. It was plainly designed to govern that people in their land, and for such time as might intervene between their acceptance of that covenant, and the coming of the promised Seed. The Seed is Christ. The coming of Christ into the world was the realization of the hope contained in the Abrahamic covenant, and, of necessity, the termination of the ad interim reign of the law. It is written: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise [the Abrahamic covenant] made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression [though there is sin]. Therefore it [the promise through Abraham] is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law [believing Israelites], but to that also which is of the faith [even believing Gentiles] of Abraham; who is the father [on a faith principle] of us all. … And therefore it [the faith] was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. 4:13–24). Thus it is demonstrated that the law has no place in the divine dealings under grace. Again, it is written: The law "was added … till the seed should come" (Gal. 3:19); but when the Seed did come, the authority of the Mosaic Law was no longer required, or even possible, as a principle of divine rule. It was the purpose of God to close every door of access to Himself, but one. This fact is next stated in the argument of the Apostle: "But the scripture hath concluded all [both Jew and Gentile] under sin" (Gal. 3:22). This, it has been seen, is more than a declaration that men are sinners by nature and by practice, and therefore subject to divine displeasure; it is a universal,

judicial decree which places the whole race absolutely without merit before God. From that position there is no escape other than through the exercise of pure grace on the part of God. The divine motive in the universal sentence of the race under sin is declared to be, according to that which follows in the text: “That the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Gal. 3:22). Thus the ad interim reign of the law is completely annulled, and the divine blessing is now centered in Christ as the sole object of faith, being promised to them that believe. The law principle is not retained as a possible optional relationship to God: “There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12).

It is important to observe, however, that, while God has completely terminated the reign of law by the death of Christ, so far as His relation to man is concerned, man is free to reject or distort the truth of God, and to impose the law obligation upon himself. In such a case, it does not follow that God accepts, or even recognizes, any self-imposed legalism. He could not do so. It does follow, however, that the self-constituted legalist, to be consistent with his own choice, should any part of the law be accepted as binding, must observe the whole of the law to do it right. The law was a unit. He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all; whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; and he is a debtor to do the whole law. Since the law is done away, these statements can apply only to the one who, without divine sanction or recognition, has assumed the obligation of the law.

The following Scriptures disclose the fact that the law was never given to any people other than Israel: “Hear, O Israel” (Deut. 5:1); “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law” (Rom. 9:4); “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature [practice] the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves” (Rom. 2:14); “Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law” (John 18:31); “Gallio said unto the Jews, If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you: but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters” (Acts 18:14–15). The chief captain of the Roman army wrote of Paul: “whom I perceived to be accused of

questions of their law" (Acts 23:29). Paul answered for himself: "Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Caesar, have I offended any thing at all" (Acts 25:8); "But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their [not, your] law" (John 15:25).

There is no record of any assumption of the law on the part of the Gentiles before the death of Christ. At the cross, it will be seen, the divine application of the law ceased even for the Jews, and *all*—Jews and Gentiles—were shut up to grace alone; but the Jews, because of unbelief, still persist in the observance of the law which was given to them from God by the hand of Moses, while Gentiles, because of failure to recognize the meaning of the death of Christ and the essential character of pure grace, are assuming the law obligation. This many are doing, some as a means unto justification before God, and some who are saved by faith in Christ, as a rule of life. These two errors—that of the Jew and that of the Gentile—are clearly set forth in Scripture. Of Israel it is said: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart." But in the case of an individual Jew receiving Christ it is said: "Nevertheless when it [the heart of a Jew] shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away" (2 Cor. 3:15–16). Turning to the Gentiles, there are two aspects of their assumption of the law. (1) With reference to the certainty of divine judgments on the Gentiles before the cross, or during the period in which the law was divinely imposed on Israel, it is said: "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law." Then it is added concerning Israel, "And as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law" (Rom. 2:12). It is impossible to believe that this Scripture offers an optional choice between justification by the law and justification which is by faith alone; for the word is final relative to God's dealing in this age: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Rom. 3:20). Reference here is, without question, to conditions which did obtain when the law was in force. (2) Regarding assumption of the law by Gentiles it is said: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature [practice] the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another" (Rom. 2:14–15). Thus the anticipation of assumption

of the law by Gentiles is revealed, and the precise effect of the law upon them. The conscience is molded and they stand before a self-imposed condemnation. To such there is no blessing. All that the legal conscience can do is to *accuse* or *excuse* for failure. Let it never be supposed that, because of self-imposed legality and misguided conscience, there is any divine recognition of Gentiles as being under the law. God must be true to His eternal purpose as revealed in His Word, and men stand, or fall, before Him now on the sole basis of their attitude toward His saving grace in Christ. Those who are now lost may honestly suppose that they do the will of God in perpetuating the principle of the law with its blasting curse; but they are lost notwithstanding, apart from Christ. It is the people of a past age who will be judged by the law. The Gentiles who now practice the things contained in the law are not said to be subject to divine judgment because of broken law; they are, by that self-imposed law, either self-accused or self-excused, according as they have created a conscience in regard to the law. The law produces the effect only of discomfort, misdirection, confusion, and limitation of their own conscience.

Before turning to the positive teaching of the Scripture relative to the passing of the law, it may be important to restate the three major aspects of the law, which are yet to be considered in this connection more at length:

First, both the commandments and requirements of the Mosaic system and the commandments and requirements of the kingdom are wholly legal in their character, and, together, comprise the written statement of the law, which law, it will be seen, is set aside during the present reign of grace.

Second, every human work, be it even the impossible, heaven-high beseeching of grace, which is wrought with a view to meriting acceptance with God, is of the nature of a legal covenant of works, and therefore belongs only to the law. Through the finished work of Christ, acceptance with God is perfectly secured; but that acceptance can be experienced only through a faith which turns from dependence on merit, and rests in Christ as the sufficient Savior. In like manner, it will be seen, the whole proposition of legal, meritorious acceptance with God has passed during the reign of grace.

Third, again, any manner of life or service which is lived in dependence on the flesh, rather than in dependence on the Spirit, is legal in character and has passed during the present period in which grace reigns. It is written:

“If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law” (Gal. 5:18). The law made its appeal only to the flesh, and, therefore, to turn to the flesh is to turn to the sphere of the law.

The law, though wholly superseded by grace, may now be self-imposed. This may be done by turning for a rule of life to the written legal code of Moses, or of the kingdom; it may be done by turning to self-works as the basis of acceptance with God; or it may be done by depending on the energy of the flesh for power to live well-pleasing to God. Self-imposed law, of whatever kind, is not acceptable to God; but it, like all human sin, may be chosen by the free will of man, and may be practiced in opposition to the revealed will of God. In view of the positive Biblical statements relative to the passing of the law, question may be raised about the meaning of certain passages:

Galatians 3:23. “But before faith came, we were kept under the law.” This is in no sense the present experience of the unsaved before they accept Christ. The Apostle is here speaking as a Jew, and of those circumstances which could have existed only for the Jew of the early church who had lived under both the dispensation of Moses and the dispensation of grace. Nevertheless, in the wider meaning of the law, before stated, all humanity was delivered by the death of Christ from the obligation of meritorious works, and from the necessity of depending on the flesh. “For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them”; “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law”; “God sending his own Son … condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us” (Gal. 3:10, 13; Rom. 8:3–4).

1 Corinthians 9:20. The Apostle said that he became “to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law.” This is plainly a consideration of the whole class of people who have imposed the law upon themselves in any aspect of the law whatsoever (note Gal. 4:21).

Romans 4:14. “For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect.” This is equally true of all humanity when the larger aspects of the law are in view; but it should also be pointed out that the agelong designation of the Jews as being “of the

law," in contrast to Gentiles to whom no law was ever given, still obtained in the early church (cf. Rom. 2:23; 4:16).

Romans 2:13. "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." This is to state an inherent principle of the law. It was an absolute covenant of works. No one is now to be justified by the law (cf. Rom. 3:20; Gal. 3:11). Again, "For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision" (Rom. 2:25). This, likewise, is a principle which belonged to the law. Failure to keep the law was a discredit to God, and an insult to His righteousness (cf. Isa. 52:5). The same principle is a warning to all who attempt, or even contemplate, the keeping of the law (see also James 2:10).

Romans 3:31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." The law has never been kept by those who tried to keep it. It is kept, however, by those who humbly acknowledge their helplessness to do anything well-pleasing to God, and who turn and find shelter in Christ who has met every demand of the law for them. Such, and only such, have ever vindicated the holy law of God. The people who attempt to keep the law have always outraged the law.

Romans 7:16. "If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good." The use of the word *law* throughout this whole context (7:15–8:13) is clearly of the wider sphere of the whole will of God, rather than the limited commandments of Moses. Not once is Moses mentioned; but "the law of God" is three times referred to (7:22, 25; 8:7).

The complete passing, through the death of Christ, of the reign of the Mosaic Law, even for Israel, is the extended testimony of Scripture. A few important passages which declare the fact of the passing of the law are here given:

John 1:16–17. "And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for [added to] grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." According to this passage, the whole Mosaic system was fulfilled, superseded, and terminated in the first advent of Christ.

Galatians 3:19–25. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made … that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we [Jews] were kept under the

law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster [child-disciplinarian] to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster" (the law). Comment is unnecessary concerning this unconditional declaration relative to the passing of the Mosaic system.

Romans 6:14. "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace." While the direct message of this passage is of the enablement that is provided for the life under grace, which was never provided under the law, the positive statement is made, "Ye are not under the law."

Romans 7:2–6. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead. she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit [Spirit], and not in the oldness of the letter." Several important revelations are given in this passage. The relation of one who had been under the law (which was true of the Apostle Paul) to the teachings of grace was that of a wife to her second husband. The law, or obligation, of the wife to her husband ceases with his death. Should she be married to a second husband, she is then under an entirely new obligation. The sacrificial death of Christ was the ending of the reign of the law, which law is likened to the first husband. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." Nothing could be clearer than this. The Christian is now under obligation to Christ. He is *inlawed* to Christ. He has only to fulfill "the law of Christ." Certainly it is most unreasonable to propose that a woman should try to be obligated to two husbands at the same time; yet this is the divine illustration

of the error of commingling the teachings of law and the teachings of grace. Spiritual polyandry is offensive to God. In the new union which is formed with Christ, there is to be the bringing forth of fruit unto God. This is a reference to the fact that the Christian's life and service is to be enabled by the power of God and therefore is superhuman. The Christian, it is clearly stated, is not only "dead to the law," but is "delivered from the law," and every aspect of the law, that he should serve in "newness of the Spirit"; for the teachings of grace are particularly characterized by the fact that they are to be wrought by the enabling power of the Spirit. The Christian is *not* to live and serve in "the oldness of the letter," which is the law. It is by vital union in the Body of Christ as a living member that the believer is both absolved from every other relationship, and is made to be centered only in that which belongs to the living Head. Thus positively is it indicated that the opposing principles of law and grace cannot coexist as rules of conduct.

2 Corinthians 3:7–13. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit [Spirit] be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech. And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." It is the law as crystallized in the Ten Commandments which is in view; for that law alone was "written and engraven in stones." In the midst of the strongest possible contrasts between the reign of the teachings of the law and the teachings of grace, it is declared that these commandments were "done away" and "abolished." It should be recognized that the old was abolished to make place for the new, which far excels in glory. The passing of the law is not, therefore, a loss; it is rather an inestimable gain. The striking contrasts which are presented in this whole context are here arranged in parallels:

The Teachings of the Law	*The Teachings of Grace*
1. Written with ink.	1. Written with the Spirit of the living God.
2. In tables of stone.	2. In fleshy tables of the heart.
3. The letter killeth.	3. The Spirit giveth life.
4. The ministration of death.	4. The ministration of the Spirit.
5. Was glorious.	5. Is rather glorious.
6. Done away.	6. Remaineth.
7. Abolished.	7. We have such hope.

Galatians 5:18. “But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.” There is no place left for the law, and hence no occasion for its recognition. To be led of the Spirit is to realize a manner of life which surpasses and more than fulfills every ideal of the law.

Ephesians 2:15. “Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.”

Colossians 2:14. “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.”

John 15:25. “But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law.” This one and only reference in the Upper Room Discourse to the Law of Moses is most significant. As has been shown, Christ, in this discourse, has taken His followers beyond the cross and is unfolding to them the very foundations of the new teachings of grace. These men were Jews; but in this teaching Christ does not speak to them as though the Law of Moses was binding on them. He says “their law,” not *your law*, thus indicating that these Jews who had come under grace were no longer

under the reign of the Law of Moses. By this Scripture not only is the whole law system definitely declared to be done away during the dispensation of grace, but it is noticeable that the law, as law, is never once applied to the believer as the regulating principle of his life under grace. This is not an accidental omission; it is the expression of the mind and will of God.

Thus it may be concluded that the written Law of Moses is not intended to be the rule of the believer's life under grace. Yet, on the other hand, the abiding principles of the law which are adaptable to grace, are carried forward and restated under the teachings of grace, not as law, but reformed to the mold of infinite grace. This great fact is aptly illustrated by the experience of an American citizen who was in Germany at the breaking out of the first World War. Fleeing through Holland, he reached England with his pockets filled with German gold coin. This coin, bearing the German stamp, was of no value as currency in England; but, when melted and restamped in the mints of England, it bore all the value of coin in that realm. Thus the intrinsic value of the gold of the law is preserved and reappears bearing the stamp of the new teachings of grace. In applying the teachings of grace it is legitimate to point out that a similar principle obtained under the Law of Moses, thus to demonstrate that the precept in question represents the unchangeable character of God; but it is both unscriptural and unreasonable to apply the teachings of the Mosaic system directly to the children of grace. Since both the Law of Moses and the teachings of grace are complete in themselves, neither one requires the addition of the other, and to combine them is to sacrifice all that is vital in each. Great importance should be given therefore to the positive, unvarying message to the believer which is stated in the words, *Ye are not under the law, but under grace*.

2. The Error of Commingling the Law of the Kingdom with the Teachings of Grace. If it be accepted that the Messianic, earthly kingdom, with Israel restored to her land in the full realization of all her covenants, under the reign of Christ sitting on the throne of David, has not been established (and there is now no semblance in the light of present world-conditions of that kingdom on earth), then it follows that the laws and principles which are to govern in the kingdom, and which could apply only to conditions within that kingdom, are not yet applied by God to the affairs

of men in the earth. It is not a question, as in the case of the Law of Moses, of discontinuing that which has once been in force under the sanction of God; it is rather a question of whether the kingdom laws, which have their application of necessity in the future earthly kingdom of Messiah, should be imposed now on the children of God under grace. Definite proofs are needed to establish the fact that there are kingdom laws presented in the Scriptures. These proofs have already been offered. Having granted that the kingdom laws are found in the Scriptures, should they be considered as any part of the divine instruction now governing the daily life of the Christian? Certainly it is no more difficult to believe that Scripture reveals a rule of life which is not yet in force because belonging to a future age, than it is to believe that Scripture reveals a rule of life which is not now in force because belonging to an age which is wholly past. In considering the question of whether the laws of the kingdom are to be applied to the Christian in this age, the fact that there is a complete system of kingdom ruling, and that this ruling is strictly legal in its character, is assumed on the basis of proofs already given. Certain vital issues, though already mentioned, should not be forgotten at this point:

a. The Two Systems Cannot Coexist. The laws of the kingdom, being legal in their character, introduce those principles of relationships to God which can never coexist with the relationships which obtain under grace. By such commingling of opposing principles, all that is vital in each system is sacrificed. On the one hand, the sharp edge of the law, which constitutes its sole effectiveness, is dulled by an admixture of supposed divine leniency; on the other hand, the truth concerning the absolute graciousness of God is corrupted by being commercialized, conditioned on the merit of man, and made subject to the persuasion of man. The principle of pure grace demands that God shall in no wise recognize human merit, and that He invariably shall be graciously disposed toward man, and therefore needing at no time to be persuaded by man. God is never reluctant in the exercise of grace; instead, He seeks, draws, and entreats man. The principles of law and grace are mutually destructive, and doctrinal confusion follows the intrusion of any legal principle into the reign of grace. When law is thus intruded, not only is the clear responsibility of the believer under grace obscured, but the priceless attitude of God in grace, which He purchased at the infinite cost of

the death of His Son, is wholly misrepresented. Since the kingdom rule is purely legal, and since the believer is not under law, it follows that he is not under the injunctions of the kingdom.

b. Not Necessary to Combine Them. The laws of the kingdom are not required to be combined with the teachings of grace, since every item within those laws which could have any present application is exactly and amply stated in the teachings of grace. It is not necessary, then, for the believer to assume any law obligation whatsoever. When it is shown by Scriptural exposition that the laws of the kingdom are not applicable to the Christian under grace, opposition is sometimes aroused which is based on wrong personal training, habits of misinterpretation, and prejudice. The cost of unteachableness should be weighed with much care; for the sacrifice of the liberty and blessing which belong to uncomplicated grace is a loss too great for computation. By the right division of the Scriptures, the truth will be clearly seen that grace reigns uncomplicated and undiminished by law. The kingdom law is a complete and indivisible system in itself. It is therefore unscriptural, illogical, and unreasonable to appropriate convenient and pleasing portions of this law, and to neglect the remainder. It should be considered that, as in the Mosaic system, to adopt some portions of the law is to be committed logically to all its teachings. “For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them”; “Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them”; “And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them” (Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:10, 12; cf. Lev. 18:5); “Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law” (Rom. 3:19); “For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law” (Gal. 5:3). Not only are some aspects of the kingdom law never attempted by Christians (cf. Matt. 5:40–42), but its whole character, being legal, is opposed to grace.

The Law of Moses is interrelated and wholly dependent on the sacrifices and ritual provided for Israel in the land. The laws of the kingdom are only related to the future kingdom conditions which shall be in the earth under the power and presence of the King when Satan is bound, creation delivered, and all shall know the Lord from the least unto the greatest. All

harmony of truth is shattered when there is the slightest commingling of the principles of law and grace. Grace alone now reigns through Christ to the glory of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

II. The Law Covenant of Works is Done Away

Under this conception of law, its scope is extended beyond the actual writings of the Mosaic system and the law of the kingdom, and includes, as well, any human action, whether in conformity to a precept of Scripture or not, which is attempted with a view to securing favor with God. The law formula is, “If you will do good, I will bless you.” It matters nothing what is undertaken as an obligation. It may be the highest ideal of heavenly conduct belonging to the teachings of grace, or it may be the simplest choice of moral action in daily life; but if it is attempted with a view to securing favor with God, such relationship to God is self-imposed, since it ignores His attitude of grace, and such attempt is purely legal in character and result. Let it be restated that the basic principle of grace is the fact that all blessings originate with God, and are offered to man graciously. The formula of grace is, “I have blessed you, therefore be good.” Thus it is revealed that the motive for right conduct under grace is not to secure the favor of God, which already exists toward saved and unsaved to an infinite degree through Christ; it is rather a matter of consistent action in view of such divine grace. The unsaved are not urged to secure salvation by meritorious conduct, or even to influence God in their behalf by asking for salvation. Since God is revealed as standing with outstretched hands, offering His greatest possible blessings in grace, and is moved to do so by His unchanging, infinite love, it ill becomes a sinner to fall before Him in an attitude of coaxing and beseeching, as though he were hoping to move God to be merciful and good. The message of grace is: “But as many as received him, to them gave he power [right] to become the sons of God” (John 1:12) . The eternal saving grace of God is offered to all who will believe. Moreover, the saved do not return to divine fellowship after a relapse into sin because they plead for divine forgiveness; their restoration is conditioned on confession. They do not abide in divine fellowship because they seek, or merit, the light; they are instructed to “walk in the light” which is all theirs through riches of grace. In no case are divine

blessings to be secured by human merit, or by pleading; they await the faith that will appropriate them. Every gift of divine love is provided and bestowed in pure grace, and not of necessity, nor as a payment, nor a recognition of human merit. Such lavishings of grace create a superhuman obligation for that manner of life which is consistent with the heavenly blessing and position which grace bestows; but the heavenly blessing and position is never earned by even a superhuman manner of life.

The determining character of pure law is seen in the fact that it is a covenant of works wherein the divine blessing is conditioned on human merit. No semblance of this principle is to be found under grace, except that rewards are to be bestowed for faithful service upon those who have already entered into every present position and possession provided in grace. It therefore follows that, not only the written rules of the law, but the very principle of the law covenant of works, has been done away in this age of grace.

III. The Law Principle of Dependence on the Energy of the Flesh is Done Away

The third and last major distinction between law and grace is seen in the attitude of heart-dependence which is maintained in view of any and all obligation toward God. The law, being a covenant of works and providing no enablement, addressed itself to the limitations of the natural man. No more was expected or secured in return from its commands than the natural man in his environment could produce. The requirements under the law are, therefore, on the plane of the limited ability of the flesh. On the other hand, grace, being a covenant of faith, and providing the limitless enablement of the power of the indwelling Spirit, addresses itself to the unlimited resources of the supernatural man. The requirements to be met under grace are, therefore, on the plane of the unlimited ability of the Spirit. There is no divine injunction addressed to the unregenerate concerning his daily life. The gospel of the saving grace of God alone is offered to him. The only divine injunctions now in force in the world are addressed to those who *are* saved, and these heaven-high standards are to be realized on the principle of faith toward the sufficiency of the indwelling Spirit, and never by dependence on the energy of the flesh.

Thus it may be seen that any aspect of life or conduct which is undertaken in dependence on the energy and ability of the flesh is, to that extent, purely legal in its character, whether it be the whole revealed will of God, the actual written commandments contained in the law, the exhortations of grace, or any activity whatsoever in which the believer may engage. Dependence on the arm of the flesh is consistent only with pure law; dependence on the power of God is demanded under pure grace. Since there is no provision for the flesh in the plan of God for a life under grace, the law is done away.

IV. Judaism is Done Away

Since practically all the features which together make up the Jewish relation to God have been considered separately in previous discussions, there is little need for an extended restatement of these issues. It should be asserted, however, that the entire system known as Judaism, along with all its component parts, is, in the purpose of God, in abeyance throughout the present age, but with definite assurance that the entire Jewish system thus interrupted will be completed by extension into the kingdom, the new earth, and on into eternity to come. As the Jew has been removed from the place of special privilege which was his in the past age and leveled to the same standing as the Gentile—under sin—so Judaism has experienced a cessation of all its features until that hour when the Jewish program begins again; however, Judaism is to be restored and is to complete its appointed course. By what title might those future divine dealings with Israel, after the Church is removed, be designated if not as the continuation of Judaism? Especially is all this evident in the fact that Judaism's predictions are not fulfilled in this Church age but are fulfilled in the age to come.

Judaism has its field of theology with its soteriology and its eschatology. That these factors of a system which occupies three-fourths of the Sacred Text are unrecognized and ignored by theologians does not demonstrate their nonexistence, nor does it prove their unimportance. A Covenant Theology engenders the notion that there is but one soteriology and one eschatology, and that ecclesiology, such as it is conceived to be, extends from the Garden of Eden to the great white throne. The insuperable problems in exegesis which such fanciful suppositions engender are easily

disposed of by ignoring them. On the other hand, Scripture is harmonized and its message clarified when two divinely appointed systems—Judaism and Christianity—are recognized and their complete and distinctive characters are observed. No matter how orthodox they may be in matters of inspiration, the Deity of Christ, His virgin birth, and the efficacy of His death, Covenant theologians have not been forward in Bible exposition. This great field of service has been and is now occupied by those who distinguish things which differ, who, though giving close attention to all that has been written, are bound by no theological traditions whatever.

Judaism is not the bud which has blossomed into Christianity. These systems do have features which are common to both—God, holiness, Satan, man, sin, redemption, human responsibility, and the issues of eternity—yet they introduce differences so vast that they cannot coalesce. Each sets up its ground of relationship between God and man—the Jew by physical birth, the Christian by spiritual birth; each provides its instructions on the life of its adherents—the law for Israel, the teachings of grace for the Church; each has its sphere of existence—Israel in the earth for all ages to come, the Church in heaven. To the end that the Church might be called out from both Jews and Gentiles, a peculiar, unrelated age has been thrust into the one consistent ongoing of the divine program for the earth. It is in this sense that Judaism, which is the abiding portion of the nation Israel, has ceased. With the completion and departure of the Church from the earth, Judaism will be again the embodiment of all the divine purpose in the world.

Conclusion

In bringing to its end this discussion respecting the entire field of Ecclesiology, it may be restated that a true development of this great theme, if Biblical, must be built on the second Pauline revelation. As asserted at the opening of this treatise on Ecclesiology, the Reformation regained the truth of the first Pauline revelation, namely, justification by faith alone, but did not go on to restore the truth contained in the second revelation. It is altogether possible that the problems attending the restoration of the first revelation, being so far-reaching and revolutionary as a reaction from the Romish perversions of truth, were all that could be undertaken at one time or by one generation. Later studies of the New Testament developed the almost limitless theme of the second revelation. Unfortunately, however, theologians were unprepared to receive any added truth beyond that gained in the Reformation, and Protestant theology has, by a misguided loyalty to orthodoxy, never received the truth contained in the second revelation. It has been assumed that this added truth is dangerous if it was not included in the Reformation attainments and that it must be in conflict with those attainments. Early in the history of Protestantism there were individual theologians who caught the first gleams of truth contained in the second revelation, and an ever increasing light has fallen on this body of truth until today there is a great company of students of doctrine who hold and teach, along with the first revelation, the clear divine unfoldings respecting the Church which is Christ's Body. Nevertheless, orthodox Reformed theology persists in its original, isolated, and exclusive recognition of the first revelation, and continues to reject and condemn as intrusive and disruptive the great certified findings of those theologians who have given their years of study to the second revelation. So persistent is this self-imposed loyalty to a limited Reformation theology that a complete disruption of orthodox forces has already set in. This is not a controversy between heterodox and orthodox contenders; it is wholly within the orthodox ranks and is properly analyzed as a dissension between those who without worthy investigation of all that is involved restrict their theology to the first Pauline revelation and those who, contending as earnestly for the first revelation, have, with great study and research, gone on to the understanding of the second revelation.

The second revelation respecting the Church, if pursued worthily, leads with inexorable logic to such dispensational and general Biblical distinctions as have been set forth in this treatise. An attack against these distinctions cannot be sustained by recourse to the beliefs of Reformers and early theologians; for such is an assumption that there is no progress to be made in the knowledge of truth, that the very light which fell on the Reformers by which they emerged from Romish darkness could not fall upon any others in subsequent years to lead them into wider fields of the understanding of God's inexhaustible revelation. There is an inherent weakness disclosed in this attitude. It tends to shirk all responsibility in the direction of advancement in the truth and to deify the writings of the Reformers or the writings of the founders of a sect, apparently forgetting for the moment that these worthy scholars made no claim to inspiration nor did they intend to set up a barrier past which no further investigation in the truth should advance. It is no disrespect to Reformers or church fathers to maintain an attitude of open-mindedness in the direction of new understanding of truth which was not accorded to men of earlier generations. No science would be benefited by such slavish assent to supposedly implacable teachers of the past.

Apart from all the misunderstandings and weaknesses of men, in which all share to some extent, it yet remains true that in the eternal purpose of God and made possible by the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and by the advent of the Spirit, a heavenly people are being called out for a specific heavenly glory, that this divine purpose is in no sense the realization of the promises and covenants made unto Israel, that every promise to Israel will yet be fulfilled, and that apart from these distinctions and anticipations there can be no harmonizing of the divine revelation. The very fact that there has been such neglect of the whole field embraced in the second Pauline revelation becomes a challenge to the student to advance with greatest care in this all-but-limitless realm of truth.

The fact that the Church is a mystery—with regard to the age of her outcalling, the truth that she is the Body of Christ, the truth that she will be the Bride of Christ, and the manner of her departure from this world—indicates her distinctive character as separate from all that has gone before or that will follow. The Apostle writes: "Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ,

according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith: to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen” (Rom. 16:25–27).

Eschatology

Chapter XIII

INTRODUCTION TO ESCHATOLOGY

THIS THE LAST major division of Systematic Theology is concerned with things to come and should not be limited to things which are future at some particular time in human history, but should contemplate all that was future in character at the time its revelation was given. The time word *now* is ever moving and things yet future at the present time will soon have passed into history. A worthy Eschatology must embrace all prediction whether fulfilled or unfulfilled at a given time. In other words, a true Eschatology attempts to account for all the prophecy set forth in the Bible.

The neglect of the prophetic Scriptures on the part of theologians is all but complete, except for a limited survey of the intermediate state, the resurrection of the body, a passing reference to the second advent, and the eternal state. Theological writers, in some instances, have confessed their lack of preparation to deal with Bible prediction. In the opening of his treatise on the second advent (*Systematic Theology*, III, 790), Dr. Charles Hodge states: "The subject cannot be adequately discussed without taking a survey of all the prophetic teachings of the Scriptures both of the Old Testament and of the New. This task cannot be satisfactorily accomplished by any one who has not made the study of the prophecies a specialty. The author, knowing that he has no such qualifications for the work, purposes to confine himself in a great measure to a historical survey of the different schemes of interpreting the Scriptural prophecies relating to this subject." To the same end, Dr. B. B. Warfield in an article on the millennium (*Princeton Theological Review*, 1904, II, 599–617), builds his argument on the untenable idea that there is no reference to such an age anywhere save in "so obscure a portion" as Revelation 20, without the slightest recognition of a covenanted kingdom for Israel with the fulfillment of every earthly promise. When, how, and where will these covenants be experienced? To Dr. Warfield the present blessing of saints in heaven is the millennium. He writes: "The thousand years, thus, is the whole of this present dispensation, which again is placed before us in its entirety, but looked at now relatively not to what is passing on earth but to what is enjoyed 'in Paradise'"

(*Biblical Doctrines*, p. 649). To him, also, Satan bound and then loosed again is a present experience concurrently progressing: “But while the saints abide in their security Satan, though thus ‘bound’ relatively to them, is loosed relatively to the world–and that is what is meant by the statement in verse *3c* that ‘he must be loosed for a little time’” (*Ibid.*, p. 656). According to this idea, Satan being bound in relation to believers cannot reach them; yet the Apostle declares, “Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places” (Eph. 6:10–12) . Thus this greatest of authorities on certain aspects of theology evinces an incomprehensible inattention to the most elementary prophetic revelations. Similarly, Dr. R. L. Dabney, the honored theologian of the South, when asked by a former student whether certain interpretations of prophecy were correct, replied, “Probably you are right. I have never looked into the subject.” It is needless to point out that the attitude of these and many other theologians has been an insuperable barrier to the so-called *educated ministry*, which precludes any attempt on their part to investigate the field of Biblical prophecy. It is natural to conclude that a truth is of little importance if the great teachers of the church ignore it. However, even the teacher himself reflects his own training with its determination to disregard all else than that peculiar to the Reformation. Over against this is the statement by Dr. I. A. Dorner: “There can be no doubt that Holy Scripture contains a rich abundance of truths and views, which have yet to be expounded and made the common possession of the Church …” (*History of Protestant Theology*, II, 4).

Such indifference or resistance is hardly justified in the light of the fact that over one-fourth of the books of the Bible are avowedly prophetic, and, in the actual text of all the Scriptures, at least one-fifth was prediction at the time it was written. A portion of Bible prophecy is now fulfilled, and attention will be given to the distinction between fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecy.

In His Upper Room Discourse, the Savior, having announced the peculiar teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit in the present age, goes on to declare what precise truths the Spirit will teach (John 16:12–15), and places

“things to come” as first on that list of themes. It is safe to say that no modern teacher of the Bible, be he even an extremist in his disproportionate emphasis on prophecy, would assume to place “things to come” as first among those important themes, and many theologians would not include this subject at all. The supreme emphasis which Christ places upon this aspect of truth should not be overlooked. Incidentally, Christ has implied in this statement that none will comprehend prophecy who are not taught by the Holy Spirit. This seems to be true to a large degree in Christian experience. Similarly, the Apostle Paul, it is disclosed, taught the deeper and more intricate aspects of prediction to his young converts. This is demonstrated in his ministry in Thessalonica where he was permitted to remain but three or four weeks and to which place it is never recorded that he was able to return. In the limited time of his stay in that city he was confronted with heathenism, but was able to make contacts with individuals and not only to lead them to Christ but to teach them enough truth that he could afterwards write the two Thessalonian epistles to them with the expectation that they would understand them. In the second epistle, where reference is made to the “falling away,” the man of sin who will sit in the restored Jewish temple declaring himself to be God, and the destruction of the man of sin by the glorious appearing of Christ, Paul declares, “Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?” Assuredly no clearer evidence could be desired to establish the truth that both Christ and Paul gave to the right understanding of prophecy a foremost place. There is no license granted here for a teacher to be a faddist in prophetic truth, nor is there any permission granted to men to ignore the field of prophetic revelation.

It is a common practice with some theologians to brand chiliasm as a modern theory, not remembering that, in its restored form, even justification by faith is comparatively a modern truth. Both justification by faith and chiliasm are taught in the New Testament and were therefore the belief of the early church. These doctrines, like all other essential truths, went into obscurity during the Dark Ages. The Reformers did not restore all features of doctrine and along with justification by faith they retained the Romish notion that the church is the kingdom, fulfilling the Davidic covenant, and appointed to conquer the world by bringing it under the authority of the church. This idea has prevailed in spite of the clear, uncomplicated

testimony of the New Testament that this age must end in unprecedented wickedness.

Precisely what was involved in the sealing of prophecy until the time of the end as was announced by Daniel, “And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end” (Dan. 12:9), may not be wholly understood. However, it is significant that the knowledge of prophecy has been increased in the past half century.

The plea that the prophetic portions of the Bible present problems over which men disagree is not a worthy release from its claims. There are no more problems in Eschatology than in Soteriology. It happens that, owing to the central place accorded Soteriology by the Reformers and in subsequent theological writings, that it has had a measure of consideration not given to prophetic truth. Disagreements as divergent as Calvinism and Arminianism have never been urged as a reason for the neglect of Soteriology; but disunity of the slightest degree among teachers respecting Eschatology has been seized on as a reason for its neglect.

In the field of prophecy, as in all the Word of God, there is need to study that one may be approved unto God and not be ashamed (2 Tim. 2:15). What is declared in the Scriptures respecting prophecy is as credible as those portions which are historical. The language is no more complex, nor is the truth any more veiled. It is recognized that it is a greater strain upon a feeble faith to believe and receive that which is mere prediction—especially so when unprecedented events are anticipated—than to believe and receive as true what has assuredly taken place. It is this unavoidable and requisite faith in God that He will do precisely what He has promised to do which proves to be lacking in many. In introducing his monumental work on *The Theocratic Kingdom*, George N. H. Peters states: “The history of the human race is, as able theologians have remarked, the history of God’s dealings with man. It is a fulfilling of revelation; yea, more: it is an unfolding of the ways of God, a comprehensive confirmation of, and an appointed aid, in interpreting the plan of redemption. Hence God himself appeals to it, not merely as the evidence of the truth declared, but as the mode by which we alone can obtain a full and complete view of the Divine purpose relating to salvation. To do this we must, however, regard *past, present, and future* history. The latter must be received as predicted, for we may rest assured, from the past and present fulfilment of the word of God, thus changed into

historical reality, that the predictions and promises relating to the future will also in their turn become veritable history. It is *this faith*, which grasps the future as already present, that can form a decided and unmistakable unity" (I, 13). It is precisely this unity of divine purpose set forth in the Scriptures which is lost by those who delete the whole field of prophecy. The very diversity in antagonistic exegesis is not only deplorable because of its unfortunate testimony to the world but is evidence that something is fundamentally wrong. Rothe (Peters, *ibid.*, p. 21) is quoted as saying, "Our key does not open—*the right key is lost;* and till we are put in possession of it again, our exposition will never succeed. The system of biblical ideas is *not* that of our schools. …" The is a frank confession and more than one would venture to assert that until the whole Bible is considered in its unity there will be no remedy for the failure. It is not a matter of impossible barriers; it is simply and only a matter of giving attention to the things God has said, and said in understandable terms. The Bible terminology is always the simplest of any literature. Where symbolism is employed in the text, it will, almost without exception, be so indicated.

Whatever the prophetic message may be, it is dependent upon language —simple terms known to all—for its conveyance, and he who tampers with or distorts those terms cannot but reap confusion. The plan of God respecting future things has broken upon the mind of many worthy scholars when they have determined to let the Bible's simple prophetic terminology bear the message that it naturally conveys. At once the entire story of the future becomes clear and free complication. It is not implied that there are not difficult situations to be confronted; but it is asserted that humble acceptance of the declarations in the natural meaning of them will yield a right understanding of the all-but-complete prophetic message.

Having spoken of the importance in Biblical interpretation of giving to language its reasonable and grammatical meaning, George N. H. Peters goes on to say:

> On a proposition which has brought forth many volumes in its discussion, we desire simply to announce our position, and assign a few reasons in its behalf. Its imports is of such weight; the consequences of its adoption are of such moment; the tendency it possesses of leading to the truth and of vindicating Scripture is of such value, that we cannot pass it by without some explanations and reflections. We unhesitatingly plant ourselves upon the famous maxim (*Eccl. Polity*, B. 2.) of the able Hooker: "I hold for a most infallible rule in expositions of the Sacred Scriptures, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest

> from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changes the meaning of words, as alchymy doth, or would do, the substance of metals, making of anything what it pleases, and bringing in the end all truth to nothing." The primitive Church occupied this position, and Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer*. 2, C. 27) gives us the general sentiment when (in the language of Neander, *Hist. Dogmas*, p. 77) "he says of the Holy Scriptures: that what the understanding can daily make use of, what it can easily know, is that which lies before our eyes, unambiguously, literally, and clearly in Holy Writ." However much this principle of interpretation was subverted, as history attests, by succeeding centuries (not without protests), yet at the Reformation it was again revived. Thus Luther (*Table Talk*, "On God's Word," 11) remarks: "I have grounded my preaching upon the literal word; he that pleases may follow me, he that will not may stay." In confirmation of such a course, it may be said: if God has really intended to make known His will to man, it follows that to secure knowledge on our part, He must convey His truth to us *in accordance* with the well-known rules of language. He must *adapt Himself to our mode* of communicating thought and ideas. If His words were given to be understood, it follows that He must have employed language to convey the sense intended, agreeably to the laws grammatically expressed, controlling all language; and that, instead of seeking a sense which the words in themselves do not contain, we are primarily to obtain the sense that the words obviously embrace, making due allowance for the existence of figures of speech when indicated by the context, scope, or construction of the passage. By "literal," we mean the grammatical interpretation of Scripture.—*Ibid*., p. 47

Since prediction is incorporated into the Sacred Text to such a large degree and since the preacher is appointed to declare the whole counsel of God, there is no escaping the responsibility of knowing and expounding the prophetic Scriptures. Let the one who avoids this great theme in his pulpit ministrations ask himself what his relation to the Holy Spirit is, in view of the truth asserted by Christ that the primary teaching of the Spirit is to "shew you things to come" (John 16:13). The pastor and teacher is a specialist in the knowledge of the Word of God and there is no intimation that the declaration of prophecy is excepted from his responsibility. Timothy was to be recognized as "a good minister of Jesus Christ" provided he put the brethren in remembrance of certain predictions (cf. 1 Tim. 4:1–6).

There is no proper approach to the Synoptic Gospels other than to see them as the fulfillment of the Old Testament prediction respecting the Messiah. Similarly, the book of Revelation is the terminal wherein, like trunk lines running into a union station, the highways of Biblical prophecy come to an end. The Bible presupposes that the reader, when reaching the last book of the Bible, will have in mind all that has gone before; and, to the same degree, these highways of prophecy are incomplete until traced to

their end in that incomparable prophetic book. This serves to emphasize the truth that the whole Bible in all its parts is an interrelated and interdependent message, and that the student who does not have as clear a grasp of prophecy as he has of other features of revelation is, by so much, disqualified to interpret the Word of God.

Knowledge of Biblical prophecy qualifies all Christian life and service. By it the believer comes to know the faithfulness of God to His Word. It is assuredly the desire of God that His own who are in the world shall know what He is going to do. He said, “Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?” (Gen. 18:17). This statement is a fair representation of His attitude toward all who are saved. Abraham, though the friend of God, is not as near to God’s heart as those who are of His household and family and who are members in the Body of His Son (cf. 2 Chron. 20:7; Isa. 41:8; James 2:23). Many tasks which Christians undertake would not be assumed if God’s program and its future aspects were better known. He has given no commission to convert the world and enterprises based on that sort of idealism are without His authority. Likewise, the knowledge of prophecy yields poise to the believer in times of crisis, as well as comfort in the time of sorrow. Having declared the truth that Christ will return, the Apostle goes on to say: “Wherefore comfort one another with these words” (1 Thess. 4:18). All parts of the Bible have a sanctifying effect (John 17:17), but none more than the realization of the fact that Christ may, as promised, return at any time. Such expectation becomes a purifying hope. The Apostle John writes: “Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure” (1 John 3:3).

Lastly, the Scriptures present but one system of truth. Men may not comprehend it, and of those who disagree respecting interpretation one or both sides of the controversy may be wrong; but both cannot be right. The Word of God does not lend itself as support to postmillennial, amillennial, and premillennial schemes of interpretation at the same time. It is for the student to weigh these claims and to be convinced of which one is Biblical. This work on theology is definitely premillennial and proofs irrefutable will be presented supporting this position as this treatment of Eschatology advances.

The future is but a part of God’s plan, and He alone knows what it comprehends. That portion of His knowledge which He desires men to

possess is set forth in the Sacred Text and nowhere else. The opinions of men are of value only as they conform to the Scriptures. The hermeneutical canon of the Reformers was “to interpret and illustrate Scripture by Scripture” (*History of Doctrine*, Hagenbach, Vol. 2, sec. 240, cited by Peters, *ibid.*, p. 112). No influence is more extensive than that of creeds; yet these creeds make no pretense at superseding the Word of God. On the place of creeds Peters declares: “Creeds, etc., valuable as they are in many respects, can only, at best, give their testimony as witnesses to the truth; and they can only *testify to as much of it* as the framers themselves have seen and experienced. Professing to give evidence in favor of the Bible, or to state what the Bible teaches, that evidence or statement is only proper, consistent, and available in so far as it *coincides* with the Holy Scriptures. Knowledge, therefore, of the satisfactory character of the confessional statements, is only attainable by bringing them to the crucial test, the Word of God. It is a bad indication when, in any period, men will so exalt their confessions that they force the Scriptures to a secondary importance, illustrated in one era, when, as Tulloch (*Leaders of the Refor.*, p. 87) remarks: ‘Scripture as a witness, disappeared behind the Augsburg Confession’ ” (*Ibid.*, p. 124). Peters also quotes Albert Barnes in his commentary on Ephesians 2:20 as saying, “We learn ‘that the traditions of men have no authority in the church, and constitute no part of the foundation; that nothing is to be regarded as a fundamental part of the Christian system, or as binding on the conscience, which cannot be found in the “prophets and apostles;” that is, as it means here, in the Holy Scriptures. No decrees of councils; no ordinances of synods; no “standard” of doctrines; no creed or confession, is to be urged as authority in forming the opinions of men. They may be valuable for some purposes, but not for this; they may be referred to as interesting parts of history, but not to form the faith of Christians; they may be used in the church *to express* its belief, not *to form* it. What is based on the authority of apostles and prophets is true, and always true, and only true; what may be found elsewhere may be valuable and true, or not, but, at any rate, is not to be used to control the faith of men’ ” (*Ibid.*, p. 126). Melanchthon in his *Apology* to the Parisian University states: “Here is, as I think, the sum of the controversy. And now I ask you, my masters, has the Scripture been given in such a form that *its undoubted meaning* may be gathered without exposition of Councils,

Fathers, and Schools, or not? If you deny that the meaning of Scripture is certain by itself, without glosses, I see not *why* the Scripture was given at all, if the Holy Spirit was unwilling to define with certainty what he would have us to believe. Why do the apostles invite us at all to the study of the Scripture, if its meaning is uncertain? Wherefore do the fathers desire us to believe them no farther than they fortify their statements by the testimonies of Scripture? Why, too, did the ancient councils decree nothing without Scripture, and in this way we distinguish between true and false councils, that the former agree with plain Scripture, the latter are contrary to Scripture? … Since the Word of God must be the rock on which the soul reposes, what, I pray, shall the soul apprehend from it, if it be not certain what is the mind of the Spirit of God?" (cited by Peters, *ibid.*, p. 125). To all this there will be some general agreement by devout minds; yet there remains the slavish disposition on the part of many to be distressed by uncertainties when thus left alone with the Word of God.

Eschatology in its general scope will now be taken up under the following divisions: (1) general features, (2) the seven major highways of prophecy, (3) major themes of Old Testament prophecy, (4) major themes of New Testament prophecy, (5) predicted events in their order, (6) the judgments, and (7) the eternal state.

General Features of Eschatology

Chapter XIV

A Brief Survey of the History of Chiliasm

Certain considerations, more or less unrelated, enter into a right preparation for the study of Eschatology and these are to be mentioned under the above title for this chapter and in the chapter following entitled *The Biblical Conception of Prophecy*.

Chiliasm, so named from χίλιοι—meaning 'one thousand'—refers in a general sense to the doctrine of the millennium, or kingdom age that is yet to be, and as stated in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th ed., *s.v.*) is "the belief that Christ will return to reign for a thousand years …" The distinctive feature of this doctrine is that He will return *before* the thousand years and therefore will characterize those years by His personal presence and by the exercise of His rightful authority, securing and sustaining all the blessings on the earth which are ascribed to that period. The term *chiliasm* has been superseded by the designation *premillennialism;* and naturally, since premillennialism is now confronted by both postmillennialism (only in its literature) and amillennialism—neither one of which opposing systems could be characterized by the use of the title *Chiliasm*—more is implied in the term than a mere reference to a thousand years. It is a thousand years which is said to intervene between the first and second of humanity's resurrections (Rev. 20:4–6), which resurrections are named in 1 Corinthians 15:23–26 as "they that are Christ's at his coming" and "the end" (resurrection). In the Corinthians passage, as in Revelation 20:4–6, these resurrections are separated by a kingdom reign when Christ, according to the Corinthians passage, before delivering up this kingdom to the Father, shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power, and shall have put all enemies under His feet: even death, the "last enemy," shall be destroyed and that, evidently, by the resurrection of all that have ever lived and died (John 5:25–29; Rev. 20:12–15). In this thousand years, not only are these transformations completed, which evidently reach to angelic realms, but every earthly covenant with Israel will be fulfilled—all, indeed, that belong to the Messianic kingdom. It has been the practice of the opponents of chiliasm to contend that chiliasm is based on Revelation 20:4–

6 and that, if this passage can be so interpreted as to assign it to the past, or as now fulfilled, the entire structure of chiliasm is dissolved. Great, indeed, is the misapprehension of truth which such a notion discloses; and, were they to undertake exposition enough to confront the problem at all, they would realize the burden they impose upon themselves. The entire Old Testament expectation is involved, with its earthly kingdom, the glory of Israel, and the promised Messiah seated on David's throne in Jerusalem. When these are applied to the Church, as too often they are, there is not so much as an accidental similarity on which to base that application. It may be well restated that such incongruity in doctrine as is developed by confusing Judaism with Christianity can exist only because of the failure to consider the issues involved. This is not to charge opponents with dishonesty; it is rather to call attention to their failure, as pointed out before, to study these great themes. This failure is clearly exposed in the fact that such schools of interpretation have never produced a constructive literature bearing on prophecy. The history of chiliasm may be approached under seven general time-periods: I. The Period Represented by the Old Testament

In Chapter III of this volume an extended contrast has been drawn between Israel and the Church. In that discussion it has been made clear that Israel and her kingdom with her Messiah on David's throne in Jerusalem is the hope which characterizes the Old Testament. A mere reference to all that has been presented must suffice at this point; but the student should not, through inattention, be unconvinced of the truth that a literal, earthly kingdom is the justifiable hope of Israel as a nation. Being a Greek word, the word *chiliasm* is not an Old Testament term. The present-time features respecting the oncoming kingdom were not disclosed until the New Testament revelation was given.

II. The Messianic Kingdom Offered to Israel at the First Advent

Again for want of space and out of the desire to avoid repetition, the student is referred back to the former consideration of this theme in Ecclesiology. No more exact terms could be employed than are used to report the earthly ministry of Christ as one addressed to Israel exclusively and concerning their kingdom as "at hand." The evidence is complete

respecting the fact that Israel's kingdom was offered to that nation by Christ at His first advent.

III. The Kingdom Rejected and Postponed

This body of truth, like the above, has had an exhaustive demonstration of its truthfulness in the same former section cited above. It is failure to recognize the rejection and postponement of the Messianic kingdom that has turned the course of many theological dissertations into confusion. Because of their failure at this point, theologians have related the kingdom to the first advent rather than to the second and to the dispersion of Israel rather than to their regathering. The doctrinal errors which are engendered by this misapprehension remain uncounted, errors which not only distort the real objective in the first advent—the outcalling of the Church—but errors which presume to substitute a human, idealistic, spiritual kingdom unknown to either Testament for the kingdom described at such length in the Word of God. This supposed spiritual kingdom assumes that the Jews, and, of necessity, their inspired prophets, were mistaken in anticipating a literal kingdom and that Christ rebuked them for this unworthy ambition. The idea that there was such an error on the part of the Jews, or that Christ rebuked them, is without Biblical support. On the contrary, when, after His death and resurrection and the forty days' ministry in teaching His disciples regarding the kingdom of God (Acts 1:3), Christ in His answer to the question "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" said "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power" (Acts 1:6–7; cf. 1 Thess. 5:1–2), there is no rebuke here to these Jewish disciples because of their reverting to the national hope of Israel. That hope will be fulfilled in God's "times" and "seasons." However, these disciples had yet to learn that a new enterprise had been introduced and of that new enterprise Christ went on to say, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). This program of testimony will eventually be terminated by the return of Christ, for it is added, "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked

stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (Acts 1:9–11).

It seems unreasonable that systems of theology, commentaries, histories of doctrine, works on the life of Christ, and some exegetical undertakings should perpetuate the theories of Rome and Whitby respecting the kingdom, and this in spite of the insuperable problems which such theories create. Only the binding power of tradition and the human trait of clinging to a religious idea—good, indeed, in its place—can account for these tendencies. A method of interpretation which is free to spiritualize or overlook important revelations in doctrine has led the way for others to deny the authority of Scripture. It is but a short step from the perversion of truth, however sincere, to the denial of it. It seems not to be a question of scholarship. It is the problem of breaking with an idealism of Romish order, handed down from generation to generation, and not the willingness to transmit only that which the apostles and early Fathers declared. The fact that the majority have followed this course, though impressive so far as it goes, proves nothing finally.

IV. Chiliastic Beliefs Held by the Early Church

At least two lines of proof sustain the claim that chiliastic beliefs were held by the early church. First, the fact that the whole Bible is harmonized only by the chiliastic interpretation. (This dogmatic statement has already been confirmed in previous portions of this work, and will be justified throughout this treatment of Eschatology.) It follows that the early church was chiliastic, since they believed the Bible and held its right interpretation —right, for their doctrine was given them by the very apostles who, under God, wrote the New Testament. Second, the fact that in many passages the belief of the early church is either directly or indirectly revealed to be chiliastic. Two notable passages may be cited at this point: *Acts 15:1–29*. This Scripture reports the occasion for the calling of the first council of the church and its findings. The problem before the assembly which was wholly Jewish, was created by the fact that

this new gospel message had leaped all bounds and reached to Gentiles with the same power and blessing which it had bestowed upon believing Jews. Such a move placed it wholly outside the bounds of Judaism. In the light of Israel's separation from Gentiles —a fact determined by God Himself with respect to His elect nation—there had to be a solution found for this strange abandonment, by evident divine authority, of one of the most fundamental features of Judaism. The question must be answered of what had become of the unchangeable divine covenants respecting the sacred nation. Following the testimony of Peter, Barnabas, and Paul in which they asserted that with the same Pentecostal power the gospel was reaching to Gentiles as it had reached to Jews, James declares what was evidently the answer to the problem and that accepted later by the church as a whole. He said: "And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:13–18).

The order of truth which this statement presents must not be ignored. A new divine undertaking has been inaugurated. God is visiting Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name. That it does not include *all* Gentiles is revealed; also, that Jews will have their part in it is assumed on the ground that God's blessings have always extended first to those people and, in fact, had already done so. The new divine purpose is the outcalling from Jews and Gentiles of a company peculiarly chosen for the glory of the divine Person (cf. Eph. 3:6). "After this," James asserts, the Lord will return and build again the tabernacle of David—David's kingly line—and

according to the covenant made with David (cf. 2 Sam. 7:1–17) set it up. Kingdom blessings will then be fulfilled for Israel and those from among the Gentiles upon whom the divine name is called. Much prediction declares the part Gentiles will have in the earthly kingdom. All this, so far from being accidental, was known unto God—though not revealed to men—from the foundation of the world. It is simply that the early (Jewish) church is discovering the new divine purpose and recognizing the postponement of the earthly kingdom. This context goes on to disclose the fact that Gentiles within the Church are not under the Mosaic Law. The record of the findings of this council are given in the Sacred Text, not to uncover the supposed errors of those who concurred in the council, but to serve as a constructive unfolding of the plan of God. From this it may be seen that a chiliastic belief that Christ returns before the thousand-year kingdom, was adopted by the church at its first council.

Romans 9–11. The three chapters, Romans 9–11, are necessary in the argument being set forth in this Epistle to define the whole scope of the present salvation under grace, which reaches alike to Jew and Gentile (cf. 3:9; 10:12). The same question—large, indeed, to the Jewish mind or to anyone who has recognized the bounds of Judaism as presented in the Old Testament—is here: what has become of the oathsustained Israelitish covenants? This Epistle must answer that question, to the end that the present purpose of God may not be confused with that earthly purpose which is expressed in all of God's dealings with Israel. One thing is crystal clear, namely, the Jewish covenants are *not* being fulfilled in the present age. What, then, has become of these covenants? Men who do not possess a Bible and who have no knowledge of the Scriptures in which Jehovah's purposes and promises concerning Israel are recorded, might, being thus blindfolded, hazard the guess that God had changed His mind and withdrawn the promises of an earthly kingdom for His chosen earthly people, or that Israel had no such promises really, since all that had been asserted in this respect is subject to a spiritual interpretation to be fulfilled in what is now in progress in the world. Such guesses not only ignore the Scriptures, but dishonor God.

The analysis of Romans 9–11 cannot be entered into here. The Apostle's conclusion may be cited, and that should be final to any devout and teachable person. Chapter 11 opens with the question, "Hath God cast away

his people?" The inspired answer is, "God forbid." This does not indicate that Israel is either forsaken or mistaken with respect to her covenants or that these covenants are realized in a spiritual way by the Church. Such ideas, when advanced, evince no understanding of these determining chapters or their relation to the entire Epistle. In the end of the chapter, which is the end of the argument, the Apostle asserts that blindness has been imposed upon Israel as a nation which serves as a judgment upon them, which judgment continues *until* the Church—"the fulness of the Gentiles"—be come in (11:25; cf. Eph. 1:22–23). It is then that "the Deliverer" shall "come out of Sion," and "turn away ungodliness from Jacob." All this is according to covenants made with Israel and occurs when Jehovah will "take away their sins" (11:26–27). It is thus that "all Israel" shall be saved. It need not be indicated that "the fulness of the Gentiles" and "all Israel" are references to widely different peoples, or that there are times and seasons for each. A very positive assertion is made in verse 29 to the effect that the gifts and calling of God respecting Israel are without repentance on His part.

Thus again, it is demonstrated, in harmony with all the Sacred Text, that the early church held the chiliastic view. He who challenges this contention is obliged to dispose of this important Scripture and to rearrange the whole Bible to conform to his scheme. The modern church is hardly in a position —even because of "great scholarship"—to repudiate that which the early church believed, which was received from the Apostles upon whom dependence must be placed for all revelation concerning these issues, and which is so evidently that to which the entire Bible lends its undivided support.

V. The Chiliastic Expectation Continued Until the Roman Apostasy

Along with justification by faith and almost every other vital doctrine, chiliastic expectation was lost in the Dark Ages. That it was held by the early church Fathers is evident beyond doubt. Out of a mass of such testimony but one need be quoted here, and that by Justin Martyr. This testimony, like many others, being so direct and far-reaching, has been attacked by opponents of chiliasm much as infidels are wont to attack the Word of God itself. George N. H. Peters' presentation of Justin's declaration is reproduced in full: Our doctrine [of the Kingdom] is traced *continuously* from the Apostles themselves, seeing that (Prop. 72, Obs. 3, note 1) the first Fathers, who present Millenarian views, saw and conversed either with the Apostles or the Elders following them. So extensively, so generally was Chiliasm perpetuated, that Justin Martyr *positively asserts that all the orthodox* adopted and upheld it. Justin's language is explicit (*Dial. with Trypho,*

sec. 2); for after stating the Chiliastic doctrine, he asserts: “it to be *thoroughly proved* that it will come to pass. But I have also signified unto thee, on the other hand, that many—even those of that race of Christians *who follow not godly and pure doctrine—do not acknowledge it*. For I have demonstrated to thee, that these are indeed *called* Christians; but are atheists and impious heretics, because that in all things they teach what is blasphemous, and ungodly, and unsound,” etc. He adds: “But I and whatsoever Christians *are orthodox in all things* do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned and enlarged, according as Ezekiel, Isaiah, and other prophets have promised. For Isaiah saith of this thousand years (ch. 65:17) ‘Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind; but be ye glad and rejoice in those which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem to triumph, and my people to rejoice,’ etc. Moreover, a certain man among us, whose name is *John, being one of the twelve apostles of Christ*, in that revelation which was shown to him prophesied, that those who believe in our Christ shall fulfil a thousand years at Jerusalem; and *after that* the general, and, in a word, the everlasting resurrection, and last judgment of all together. Whereof also *our Lord spake* when He said, that therein they shall neither marry, nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal with the angels, being made the sons of the resurrection of God.”—*The Theocratic Kingdom*, I, 480

There have always been those, as Justin Martyr testifies with regard to his day, who oppose the plain teaching of the Bible on the millennial question. Modern denials move in one of three directions. They belittle the Scriptures bearing on the theme; they belittle the subject itself; or they belittle the scholarship of those who defend chiliasm. Some modern writers seem to realize but little that chiliasm or premillennialism was the all-but-universal belief of the early church, or the extent of that conviction in all centuries when any truth has been received at all. It is hardly worthy of any scholar to assert that this is a modern departure, or, if held in the early centuries, was looked upon as a heresy. It has been conceded that it was “lost,” along with other vital truths, at the end of the third century and remained hidden until the Reformation. It, like other truths, has had to be rediscovered and restated, all of which requires much time and study. In view of the great importance of the attitude of the early church on this theme, it seems best to quote again at length from the massive work of Peters relative to the known beliefs of the early Fathers.

> *Obs. 13*. Since many of our opponents, in order to make an erroneous impression on those unacquainted with Eccles. History, *purposely mingle the later* Fathers with *the earlier* (as if they were *contemporary*), it will be proper to give the Fathers *in chronological* order, so that the ordinary reader can see *for himself* when they lived, and *form his own judgment* respecting their position in history. This decides the question *of priority*, and also that of *the later* introduction of opposing influences. We will, therefore, mention those that are *expressly named* by both ancients and moderns.
>
> 1. *Pre-Mill. Advocates of the 1st Century*.

a. (1) *Andrew*, (2) *Peter*, (3) *Philip*, (4) *Thomas*, (5) *James*, (6) *John*, (7) *Matthew*, (8) *Aristio*, (9) *John the Presbyter*—these all lived between A.D. 1–100; John, it is supposed—so Mosheim, etc.—died about A.D. 100. (All these are cited *by Papias*, who, according to Irenaeus, was one of John's hearers, and intimate with Polycarp. John is also expressly mentioned *by Justin*. Now this reference to the apostles *agrees* with the facts that *we have proven*: (*a*) that the disciples of Jesus did hold the Jewish views of the Messianic reign in the first part of this century, and (*b*) that, instead of discarding them, they linked them with the Sec. Advent.) Next (10) *Clement of Rome* (Phil. 4:3), who existed about A.D. 40–100. (His Chiliasm, in the small remains left, is apparent from three particulars: (*a*) "preaching *the Coming* of Christ;" (*b*) rebuking scoffers at the alleged *delay of that Coming*, and expressing the hope "*that He shall come quickly and not tarry; "* (*c*) and occupying the Chiliastic posture of "*every hour expecting the Kingdom of God*." Such sentiments *only accord* with the then prevailing Millenarian views; if opposed to it, as some too eagerly affirm because no detailed expression of eschatological opinions have reached us, *how* could he, when Jewish views were all around, thus employ language *pre-eminently* adapted to confirm Chiliasm, unless *in sympathy* with it?) (11) *Barnabas*, about A.D. 40–100. (Whether the Epistle is that of Barnabas who was with Paul, or of some other one, makes no material difference, seeing that all concede him to us, and admit that it was written *quite early, and must be* indicative of the views then held.) (12) *Hermas*, from A.D. 40 to 150. (We give this lengthy date to accommodate the dispute respecting the Hermas who is the author of the *Pastor*. Some who do not receive Chiliasm make him the earlier mentioned in Rom. 16:14; others, a later Hermas, who wrote about A.D. 150. All agree that he is a Chiliast, and his location as to time is, probably, decided by our doctrinal preferences.) (13) *Ignatius*, Bh. of Antioch, died under Trajan, about A.D. 50–115 (some date his death A.D. 107). (His references, in the brief fragments, to "*the last times*" and the exhortation in those times to "*expect Him*, " is in correspondence with our doctrine.) (14) *Polycarp*, Bh. of Smyrna, a disciple of the Apostle John, who lived about A.D. 70–167. (In view of his association with Chiliasts, and, in the few lines from him, locating the reigning of the saints *after* the Coming of Jesus and the resurrection of the saints, has led Dr. Bennet and others to declare him a Millenarian.) (15) *Papias*, Bh. of Hierapolis, lived between A.D. 80–163. (His writings come chiefly through an enemy—Eusebius—but all concede him to be a Chiliast, and declare that he was *the disciple and pupil of St. John*, and the companion of Polycarp.) This is the record of names in favor of Millenarianism,—names that are held in honorable esteem because of their faith and works in the Christ, extending to death.

b. Now on the other side, *not a single name* can be presented, which (1) can be quoted as positively against us, or (2) which can be cited as teaching, in any shape or sense, the doctrine of our opponents.

2. *Pre-Mill. Advocates of the 2d Cent*.

a. (1) *Pothinus*, a martyr, died aged 99 years (A.D. 177, Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 120), hence A.D. 87–177. (His Chiliasm is evident from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, over which he presided, being Chiliastic, from his associate Irenaeus being his successor, who describes the uniformity of faith, *Adv. Haeres.*, 50, 1. 10.) (2) *Justin Martyr*, about A.D. 100–168 (although others, as Shimeall, give A.D. 89–165). … Semisch (Herzog's *Cyclop*.) remarks on it [the disputed text of Justin's word on Chiliasm]: "Chiliasm constituted in the sec. century *so decidedly an article of faith* that Justin held it up as a criterion of *perfect orthodoxy*." … (3) *Melito*, Bh. of Sardis, about A.D. 100–170, a few fragments alone preserved. (Shimeall, in his *Reply*, says, "*Jerome and Genadius* both affirm that he was a decided Millenarian.") (4) *Hegisippus*, between A.D. 130–190. (Neander, *Genl. Ch. His.*, vol, 2, pp. 430, 432, designates

him “a church teacher of Jewish origin and strong Jewish prepossessions,” and an advocate of “sensual Chiliasm.”) (5) *Tatian*, between A.D. 130–190. (He was converted under Justin, and is designated by Neander as “his disciple.”) (6) *Irenaeus*, a martyr (being, Mosheim, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, Amer. Ed., note, p. 120, “born and educated in Asia Minor, under Polycarp and Papias,” must therefore be), about A.D. 140–202. (We frequently and largely quote from him.) (7) *The Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, in a letter A.D. 177 (which some attribute to Irenaeus and others to a Lyonese Christian—author unknown) has distinctive traces of Chiliasm in the allusion to a prior or first resurrection. (8) *Tertullian*, about A.D. 150–220. (We frequently give his views.) (9) *Hippolytus*, between A.D. 160–240. (He was a disciple of Irenaeus, and—according to Photius—he largely adopted Irenaeus in his work against Heresies, and in his *Com.* on Dan., fixed the end of the dispensation five centuries after the birth of Jesus.) (10) *Apollinaris*, Bh. of Hierapolis, between A.D. 150–200. (He is claimed by us, and conceded by e.g. Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, Sec. 139.) Nearly every witness is a martyr.

b. Now on the other side, *not a single writer* can be presented, not even a single name can be mentioned of any one cited, who opposed Chiliasm in this century, unless we except Clemens Alexandrinus (see 3.); much less of any one who taught the Whitbyan view. Now let the student reflect: here are *two centuries* (unless we make the exception stated at the close of the 2d), in which positively no direct opposition whatever arises against our doctrine, but it is held by *the very men*, leading and most eminent, *through whom we trace the Church*. What must we conclude? (1) That the common faith of the Church was Chiliastic, and (2) that such a generality and unity of belief could only have been introduced—as our argument shows by logical steps—by the founders of the Ch. Church and the Elders appointed by them.

3. *Pre-Mill. Advocates of the 3d Cent*.

a. (1) *Cyprian*, about A.D. 200–258. (He greatly admired and imitated Tertullian. We quote him on the nearness of the Advent, the Sabbatism, etc. Shedd, in his *His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, p. 394, says that “Cyprian maintains the Millenarian theory with his usual candor and moderation.”) (2) *Commodian*, between A.D. 200–270. (Was a decided Millenarian. Comp. e.g. Clarke’s *Sac. Lit.* Neander, *Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 448—censures him as follows: “The Christian spirit, however, in these admonitions, which otherwise evince so lively a zeal for good morals, is disturbed by a sensuous Jewish element, a gross Chiliasm; as for example, when it is affirmed that the lordly masters of the world should in the Millennium do menial service for the saints.” Neander overlooks how early childlike piety might contemplate Ps. 149:5–9; Isa. 60:6–10; Mic. 7:16, 17, and kindred passages.) (3) *Nepos*, Bh. of Arsinoe, about A.D. 230–280. (Jerome, Whitby, Shedd, etc., make him a pronounced Chiliast.) (4) *Coracion*, about A.D. 230–280. (He is always united with Nepos by various writers, comp. Hagenbach’s *His. of Doc.*) (5) *Victorinus*, about A.D. 240–303. (He is expressly called a favorer of Nepos and the Chiliasts by Jerome, *de Viris Ill.*, c. 74.) (6) *Methodius*, Bh. of Olympus, about A.D. 250–311. (Of whom Neander—*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p 496—says, he had “a decided leaning to Chiliasm.” Conceded to us by Whitby, Hagenbach, and others.) (7) *Lactantius* (although his works were chiefly composed in the next cent., yet being contemporary with Chiliasts so long in this century, we include him), between A.D. 240–330. (We quote from him, although Jerome ridicules his Millenarianism. Prof. Stuart calls him, “a zealous Chiliast.”) Others, whom we strongly incline to regard as Millenarians, owing to their constant association with Chiliasts, etc., we omit, because the remains and the statements that we have are so meagre as to make it impossible to give a decided expression of opinion.

b. In this century we for the first time, unless we except Clemens Alexandrinus, come to opposers of our doctrine. Every writer, from the earliest period down to the present, who has entered the lists against us, has been able only to find these antagonists, and we present them

in their chronological order, when they revealed themselves as adversaries. They number four, but three of them were powerful for mischief, and speedily gained adherents (comp. Prop. 76). The first in order is (1) *Caius* (or *Gaius*), who is supposed, by Kurtz (*Ch. His.*), to have written about A.D. 210, or as Shedd (*His. Doc.*), in the beginning of the 3d cent. (Much that he is alleged to have said comes to us through bitter Anti-Chiliastic sources, and must be correspondingly received with some allowance.) (2) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who succeeded Pantaenus (died A.D. 202, so Kurtz) as preceptor in the Catechetical School of Alexandria, and exerted a powerful influence (on Origen and others) as a teacher from A.D. 193–220. (He became a Christian under Pantaenus, after having devoted himself to Pagan philosophy, and only during the latter part of his life made the disciples, who so largely moulded the subsequent interpretation of the Church.) (3) *Origen*, about A.D. 185–254. … "*Origen assailed it* [the Millenarian doctrine] *fiercely; for it was repugnant to his philosophy;* and by the system of biblical interpretation which he discovered, he gave *a different turn* to those texts of Scripture on which the patrons of this doctrine most relied" (Mosheim, *Com. on the First Three Cen.*, vol. 2, sec. 38). … (4) *Dionysius*, about A.D. 190–265 (See next Prop.) There is no doubt but others were largely led to accept of Anti-Chiliastic teaching (seeing what an opposition sprung up in the 4th cent.), but these are *the champions* mentioned as directly hostile to Chiliasm. Now let the student carefully weigh this historical record, and he will see that the Church history indubitably *seals our faith as the general, prevailing belief*, for the most that can possibly be said respecting the opposition is, that in the closing years of the 2d century men arose who started an antagonism distinctively presented and urged in the 3d cent., and which culminated in the 4th and succeeding centuries. Hence, our Prop. is *abundantly confirmed* by the doctrinal status of the early Church; indeed, it is—if our line of argument respecting *the apostolic belief* remaining unchanged concerning the Kingdom is conclusive—*the very position* that the Church in its introduction *must occupy*. How illogical and unscriptural, therefore, for men to strive to weaken the testimony of those Fathers, and to apologize in their behalf, by making them ignorant, superstitious, sensual, etc., thus tracing the Church, established by inspired men and their selected successors, though ignorant, superstitious, and sensual believers, until the learned, enlightened, and spiritual Clemens, Caius, Origen, and Dionysius arose and brought light which "*the consciousness of the Church*" appreciated.—*Theocratic Kingdom*, I, 480, 494–97, 500

Added to this is the admission of Daniel Whitby (1638–1726), an English theologian who, almost more than any other, opposed the chiliastic view. Peters quotes him from his *Treatise on Tradition* as follows: "The doctrine of the Millennium, or the reign of saints on earth for a thousand years, is now rejected by all Roman Catholics, and by the greatest part of Protestants; and yet it passed among *the best Christians, for two hundred and fifty years, for a tradition apostolical;* and, as such, is delivered by *many* Fathers of the second and third century, who speak of it as the tradition *of our Lord and His apostles*, and of *all the ancients* who lived before them; who tell us *the very words* in which it was delivered, *the Scriptures* which were then so interpreted; and say *that it was held by all Christians that were exactly orthodox*." "It was received not only in the Eastern parts of the Church, by Papias (in Phrygia), Justin (in Palestine), but by Irenaeus (in Gaul), Nepos (in Egypt), Apollinaris, Methodius (in the West and South), Cyprian, Victorinus (in Germany), by Tertullian (in Africa), Lactantius (in Italy), and Severus, and by the Council of Nice" (about A.D. 323). Even in his *Treatise on the Millennium*, in which he endeavors to set aside the ancient faith by his substitution of "*a new hypothesis,* " he acknowledges, according to Justin and Irenaeus, that (ch. 1, p. 61) there were "three sorts of men: (1)

The Heretics, denying the resurrection of the flesh and the Millennium. (2) *The exactly orthodox*, asserting both the resurrection and the Kingdom of Christ on earth. (3) *The believers*, who consented with the just, and yet endeavored to allegorize and turn into a metaphor all those Scriptures produced for a proper reign of Christ, and who had sentiments *rather agreeing* with those heretics who denied, than those *exactly orthodox who maintained, this reign of Christ on earth*."—*Ibid.*, pp. 482–83

When to the fact that the Bible in its predictions universally anticipates the return of Christ *before* the kingdom reign is added this overwhelming testimony of the early Fathers, there can be but one conclusion respecting the priority, honor, and dignity which belongs to chiliasm. Postmillennialists and amillennialists would certainly glory in their early history could they set up even a portion of such evidence in support of their contentions.

In view of the testimony of the early Fathers—Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Polycarp, Ignatius, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, and 318 bishops from all parts of the earth placed themselves on record in the Nicene Council—who gave direct support to the chiliastic belief, it may be well to note also the recognition by worthy historians of the place chiliasm held in the early church. The following list with their declarations is taken from the pamphlet, *The History of the Doctrine of Our Lord's Return*, by Dr. I. M. Haldeman: Eusebius, the early historian of the Church, admits that most of the ecclesiastics of his day were millenarians. That is—they believed in the coming of Christ before the millennium. Gieseler, "Church History," Vol. I, p. 166, says "Millenarianism became the general belief of the time and met with almost no other opposition than that given by the Gnostics." Dr. Horatius Bonar says, in his "Prophetic Landmarks," "Millenarianism prevailed universally during the first three centuries. This is now an assured historical fact and presupposes that chiliasm was an article of the apostolic creed." Müncher says, p. 415, *History of Christian Doctrine*, Vol. II: "How widely the doctrine of millenarianism prevailed in the first three centuries appears from this, that it was universally received by almost all teachers." W. Chillingworth says: "Whatsoever doctrine is believed or taught by the most eminent fathers of any age of the church, and by none of their contemporaries opposed or condemned, that is to be esteemed the Catholic doctrine of the church of those times. But the doctrine of the millenarians was believed, and taught by the most eminent fathers of the age next after the apostles, and by none of that age opposed or condemned, therefore it was the Catholic or universal doctrine of those times." Stackhouse, in his "Complete Body of Divinity," says: "The doctrine was once the opinion of all orthodox Christians." Bishop Thomas Newton says: "The doctrine was generally believed in the three first and purest ages." Bishop Russell, *Discourse on the Millennium*, says: "On down to the fourth century the belief was universal and undisputed." Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 185, of his "Ecclesiastical History" says: "That the Saviour is to reign a thousand years among men before the end of the world, had been believed by many in the preceding century (that is, the second), without offense to any."… Neander, the eminent church historian, says in his *Church History*, page 650, Vol. I. "Many Christians seized hold of an image which had passed over to them from the Jews, and which seemed to adapt itself to their own present situation. The idea of a millennial reign which the

Messiah was to set up on the earth at the end of the whole earthly course of this age—when all the righteous of all times should live together in Holy Communion. …" Gibbon, the author of that immense work, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," cannot be accused of sympathy with Christianity. … In the first volume of his work, p. 532, he writes: "It was universally believed that the end of the world was at hand. The near approach of this wonderful event had been predicted by the apostles. The tradition of it was preserved by their earliest disciples, and those who understood in their literal sense the discourses of Christ Himself were obliged to expect the Second and glorious Coming of the Son of Man before that generation was totally extinguished." And now, mark you what he says: "As long as for wise purposes this error was permitted to exist in the church, it was productive of the most salutary effects on the faith and practice of Christians who lived in the awful expectation of that moment." … "The ancient and popular,"—note, I pray you, *the ancient and popular*—"The ancient and popular doctrine of the millennium was intimately connected with the Second Coming of Christ: As the works of creation had been finished in six days their duration in their present state, according to tradition, was fixed to six thousand years. By the same analogy it was inferred that this long period of labor and contention, which was now almost elapsed, would be succeeded by a joyful Sabbath of a thousand years, and that Christ with His triumphant band of the saints and the elect who had escaped death, or who had been miraculously revived, would reign upon the earth till the time appointed for the last and general resurrection." "The assurance of such a millennium … was carefully inculcated by a succession of fathers from Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, who conversed with the immediate disciples of the apostles, down to Lactantius, who was preceptor to the son of Constantine. It appears to have been the reigning sentiment of the orthodox believers, and … it seems so well adapted to the desires and apprehensions of mankind that it must have contributed in a very considerable degree to the progress of the Christian faith." … "But when the edifice of the church was almost completed the temporary support was laid aside. The doctrine of Christ's reign upon earth was at first heralded as a profound allegory, was considered by degrees as a doubtful and useless opinion, and was at length rejected as the absurd invention of heresy and fanaticism." Kitto, in his encyclopedia of "Biblical Literature," under the head of article "Millennium," states that the millenarian doctrine was generally prevalent in the second century, and that it received its first staggering blow from Origen, followed by Augustine, Jerome, and others in the fourth century. In the "Encyclopaedia Britannica," under article "Millennium," the writer, a no less distinguished scholar than Adolf Harnack, D.D., Professor of Christian History in the University of Giessen, Germany, says: "This doctrine of Christ's second advent, and the kingdom, appears so early that it might be questioned whether it ought not to be regarded as an essential part of the Christian religion." Sheldon, "Church History," Vol. I., p. 145, ch. 6, testifies that "premillenarianism was the doctrine of the Christians in the first and second century. The fathers expected anti-Christ to arise and reign, and meet his overthrow at the personal coming of the Lord. After which the Kingdom of Christ for a thousand years, would be established on the earth." Crippen, "History of Doctrine," p. 231, sec. 12, says that "the early Fathers lived in expectation of our Lord's speedy return"; on p. 232 he remarks: "They distinguish between a first resurrection of the saints and a second or general resurrection. These they supposed would be separated by a period of a thousand years, during which Christ should reign over the saints in Jerusalem." … "While the church was alternately persecuted and contemptuously tolerated by the Roman Empire, the belief in Christ's speedy return and his millennial reign was widely entertained." … "When the Church was recognized and patronized by the state, the new order of things seemed so desirable that the close of the dispensation ceased to be expected or desired." Smith, "New Testament History," p. 273, says: "Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, Christianity having become dominant and prosperous, Christians began to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy advent, and to look upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfillment of the promised reign of Christ on earth."—Pp. 14–20, 24

VI. Chiliasm Began to Be Restored in the Reformation

The entire character of Biblical testimony was changed by Gnostic and Alexandrian influences, and, along with all vital truth, the church lost her conception of the purifying hope of Christ's return, and, eventually, under Constantine, exchanged the divine program of a returning Lord for a world-conquering church. Of this, Dr. James H. Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 536) quotes Bengel as saying: "When Christianity became a worldly power by Constantine, the hope of the future was weakened by the joy over the present success." Similarly, Auberlen (*Daniel*, p. 375) has this to say: "Chiliasm disappeared *in proportion* as Roman Papal Catholicism advanced. The Papacy took to itself, *as a robbery*, that glory which is an object of hope, and can only be reached by obedience and humility of the cross. When the Church became a harlot, she ceased to be a bride who goes out to meet her bridegroom; and *thus Chiliasm disappeared*. This is the deep truth that lies at the bottom of the Protestant, anti-papistic interpretation of the Apocalypse" (both references cited by Peters, *op. cit.*, I, 499).

No review of Rome's dark ages nor of the Reformation itself is required here. Suffice it to say that being suddenly set free from mental slavery and spiritual bondage and in danger of martyrdom, the Reformers were groping about in matters of doctrine with an entire divine revelation to rediscover and organize into a system. The marvelous progress and achievement of the Reformers is disclosed in their theological writings, and the writings of the following generations. Some of these leaders embraced the chiliastic interpretation and some did not. Whatever the beliefs of the Reformers, they did not accept the view of Whitby. They were Augustinian in their doctrine and gave no support to the idea of a millennium prior to the second advent. Luther wrote: "*This is not true and is really a trick of the devil*, that people are led to believe *that the whole world shall become Christian*. It is the devil's doing, in order to darken sound doctrine and to prevent it from being understood. … Therefore *it is not to be admitted*, that the whole world, and all mankind shall believe on Christ; for we must continually bear the sacred cross, that they are *the majority* who persecute the saints" (Walch's *Luther*, vol. 2, cols. 1082–83, cited by Peters, *ibid.*, III, 175). In another place Luther wrote, "I believe that all the signs which are to precede the last days have already appeared. Let us not think that the Coming of Christ is far off;

let us look up with heads lifted up; let us expect our Redeemer's coming with longing and cheerful mind" (cited by Haldeman, *op. cit.*, p. 27). So, also, Calvin: "*There is no reason, therefore, why any person should expect the conversion of the world,* for at length—when it shall be too late, and will yield them no advantage, they shall look on Him whom they have pierced" (*Commentary mentary* on Matt. 24:30, cited by Peters, *loc. cit.*). Calvin also declares in the third book of his *Institutes*, chapter 25, "Scripture uniformly enjoins us to look with expectation for the advent of Christ." To this may be added the testimony of John Knox: "The Lord Jesus shall return, and that with expedition. What were this else but to reform the face of the whole earth, which never was nor yet shall be, till that righteous King and Judge appear for the restoration of all things." Similarly, the words of Latimer: "All those excellent and learned men whom, without doubt, God has sent into the world in these latter days to give the world warning, do gather out of the Scriptures that the last days cannot be far off. Peradventure it may come in my day, old as I am, or in my children's days" (the above 3 refs. cited by Haldeman, *loc. cit.*). The attitude of the Reformers is reflected in the Augsburg Confession. As a condemnation of the Anabaptist beliefs, this confession in its Seventeenth Article states: "Condemn those who spread abroad Jewish opinions, that, *before the resurrection of the dead,* the godly shall occupy the kingdom of the world, the wicked being everywhere suppressed" (Müller's *Symb. Books*, p. 43, cited by Peters, *loc. cit.*).

An investigation of prophetic truth was not undertaken until later, and, being absent, largely, from the theological writings of the Reformers—along with other important teachings, notably the Pauline Ecclesiology—has not, like all later unfoldings, been given the consideration in systems of theology which are based on the Reformation, that its vital importance demands.

The student is exhorted to bear in mind the facts related to the Reformation and the enormous task laid upon the Reformers, and to remember that men then, as now, are for various reasons hardly ever of one mind to the last degree. Prophetic study had its devotees as well as its enemies then as now. All of this, however, does not change one word of revelation; and though it were true that no man comprehended the Sacred Text, that Text abides in its purity and is a challenge to the devout soul.

VII. Chiliasm Since the Reformation

The record of the history of chiliasm since the Reformation is a task for the historians. Unfortunately, existing ecclesiastical histories are, in the main, written by men trained in the interpretation of Whitby and the essential facts of chiliasm have been omitted or misstated; especially is this true of the estimation by these historians of the beliefs of the church in the first two centuries.

In estimating the views of Protestant theologians of near Reformation times, it would be well to note at least one outstanding American, namely, Cotton Mather (1663–1728), son of Increase Mather (1639–1723), who, in turn, was son of Richard Mather (1596–1669). All three of these men were Congregational clergymen of New England. Both Increase Mather (sixth president of Harvard University) and Cotton Mather might be quoted at length as well-informed chiliasts. One quotation from Cotton Mather may suffice: It is well known, that in the earliest of the primitive times the faithful did, in a literal sense, believe the "second coming" of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the rising and the reigning of the saints with Him, a thousand years *before*, "the rest of the dead live again," a doctrine which, however, some of later years have counted heretical; yet in the days of Irenaeus, *were questioned by none but such as were counted heretics*. It is evident from Justin Martyr that the doctrine of the Chiliad was in his days embraced *among all orthodox* Christians; nor did this Kingdom of our Lord begin to be doubted *until* the Kingdom of Antichrist began to advance into a considerable figure, and *then* it fell chiefly under the reproaches *of such men* as were fain to deny the divine authority of the Book of Revelation, and of the Second Epistle of Peter. He is *a stranger* to antiquity who does not find and own the ancients generally of the persuasion. Nevertheless, at last men came, not only to lay aside the modesty expressed by one of the first Anti-Millenarians, namely, Jerome, but also with violence to persecute the Millenary truth as an heretical pravity. So the mystery of our Lord's "appearing in His Kingdom" *lay buried* in Popish darkness, till the light thereof had a fresh dawn. Since the Antichrist entered into the last half-time of the period allotted for him, and now within the last seven years, as things grow nearer to accomplishment, *learned and pious men, in great numbers,*

everywhere come to receive, explain, and maintain, *the old faith* about it.—Quoted by Peters, *ibid.*, I, 541–42

It is significant that Cotton Mather testifies that "learned and pious men, in great numbers, everywhere came to receive, and explain, and maintain, the old faith about it"—meaning that held by the early church. Such declarations serve, at least, to silence that form of unlearnedness which contends that the premillennial interpretations are of recent development.

Theological thought has, since the Reformation, divided into three ideas respecting the millennium.

1. The Theory of Whitby. This conception was originated by Daniel Whitby (1638–1725), an English theologian whose belief has never been recovered from a Socinian charge. Whitby contended that the millennium is yet future, but will be set up in the earth by present gospel agencies. Thus he became the originator of what is known as post-millennialism—that is, the belief that the second advent is to follow the setting up of a man-made millennium. This theory appealed to theologians and until recent years has been promulgated in theologies and sermons. That the theory of Whitby is dead by now cannot be denied. It exists only in the limited literature which it created and with no living voice to defend it. Doubtless the stress upon Bible study of the present century has served to uncover the unscriptural character of this system. Its advocates have not been able to meet the challenge made to them to produce one Scripture which teaches a millennium before the advent of Christ, or that teaches an advent of Christ after the millennium. It has been characteristic of those theologians who follow Whitby to denounce premillennialism with great zeal and yet to confess that they have never given the subject the critical study that it demands.

2. Antimillennialism. This strange theory, the origin of which is traced to the Romish notion that the church is the kingdom, contends that whatever millennium there may be is being experienced in the present age. Its advocates interpret the book of Revelation as a description, or varied descriptions, of this church age. At the opening of this seventh major division of theology reference was made to the fact that Dr. B. B. Warfield embraced the Romish idea, common to all who defend the amillennial

theory. His great learning and scholarship in other fields of truth have given him an influence over many who do not investigate any more than Dr. Warfield evidently did (note "The Millennium and the Apocalypse," *The Princeton Theological Review*, 1904, II, 599–617). In their unenviable attempt to fit all of the events anticipated in the Revelation into the history of this age, the amillennialists indulge in a form of speculation almost unsurpassed. Their abandonment of reason and sound interpretation has but one objective in mind, namely, to place χίλιοι ('thousand') years—six times repeated in Revelation, chapter 20—back into the past and therefore something no longer to be anticipated in the future. The violence which this interpretation imposes upon the whole prophetic revelation is such that none would propose it except those who, for lack of attention, seem not to realize what they do. On the other hand, chiliasm or premillennialism is not to be cited as indulging in things fanciful when it declares the future things set forth in the Bible in the exact and literal sense in which the Bible depicts them. There is no comparison here with that Romish notion—amillennialism—which proposes to place all of Revelation, chapters 6–20, in the present church age. In sheer fantastical imagination this method surpasses Russellism, Eddyism, and Seventh Day Adventism, since the plain, grammatical meaning of language is abandoned, and simple terms are diverted in their course and end in anything the interpreter wishes. To maintain that the main body of the Revelation is fulfilled in the present age, it must be contended that Satan is now bound. This very thing Dr. Warfield asserts (*loc. cit.*), as do other amillennialists. The first resurrection is already past. The beast is Nero, since the numerical value of the Hebrew letters which spell *Neron-Caesar* (in Hebrew *Nero* has a final *n*) totals 666. But Satan is not bound, since he now goeth about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour and since all believers are wrestling against these principalities and powers (Eph. 6:10–12). The first resurrection is not past, for it is to be accompanied by the translation of the living saints (1 Thess. 4:16–17). Nor is Nero the beast, the man of sin, since that individual will be destroyed at the glorious appearing of Christ (2 Thess. 2:8–10). Added to this is the fact that the beast with the false prophet is to be cast into the lake of fire. Nero was not destroyed by the glorious appearing of Christ nor was he, by any Scripture authority, cast into the lake of fire. He, with all the wicked dead, will be cast into that lake at the final judgment (Rev. 20:12–

15). Furthermore, what may be said of seals, trumpets. vials, the seven dooms, the four horsemen, war in heaven, Satan and his angels having their activities confined to the earth, the 144,000 witnesses, the two witnesses, the destruction of ecclesiastical Babylon and the destruction of political Babylon? Likewise, if all of Revelation, chapters 6–20, is fulfilled in the present age, when will Christ's prediction of an unsurpassed tribulation (Matt. 24:9–29) and that of Daniel (Dan. 12:1) and that of Jeremiah (Jer. 30:5–7) be fulfilled? One man's guess is as good as another's respecting these vast issues and all would do well to ponder the Scriptures before venturing an opinion. As before stated, the one objective in all this torturing of the consummating book of the Bible is to get away from the prospect of a thousand years of Christ's glorious and righteous reign on the earth. The few amillennial writers, without exception, attempt to dispose of the sixfold reference to a thousand years with this one purpose in view, and among them one, a professor of New Testament in a reputable seminary, closes his argument by assuming that his task is well done and by "thanking God" for the "riddance."

3. PREMILLENNIALISM. Premillenarians have never organized or attempted to display their influence. They form no sectarian denomination, but are scattered through all Protestant churches. They do not practice separation from their brethren, nor have they maintained separate schools. However, half a hundred Bible institutes in America are all premillennial without exception; and, of late, several thoroughly qualified theological seminaries have been established which teach theology from a premillennial interpretation of the Scriptures. Added to this are unnumbered churches, both independent and denominational, which sustain only a premillennial testimony. Bible conferences and Bible-study courses are multiplied on every hand, and these are largely working on premillennial lines. The great faith missions are premillennial as are the thousands of missionaries they have sent out. Great religious journals—great from the standpoint of their circulation and influence—are clearly premillennial as all evangelists are and have been almost without exception. Apparently, the next division in the orthodox body of believers will not arise over those theological differences which have separated denominations, but rather over the question of dispensational and premillennial interpretation of the Bible.

After the first general American Bible and prophetic conference, which was held in New York City in 1878, Dr. C. A. Briggs of Union Seminary, New York, issued a warning to premillennialists that if they wished to preserve their ecclesiastical standing they must stop these Bible study conferences. He wrote: "It depends entirely upon themselves what the future is to bring forth. If they will *abandon* their organization, *disband* their committee, *stop* their Bible and Prophetic Conferences, we doubt not that there will soon be a calm again, and they will remain undisturbed in their ecclesiastical relations; *but if* they are determined to go on in their aggressive movement, they will have only themselves to blame *if the storm should become a whirlwind that will constrain them to depart from the orthodox churches, and form another heretical sect*" (quoted by Peters, *op. cit.*, I, 481). So, also, at the present time, there is abroad a similar sentiment, thinly veiled indeed, in which all liberals unite, which proposes to rid denominations of all who persist in teaching the second advent and its related doctrines.

Contained in Proposition 78 of his colossal work, *The Theocratic Kingdom*—published in 1884 and unsurpassed either for completeness or for scholarship—George N. H. Peters has listed by name the outstanding clergymen of the world in his day both with reference to country and denomination who were premillenarians. In the United States within eleven denominations he has named 360, a considerable number of whom were bishops, or doctors of divinity. Very many of America's honored expositors, editors, and preachers are entered in this list. Similarly, at least 470 widely known ministers and writers of Europe are also indicated by name. This register includes what seems to be the preachers and writers whose names have endured because of their achievements. It would be a satisfaction to reproduce these lists if space permitted. Fifteen men who have undertaken a commentary of the entire Sacred Text (Old and/or New Testament usually) are also listed. These include the greatest of authorities—Bengel, Olshausen, Gill, Stier, Alford, Lange, Meyer, Starke, Fausset in the Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary, Jones, and Nast. At least fifty-nine writers are named who produced standard expositions of smaller portions of the Scriptures. This group includes Keach, Bonar, Tait, Ryle, Seiss, Cumming, Fry, MacIntosh, Wells, Demarest, Delitzsch, Ebrard, Mede, Goodwin, Elliott, Cunningham, Darby and his associates.

Writers and teachers who are not aware of the history or the literature of premillenarianism—and there have been many—are wont to dismiss chiliasm with contempt, to assert that it is a modern idea, and to brand it as a heresy, whereas some of those who do not follow the chiliastic interpretation are sufficiently informed and candid to acknowledge that "devotedly pious men who are highly reputable scholars" are of the premillennial faith. In the light of the obvious truth that chiliasm has produced the great missionaries, the great evangelists, and an uncounted number of honored expositors, the charge of heresy must arise either from ignorance or malice. It is of great significance that, though some have gone to extremes, instructed premillennialists are not only sound in doctrine but are awake to the God-appointed task of witnessing. It is equally significant that every unbeliever and every heretic throughout the entire church age has been antichiliastic.

It will be noted that the lists cited above represent conditions which existed sixty years ago and that the premillennial view of the Scriptures has made its greatest progress since that date and developed its greatest preachers and teachers, produced its greatest literature, and multiplied its followers manifold. What premillennialism teaches will be the theme of following pages.

Chapter XV

The Biblical Conception of Prophecy

In the sphere of prophecy, the divine ability is clearly seen as something transcending human limitations. God seems to delight in His power to predict the future; at least that power is evidently used to awaken the human mind to the marvels of His Being. Apart from divine revelation, man knows not what a day may bring forth. To God the end is known from the beginning. “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world” (Acts 15:18). Through divine revelation the human limitation may be relieved. It is an immeasurable advantage to the human being to be informed about the future. It seems that men would seize upon every word of divine prediction and not only study its meaning but glory in the added light which it affords. Yet the prophetic Scriptures have been more neglected than any other portion of the Sacred Text, and that stimulus—among the greatest of Bible influences—intended for believers has been withheld from them by those who have been appointed to preach and teach the whole counsel of God. The preacher who persistently and consistently avoids prophetic themes is committing a wrong which only heaven can estimate. The same is true of works on theology which make no worthy attempt to account for so vast a portion of the Word of God, and, by so much, influence the student to follow the same course.

The Bible conception of prophecy may be approached under six general subjects: (1) the prophet, (2) the prophet’s message, (3) the prophet’s power, (4) the selection of prophets, (5) the fulfillment of prophecy, and (6) the history of prophecy.

I. The Prophet

In general, the prophet was one who spoke for God. He was God’s voice to the people. Over against this, the priest represented the people in his going to God. The two together define in type two aspects of Christ’s mediation; for He was both Prophet and Priest in the final sense of those terms. In the Biblical sense of the word, prophecy may refer to either forthtelling or foretelling. Much that the prophet uttered was not predictive

in its nature; yet he declared the truth which God gave to him. His message was sustained by the Old Testament phrase, “Thus saith the LORD.” Of the Old Testament prophet it may be observed that he was familiarly identified as “the man of God.” Once he had been known as “the seer,” but finally, as “the prophet” (cf. 1 Sam. 9:8–9). He was a patriot and a reformer, a revivalist in the midst of a chosen people. His ministry was called forth in times of spiritual declension, and his very warnings inevitably assumed the character of predictions.

There is ground for deep interest in the ministry of the prophet and also in the manner in which he received his message from God. The Old Testament prophets have dwelt upon the reception of their message. There was, as always, great variety in the divine method of revealing the mind and will of God to the prophet. There was a superseeing and a superhearing power accorded these men of God. They saw words (cf. Isa. 2:1). The message was not their own (cf. Jer. 23:16; Ezek. 13:2). It was as a burning fire within them (cf. Jer. 20:9; Ezek. 3:1–27). Nevertheless, the personal element was not sacrificed (cf. Jer. 15:16; 20:7; Ezek. 3:3).

The New Testament prophet is to be distinguished from the Old Testament prophet both as one situated in a different dispensation and as more committed to forthtelling than to foretelling. The New Testament prophet’s ministry is defined thus: “But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort” (1 Cor. 14:3). The service assigned to the New Testament prophet is of great importance. He appears among the ministry gifts of Ephesians 4:11, and, with Christ and the apostles, forms the foundation on which the Church is being built (Eph. 2:20). It is clear that, after the death of Christ, reference to the prophet is not to one of the Old Testament order but to one of the New Testament order, who is as much called of God and as highly to be esteemed as the prophet of old.

II. The Prophet’s Message

As intimated above, the Old Testament prophet spoke as he was “moved” by God (cf. 2 Pet. 1:21). Of the message of the Old Testament prophet, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes:

> Speaking broadly, then, *predictive* prophecy is occupied with the fulfilment of the Palestinian and Davidic Covenants; the Abrahamic Covenant having also its place. Gentile powers are mentioned as connected with Israel, but prophecy, save in Daniel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Nahum, is not *occupied* with Gentile world-history. Daniel, as will be seen, has a distinctive character. The predictions of the restoration from the Babylonian captivity at the end of seventy years, must be distinguished from those of the restoration from the present world-wide dispersion. The context is always clear. The Palestinian Covenant (Deut. 28:1–30:9) is the mould of predictive prophecy in its larger sense—national disobedience, world-wide dispersion, repentance, the return of the Lord, the regathering of Israel and establishment of the kingdom, the conversion and blessing of Israel, and the judgment of Israel's oppressors. … The keys which unlock the meanings of prophecy are: the *two advents of Messiah*, the advent to suffer (Gen. 3:15; Acts 1:9), and the advent to reign (Deut. 30:3; Acts 1:9–11); the doctrine of the *Remnant* (Isa. 10:20, *refs.*), the doctrine of the *day of the* LORD (Isa. 2:10–22; Rev. 19:11–21), and the doctrine of the *Kingdom* (O.T., Gen. 1:26–28; Zech. 12:8, *note*; N.T., Lk. 1:31–33; 1 Cor. 15:28, *note*). The pivotal chapters, taking prophecy as a whole, are, Deut. 28., 29., 30.; Psa. 2.; Dan. 2., 7. The whole scope of prophecy must be taken into account in determining the meaning of any particular passage (2 Pet. 1:20).—*Reference Bible*, pp. 711–12

III. The Prophet's Power

While to kings was given, or by them assumed, the power of life and death, and while they could destroy any prophet at will, the prophet, nevertheless, dictated to kings and released not his position as God's voice even to the king on the throne. Divine power rested upon the prophet, which power was recognized by men and protected by God. On this feature, a study may be made of Numbers 11:25, 29; 24:2; 2 Kings 2:15; 3:15; 1 Chronicles 12:18; 2 Chronicles 24:20; Isaiah 11:2; 42:1; 61:1; Ezekiel 1:3; 3:14, 22; 11:5; Joel 2:28–29.

IV. The Selection of Prophets

With a complete exercise of sovereignty and election, God chose whom He would for the prophetic office. At times prophets were not even in sympathy with their message (cf. Saul—1 Sam. 10:11; 19:24; Balaam—Num. 23:5–10; Caiaphas—John 11:51). Though taken from various walks of life, the Old Testament prophets were divinely held to the declaration of that which God proposed to say. So far as the record goes, they were prophets for their entire lifetime. The gifts and callings of God are without repentance.

V. The Fulfillment of Prophecy

As a test of its divine origin and character, the fulfillment of prophecy was its reasonable test. Jehovah declared: “And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him” (Deut. 18:21–22). The New Testament constantly asserts that events transpired “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet,” and every such reference serves to emphasize the trustworthiness of the words of a true prophet.

A worthy study of prophecy and its fulfillment leaves little room for unbelief. In vain the skeptic asserts that predictions were only fortunate conjecture. If it were conjecture, the prophet was preserved from error and that would be supernatural in itself. To God be the glory both for prophecy and its fulfillment!

VI. The History of Prophecy

The prophetic story is largely the fulfillment of the Abrahamic, the Palestinian, and the Davidic Covenants. It includes, also, the realization of the two divine purposes—the earthly purpose centered in Israel and consummated according to Psalm 2:6, and the heavenly purpose centered in the Church and consummated according to Hebrews 2:10. It is here declared with complete assurance that, as prophecies which are now fulfilled were fulfilled in their natural, literal, and grammatical meaning, in like manner all that remains—reaching to eternal ages—will be fulfilled in the natural, literal, and grammatical way which the predictions imply. None could question with fairness that the prophecy now fulfilled has followed the literal method to the last detail. It is therefore both unreasonable and unbelieving to suppose that, to relieve some incredulity, the predictions yet unfulfilled will be realized in some spiritualized manner. Certain general divisions of the prophetic story are to be observed.

1. Four Prophets Who Serve as Milestones. With the coming earthly Messianic kingdom in view as the ultimate earthly objective, four prophets

measure the intervening time from the beginning of the Jewish nation to that consummation. Those prophets are:

a. Abraham. God did not withhold from Abraham the thing He was about to do (Gen. 18:17). The future of Abraham's posterity up to the time of Moses, or to the deliverance from Egypt, was disclosed to him. It is written: "And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not their's, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance" (Gen. 15:13–14). All of this Abraham must have reported to his posterity. Added to this are the assurances within the Abrahamic Covenant of the final earthly blessings for Abraham's descendants; that is, Abraham saw and reported to others the period from his own day to that of Moses, and then lost sight of the thread of events until the time of the setting up of the kingdom blessings on the earth.

b. Moses. As one of the greatest of all human prophets (cf. Deut. 34:10–12), Moses saw from his own day on through the period that Israel would continue in the land—a thousand years—and to the time of captivity. Beyond that, he saw only the coming kingdom blessings. Moses, therefore, saw to the days of Daniel.

c. Daniel. To Daniel was given the vision of Gentile dominions. The time measured from the end of the edict to rebuild Jerusalem till the kingdom of righteousness he declared to be seventy sevens, or 490 years. Sixty-nine of the sevens, or 483 years, would measure the time from the edict to the "cutting off" of Messiah, thus leaving one seven, or seven years, to be experienced in Israel's earthly history before the kingdom of righteousness would be set up in the earth (Dan. 9:24–27). As a sacred secret, therefore unrevealed to men, God, through the "cutting off" of Messiah, or the death of Christ, began the realization of His heavenly purpose during which time —as now—all distinctive Jewish history is standing still and Jews and Gentiles, leveled to the place where they are "under sin" (Rom. 3:9), are alike subject to the same message of saving grace (Rom. 10:12). Very much Scripture bearing on this program of events—either directly or indirectly—anticipates that the remaining seven years, which are distinctly the completion of Israel's 490-year program which the prophet Daniel saw, will

run their course as the great tribulation, immediately upon the completion of the outcalling of the Church, and the moment of her removal from the earth. It is the “time of Jacob’s trouble” (Jer. 30:7). Daniel saw from his own time to the first advent of Messiah, but lost the vision at that point, only to regain it in the anticipation of that kingdom which will be ushered in by the second advent (Dan. 2:44–45; 7:13–14; 9:27). It would be of great value, if space permitted, to quote at this point from the commentary on Daniel by Sir Robert Anderson, *The Coming Prince*. A careful reading of that treatise is suggested for every student of prophecy.

d. Christ. Beginning where Daniel’s earlier vision ended at the “cutting off” of Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ—the final and greatest of all prophets—gave prediction respecting an unforeseen age which would intervene between His first and His second advents (Matt. 13:1–50; 24:3–8). He also gave the unbroken thread of coming events which lead into the earthly kingdom—the rapture of the Church (John 14:1–3), the unprecedented tribulation (Matt. 24:21–22), the preaching of the kingdom gospel (Matt. 24:14), the coming of the desolator (Matt. 24:15), the glorious appearing of the Messiah (Matt. 24:27), the regathering of Israel (Matt. 24:31), the judgment of Israel (Matt. 24:37–25:30), and the judgment of the nations (Matt. 25:31–46). Thus as the last of the prophets Christ completes the connected story previously sustained by Abraham, Moses, and Daniel, and brings it to the consummation which was seen by these three men of God.

The period between Adam and Abraham presents but one prophet, namely, Enoch, the seventh from Adam, and his actual prediction is not recorded until the next to the last book of the Bible. There it is written: “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him” (Jude 1:14–15) . Similarly, the period of the kingdom in the earth will be characterized by prophecy (cf. Joel 2:28–29; Acts 2:16–18).

2. John the Baptist. Of all the prophets, none has declared the coming Messianic kingdom with more insistence than John the Baptist. This is to be

expected since he fulfilled the anticipation of Isaiah 40:3–5, which reads: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: and the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it." This passage is related to the two verses preceding, which restrict the application to Israel and to their Messianic hope. The terms *my people* and *Jerusalem*, as used in the Old Testament, are hardly a direct word to the Church. These qualifying verses state: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the LORD'S hand double for all her sins" (vss. 1–2). It is Israel's warfare that is to be accomplished and it is her iniquities which are to be pardoned. The sins of those who comprise the Church have been so dealt with that they, each one, stand justified (Rom. 8:30), beyond condemnation (Rom. 8:1), and upon a peace footing with God (Rom. 5:1). The herald announces the soon-appearing Messiah, coming to Israel, and He is declared to be none other than Jehovah, whose way is to be prepared and whose highway is to be made straight. The Occupant of David's throne is a theanthropic Person. His is a theocratic kingdom which is both literal and glorious. The anticipation of the Old Testament is too often disregarded even by chiliasts. That forecast is that God is to sit on David's throne and the coming kingdom-rule will be exalted to that ineffable degree. It was as herald of God Himself that John came. No greater service or higher honor could be accorded to a man. All Scripture which bears on the hypostatic union of two natures in Christ is in evidence here; for it was the Second Person of the Godhead who took upon Him the human form through incarnation. It was that same Person who ascended into heaven, taking with Him His glorified humanity. It is that same Second Person who when returning will appear as the God-man that He is. It is that same Second Person who as God and man—David's rightful Heir and God the Son—will sit on David's throne forever. Though it is equally true that this theanthropic Person is the Head and Bridegroom to the Church, the emphasis falls at this point upon His occupancy of David's throne as both Son of God and Son of David, and upon the truth that John's ministry was

characterized by such immeasurable dignity and responsibility. Into the message of John is converged the earthly purpose of the Creator and the announcement of the execution of covenants which Jehovah Himself has confirmed with His oath. Let none treat that oath lightly. Some sins are more base than others, and it would be an easy task to demonstrate what a high crime is committed against the sovereign God when His oath respecting the placing of His Son on David's throne is dismissed as an absurdity. David's own expectation is revealed in 2 Samuel 7:18–29; Psalm 89:20–37; Acts 2:30. The last of these Scriptures reads, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." This body of Scripture is exceedingly impressive and the devout person will pause to consider the truth that the Davidic throne will in no wise degrade Deity, but, rather, Deity will exalt that throne to the height of heaven's glory. Then, and only then, will be answered the prayer, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10).

John at once becomes a problem for those who are opposed to chiliasm. Under a mistaken view of the kingdom—to which John's ministry is foreign—the advocates of a spiritual kingdom or no kingdom at all, are forced to discount the importance of John's service. Some have gone so far as to state that John was mistaken, that he had no revelation from God, and that he was guided by his own understanding. It is evident that if John had a revelation and spoke with divine authority, those who oppose the literal Messianic kingdom, which John announced, are hopelessly in error. In this controversy they must belittle John's testimony or themselves be found to be distorting the truth of God. Only a moment's reflection is required to recognize the importance of this great prophet—yea, "more than a prophet" (Matt. 11:9). He was filled with the Spirit from birth (Luke 1:15). He was generated by an extraordinary act of God (Luke 1:18, 36–37). He was a witness to the Light, sent from God, "that all men through him might believe" (John 1:6–7). He was the messenger sent as the herald of the eternal King. There is, however, no other course open to those theologians who are wedded to the view of Whitby or to those who are committed to the imperial ambitions of Rome than to discredit such a one.

Christ contrasted His forerunner with all men gone before and with those that would follow. He said, "For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I

send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there bath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Matt. 11:10–11). In all preceding generations none had arisen greater than John, and yet, in the kingdom, he that is least (the rendering may be, *he that is less*) in the kingdom is greater than he. It is true that in the Church the least is, by the marvel of a complete salvation by grace, exalted above the position accorded to John. This truth, feebly apprehended by many, becomes at once an encouragement to some to suppose that the Church is the kingdom to which Christ referred. However, regardless of that which may incidentally be true about the higher position of the believer, being in Christ, it still remains true that Christ is not here, or elsewhere, confusing the Church—not yet announced—with the earthly kingdom. He that is less in the kingdom—so great is that sort of position—is greater than John. If, however, the interpretation be allowed that "any preacher in the church knows more of the kingdom than John knew," the question may be asked why learned theologians with this superior knowledge discover various kinds of kingdoms. And why is there such lack of uniformity among them? John, at least, was saved from a confusion of ideas. His plain message therefore stands, until theories are invented which are more commendable than those offered by antichiliastic advocates.

Regarding the declaration by Christ in the following verse respecting those who act in violence during the brief period between the ministry of John and the moment in which Christ spoke, Dr. C. I. Scofield remarks: "It has been much disputed whether the 'violence' here is external, as *against* the kingdom in the persons of John the Baptist and Jesus; or that, considering the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees, only the violently resolute would press into it. Both things are true. The King and His herald suffered violence, and this is the primary and greater meaning, but also, some were resolutely becoming disciples (cf. Luke 16:16)" (*Ibid.*, p. 1010).

It yet remains to be seen that John's ministry served as the consummation of the Old Testament order. Christ said: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John" (Matt. 11:13), and this is in harmony with the evident fact that John saw the kingdom, which was the subject of the preaching of John, of Christ, and of the disciples until Messiah was

rejected and His kingdom postponed. The kingdom was the national hope and no other objective had been introduced. It was, therefore, most unlikely that some new, unannounced divine program should be the theme of this nation-wide preaching. The confinement of the forerunner in prison (cf. Matt. 11:2), the beheading of this same forerunner (Matt. 14:10), and the crucifixion of the King Himself serve as final evidence that the kingdom was rejected. No greater violence could have been done to this proffered blessing. John, however, had not the same limitless knowledge that Christ had of the unrevealed truth that a new divine purpose was being introduced through the rejection, which would be built on that very foundation, and then, when that new purpose was completed, the kingdom would be established forever. John, being in prison, inquires, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. 11:3). This may have been no more than an inquiry why that which he himself had been sent to announce did not materialize. This is a very natural reaction in the one who had done that which was required of him in the fullness of his devotion and sincerity. At this point it is easy to assume again that John's whole program had been an unwarranted adventure, that is, if the facts are ignored; but when the facts are duly considered, it must be seen that John had wrought precisely as divinely appointed in giving forth a genuine announcement of the presence of the King and His kingdom, and that he could not know that the kingdom would be postponed and that through the same divine authority by which it had been designed at all.

Aside from the one declaration of John the Baptist—recorded in John 1:29 (cf. also vss. 16–17) and which has its peculiar place in that Gospel—the preaching of the forerunner is expressed in the words: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:1–2). This, too, was the early message of Christ (Matt. 4:17; cf. Rom. 15:8), and of His disciples (Matt. 10:6–7). The message announced what was then a new project, anticipated indeed by the whole nation, but without precedent in previous times. It called for the long foretold repentance which the nation will yet experience (cf. Deut. 4:29–30; 30:1–3; Isa. 61:2–3; Hos. 3:4–5; 14:7; Zech. 12:10–13:1; Mal. 3:7; Matt. 24:30). In accordance with kingdom requirements, the forerunner's message was one of human works, a return on the part of a covenant people to right living before God. The

student should read Luke 3:1–18 with attention, for it is the substance of John's message and vindicates the assertion that John's message was not a call to faith in a crucified Savior, but rather to a correction of daily life on the part of those who should be thus prepared for their King. Luke 3:1–18 does not record the words of a mistaken zealot, but is conveying the *voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the* LORD.

3. FALSE PROPHETS. In addition to the record regarding false prophets found in the Old Testament, it is anticipated in the New Testament that false prophets will appear in the last days of the Church and in the tribulation. The following Scriptures should be noted in this connection: Matthew 7:15; 24:11, 24; Mark 13:22; Acts 16:16; 1 Corinthians 14:29; 2 Peter 2:1; 1 John 4:1; Revelation 16:13; 19:20; 20:10. Evil spirits have always sought to imitate the work of the true prophet. These imitations have found expression through soothsayers and mediums (cf. Lev. 19:26; 20:6, 27; Deut. 18:10–11; 1 Sam. 28:9; Isa. 8:19).

4. THE CLASSIFICATION OF OLD TESTAMENT WRITTEN PROPHECIES

a. PROPHECIES BEFORE THE EXILE

(1) To Nineveh
Jonah—862 B.C.
(2) To the Ten Tribes
Amos—787 B.C.
Hosea—785–725 B.C.
Obadiah—887 B.C.
Joel—800 B.C.
(3) To Judah
Isaiah—760–698 B.C.
Micah—750–710 B.C.
Nahum—713 B.C.
Habakkuk—626 B.C.
Zephaniah—630 B.C.
Jeremiah—629–588 B.C.
b. PROPHETS OF THE EXILE
Ezekiel—595–574 B.C.
Daniel—607–534 B.C.

C. POST-EXILE PROPHETS
Haggai—520 B.C.
Zechariah—520–487 B.C.
Malachi—397 B.C.

The Major Highways of Prophecy

Chapter XVI

Prophecy Concerning the Lord Jesus Christ

The importance of the last book of the Bible—the Revelation—in its relation to all Biblical prophecy cannot be overestimated. This book consistently presupposes the study of all that has gone before. Apart from this preparation for its study, the book will be sealed, not by God, but by human ignorance. Deplorable guesswork in its interpretation is usually apologized for by writers and teachers on the supposition that the book is veiled, visionary, and unknowable. On the contrary, the book could not be veiled since it is a *revelation*. It is not sealed (cf. 22:10; Dan. 12:9), for as in the case of no other book of the Bible a blessing is pronounced on him that readeth, and on them that hear—naturally, of course, to understand. It is a revelation given to Jesus Christ—not first of all to John—and it is to be shown to His "servants." Believers, here called *servants*, if yielded to the Spirit, are taught by the Spirit concerning "things to come" (John 16:13). John is appointed to "see" and "hear" that he may write in behalf of the servants. Of hundreds of written expositions it is probable that no two of them agree in every particular. This is largely due to the limitless scope of the book as related to all prophecy. However, these authors' works fall into two general classifications—that of the *preterist* who believes that chapters 4–20 have been or are being fulfilled in this present age, and that of the *futurist* who believes that these chapters are yet to be fulfilled. The last half century has seen a notable increase in the attempted exposition of the Revelation and practically all of these have given it the futuristic interpretation. The book is "sign-i-fied" (1:1) and the symbols used must be considered in the light of their use elsewhere in the Bible. The signs and symbols are clearly designated and only what is so designated may be employed figuratively. The attempts of postmillenarians and amillenarians to fit these descriptions of world-transforming events recorded in chapters 4–20 into the history of the present age are hardly worthy of men who, in regard to other portions of the Bible and in the interest of accuracy, demand that every word of Scripture shall have its full, reasonable, grammatical meaning. Human inventions and imaginations are strained beyond bounds

when the task is assumed of fitting seals, trumpets, vials, the binding of Satan, the first and second resurrections, the beast and the false prophet into the history of this age. When, however, the words of Bible prophecy, and especially the Revelation, are given their reasonable, grammatical meaning, the whole message of the climactic book becomes a prediction of God's coming judgments in the earth and upon a Christ-rejecting world. The futurist's interpretation recognizes three sets of "things" (1:19)—"things which thou hast seen" (1:1–18), "things which are" (chapters 2–3), and "things which shall be hereafter" (chapters 4–22). Similarly, this interpretation recognizes four time-periods, namely, (1) the present Church age (chapters 2–3), (2) the great tribulation (6:1–19:6), (3) the reign of Christ with His Bride (19:7–20:15), and (4) the eternal state (21:1–22:7). Thus, also, several structural divisions are indicated: (1) introduction, salutation, and vision (1:1–20), (2) the Church on earth (2:1–3:22), (3) the Church in heaven with messengers of Israel sealed on earth (4:1–5:14), (4) the great tribulation (6:1–19:6), (5) the coming King, His Bride, and His kingdom (19:7–20:15), (6) the new heavens and the new earth (21:1–22:7), and (7) the closing appeal and promise (22:8–21).

According to its own claim the Revelation is prophecy (1:3). To it, then, the foundational law of prophecy's interpretation must be applied. This law is stated in 2 Peter 1:20: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation." No Scripture is to be interpreted alone or within itself, but, rather, in harmony with all other Scripture. Many works on the Revelation have failed at this point. In them no effort has been made even to harmonize a given text with the one book in which it is found, let alone with the whole Bible itself. The book of Revelation is the terminus of *all* the great highways of prophecy running through the entire Scriptures. As certainly as Genesis is the book of sources and beginnings, Revelation is the book of termini and endings. One begins with the eternal blessedness which is afterwards lost; the other closes with the eternal blessedness regained. One begins with the tree of life; the other closes with the tree of life. One sees the first creation ruined; the other closes with a new creation in its blaze of glory. One introduces man, Satan, and sin; the other disposes of rebellious man, Satan, and sin. One anticipates and prophesies; the other realizes and sets forth the fulfilments of the prophecies of Genesis: it realizes and sets forth the consummation of all the prophecies of the Word

of God. Not only does Revelation need these prophecies for its right understanding, but these prophecies need Revelation for their consummation. To attempt to interpret Revelation within itself, therefore, leads to the colossal twofold error that would be caused by overlooking such necessity.

There is a peculiar advantage, especially for the amateur, in the method of prophetic study which pursues one subject of prediction from its beginning to its end. Only those mature in the vast field of prophecy will succeed in keeping all highways in mind at one time as they trace the unfolding of God's marvelous program. The first approach, therefore, to the study of prophecy will be to trace briefly and in their separate character certain major highways of prophecy, and in this chapter consideration is given to the highway of prophecy concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.

This the greatest theme of the Bible is also the central theme of prophecy. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Rev. 19:10; cf. Eph. 1:9–10; 1 Pet. 1:10–12). These are the words spoken to John by a celestial voice; and with them a rebuke is included to the end that John should not worship the one who spoke, for that one, like John, has the same divine appointment to give testimony respecting Jesus. It is not Christ's own testimony to Himself that is in view; it is the objective testimony concerning Jesus in which heavenly beings may share as "fellow servants" and "brethren." The declaration that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" does not imply that all prediction directly concerns the Second Person of the Godhead; it does state, however, that the whole program of God moves in the one direction of bringing to its fullness the determined exaltation and glory of Christ. The larger study of Christology is reserved for the following volume. Only an outline of so extensive a body of prediction may be introduced here. Christ in all these anticipations is set forth in His peculiar theanthropic character. The human child of a woman is, nevertheless, Emmanuel—"God with us." A child is born and a Son is given. His reign shall be as a son of David; yet He is the theocratic Ruler of the universe.

Since the last book of the Bible is a *revelation* given to Jesus Christ to be shown to His servants, it is reasonable to expect that every theme of prediction respecting Christ which was yet future at the time the book was written will be consummated in that book; and so it is.

As a salutation in the opening chapter of the Revelation, there is a reference to Christ as "him which is, and which was, and which is to come." As Prophet, He *was;* as Priest, He *is;* and as King, He is yet to come. Such an interpretation of these aspects of Christ's ministry will be recognized as exact by all who have entered at all into a Biblical Christology.

Much, though not all, prediction related to Christ may be gathered under three heads—the three offices He holds, namely, that of Prophet, Priest, and King—and in all of these, it will be observed, His theanthropic character is contemplated. To this will be added the two more general lines of prediction —that of the seed and that of His two advents.

I. Prophet

Because of its repetition in quotations given in subsequent Scriptures, the one exalted passage regarding Christ as Prophet must be the one found in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18–19, which reads: "The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. … I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." It is to this expectation that Philip refers, as the following is recorded in John 1:45: "Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Peter quotes this prophecy in his second recorded sermon (Acts 3:22–23), and Stephen declares in his last address before his martyrdom, "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear" (Acts 7:37). In like manner, it is equally clear that Christ assumed the mediatorial relationship which belongs to a prophet. He spoke for Another rather than from Himself. It is written, "Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me" (John 7:16); "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto

me, so I speak" (12:49–50); "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me" (14:24); "For I have given them the words which thou gavest me" (17:8).

In the exercise of His prophetic ministry, Christ was both a *forthteller* and a *foreteller*. His preaching as a forthteller is reported throughout the four Gospels—notably in the major discourses. His predictions were (1) of His own death, burial, resurrection, ascension, of the advent of the Spirit, and of His second coming; (2) the beginning, character, course, and end of the present age; (3) the Church, her emergence, character, safety, rapture, and destiny; (4) the great tribulation, the man of sin, the coming of false christs, and the yet future judgments; (5) the Messianic kingdom; and (6) the eternal estate of all men.

II. Priest

Previews of Christ's priestly ministry are set forth more in types than in prophecy. Two types are to be recognized especially—that of Aaron (Ex. 28:1) and that of Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18). In the Aaronic type, Christ followed only to the extent of making a sacrifice. He offered Himself without spot to God (Heb. 9:14). In that type which Melchizedek afforded, Christ is represented as a King-Priest who abides forever. Prophecy respecting Christ's priesthood is in relation to that type which is foreseen in Melchizedek. In Psalm 110—a prediction of Messiah—it is said: "The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (vss. 1–4; cf. Heb. 5:6). As a priest offers sacrifices, so Christ offered Himself to God *once for all* (Heb. 9:26). A priest offers intercession and prayers; so Christ ceases not to make intercession (Heb. 7:25; John 17:1–26; Rom. 8:34).

III. King

This highway of prediction begins with the covenant Jehovah made with David (2 Sam. 7:1–17), and, being so much a part of the entire kingdom expectation, is one of the most extensive prophecies in the Bible. Failure on the part of good men to consider the meaning, scope, and end of the Davidic covenant is responsible to a large degree for the present confusion of ideas respecting the whole plan and purpose of God. Men have made some attempts to spiritualize the Abrahamic covenant, but there is no such freedom possible with the Davidic covenant. It concerns David's throne, on the earth, in Jerusalem, with Messiah seated upon it and reigning over Israel and the whole world forever. There is but one way to deal with a prediction which is so literal and clear when the plain statements are not acceptable, and that is to ignore it altogether. This is the treatment the majority of theologians have accorded this great covenant. Among the six references in Revelation 20 to the thousand-year period is the declaration that those who participate in the first resurrection (the Church) are those who live and reign with Christ a thousand years. This statement relates the thousand-year period to the kingly reign of Christ. This entire context concerning the thousand years in which the saints share in Christ's reign is preceded by the description of His second advent, in which description He returns in power and great glory and as a Conqueror over the nations of the earth. He bears four titles in His return and one of them—the last named—is "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." The amillennialist with his distortions of the thousand-year period supposes that he is dealing here with an insignificant feature of revelation, that he is free to dismiss it wholly, and justified in thanking God for the "riddance." But the entire kingdom program is bound up with the return of the King, the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant, the glory of Israel, and the blessings to Gentiles and the whole earth. This accounts for the vast quantity of material on the subject in Old Testament prediction. The twentieth chapter of the Revelation, so far from standing alone as an obscure declaration which may be disarranged and distorted at will, is but one passage of many bearing on that reign, when it reveals that the saints will share in Christ's reign and that the reign itself is for a thousand years. It is pertinent to inquire what language God could employ other than that which He has employed, if, as a hypothetical case, He wished to say that His Son, the Son of David, would sit on David's throne and reign over the house of Jacob forever (Isa. 9:7; Luke 1:33; Acts

2:29–31), with a specific mediatorial character to that reign for a thousand years (1 Cor. 15:24–28; Rev. 20:6). It does not savor of candor to avoid this question. Even were it proved that a certain ancient building was not, as supposed, a thousand years old, that discovery would not eradicate the building; and though the amillennialist could demonstrate–which he cannot do—that there is no reference to a kingdom reign in Revelation 20:1–8, he would not dispose thereby of the divine testimony which asserts that the King will reign forever sitting on David's throne. In other words, the thousand-year, mediatorial aspect of Christ's reign is itself but a detail of the immeasurable truth that He will reign on David's throne forever (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:35–36; Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:31–33; 1 Tim. 1:17; Rev. 11:15). Again, the question may be asked why it was necessary for Christ to be born of the house of David. To this question the amillenarian has no answer.

Since the Davidic line in its relation to the earthly kingdom constitutes one of the highways of prophecy yet to be traced, it will not be traced further here.

IV. The Seed

As recorded in Genesis 3:15, God declared that there would be a seed of the woman. While that prediction could have been fulfilled in the first generation to be born, its consummation was, in the plan of God, to be realized only after at least four thousand years of human history. Thus the line of the seed was forecast and is traced faithfully through the genealogies recorded in the Bible. Special importance is attached to five men in this line: (1) Abraham, to whom the promise of a glorious seed was given; (2) Isaac, a type of Christ and a direct removal from the line of Ishmael; (3) Jacob, the progenitor of the twelve tribes, in whom the line of seed was removed from Esau; (4) Judah, the chosen of the twelve sons of Jacob through whom the Messiah was to come—in his prediction, Jacob said of Judah, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be" (Gen. 49:10); and (5) David, to whom was covenanted by Jehovah's oath an everlasting kingdom, an everlasting throne, and an everlasting kingly line (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:20–37; Jer. 33:17). Every anticipation of Jehovah regarding the seed has been fulfilled both literally

and to completeness. “The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this” (Isa. 9:7), and “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world” (Acts 15:18).

V. The Two Advents

From its beginning to its end, the Old Testament is centered on the coming One. In some predictions He is seen as an unresisting, sacrificial Lamb, while in other predictions He is set forth as a conquering Lion. The first instance of Old Testament prescience is that of the suffering Lamb (Gen. 3:15), while the second is that in which He is seen as the Lion of the tribe of Judah. The prophecy on the lips of Jacob, already quoted, foresees an unbroken kingly sceptre continuing in Judah’s line until Shiloh come, at which coming the people will be gathered unto Him, which they were not at His first advent. Nevertheless, one of the most determining factors in the right apprehension of Old Testament prophecy is the recognition of the truth that to no individual in that vast period from Adam to Christ was any intimation revealed respecting the fact that there would be two advents of Christ. Moses did say with regard to the future regathering of Israel that it would be at the time of Jehovah’s return—“and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee” (Deut. 30:3); but no attention seems to have been centered on this promise, as clear as it seems now in the light of subsequent disclosures.

Notice has been called earlier to the fact that, as revealed in 1 Peter 1:10–11, the prophets of old could not discover the time element which would intervene between the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Unavoidably, this was due to the truth that the present age was a divine secret, or mystery (Matt. 13:11; Eph. 3:1–6), not revealed in the Old Testament. Clear evidence that the divine purpose in this age was purposely withheld is found in many Scriptures. Three of these may be noted:

Isaiah 61:1–3. “The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty

for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the LORD, that he might be glorified."

This passage, it will be remembered, is the text selected by Christ for His reading in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:18–19), and He read only down to and including the words "to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD," which phrase, as reported in the English text of Isaiah, is separated from that which follows by no more than a comma. That which follows in the context, however, evidently belongs to the second advent. He could say of that which He read, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:21); but in no sense has that portion of Isaiah's prediction which He did not read ever been fulfilled.

Malachi 3:1. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts."

The first clauses of this passage are clearly of the coming of John the Baptist and therefore related to the first advent (cf. Matt. 11:10; Mark 1:2; Luke 7:27), but the remainder—continuing to verse 6—is of the second advent.

Luke 1:30–33. "And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Even the angel Gabriel is not permitted—and as late in time as the birth of Christ—to disclose to Mary the fact of two advents; yet those advents are clearly discerned now. The Savior was named *Jesus*, He was great, and He was called the Son of the Highest; but the taking of the throne of His father David and His reigning over the house of Jacob forever await His return. The two advents should be considered separately as each presents a specific and extended highway of prophecy.

1. THE FIRST ADVENT. In those Scriptures which anticipate His physical birth the first advent of Christ is seen. A virgin was to conceive and bear a

Son who would be Immanuel (Isa. 7:14); a child would be born who is the mighty God, and upon whom the government would rest (Isa. 9:6–7); that child would be born in Bethlehem (Mic. 5:2); and the entire line of the seed from Adam to Christ was an expectation of the physical birth and first advent of the Redeemer. Every sacrifice of the Old Testament announces in type the first advent and its specific purpose as something to be realized in the death and resurrection of the Son of God. The great predictions which set forth His death (Gen. 3:15; Ps. 22:1–21; Isa. 52:13–53:12), likewise His resurrection (Ps. 16:1–11; 22:22–31; 118:22–24), speak of His first advent.

Prediction which looks on to the first advent is not difficult to identify since it articulates so perfectly with history. Upwards of three hundred separate prophecies have been identified which belong to the first advent, and these, without exception, follow the plan of a literal fulfillment. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that the yet future second advent program—far greater in extent—will be fulfilled after the same manner. Especially is this a natural conclusion since, as foreseen in the Old Testament, the features which make up the two advents are combined into one story. To introduce a literal fulfillment for those items which forecast the first advent—and such an interpretation cannot be avoided—with a spiritualizing conception of the features which preview the second advent is nothing short of violence to the Sacred Text.

The highway of the first advent may be traced thus: Genesis 3:15; 12:3; 17:19; 24:60; 28:14; 49:10; 2 Samuel 7:16; Psalms 2:2; 16:10; 22:1–18; Isaiah 7:13–14; 9:6; 28:16; 42:1–7; 49:1–6; 50:4–7; 52:13–53:12; 61:1; Daniel 9:25–26; Hosea 2:23; Micah 5:2; Haggai 2:7; Zechariah 9:9; 11:11–13; 13:7; Malachi 3:1–2; Matthew 1:1, 23; 2:1–6; 4:15–16; 12:18–21; 21:1–5, 42; 26:31; 27:9–10, 34–35, 50; 28:5–6; Acts 1:9.

2. The Second Advent. Here, again, it is important to observe that, as before indicated, there is no separate treatment of either advent in the Old Testament, though the events related to each are never confused. There is no identification of one as removed in point of time from the other. As in the Second Psalm, the Messiah is first seen before the nations and their kings as One to be rejected, which attitude belongs to the first advent and those relationships which grew out of it. Later, and as indicated in verses 6–9, He takes His throne and becomes the conquering Monarch of the whole earth.

The remainder of the Psalm reverts to the first advent relationship wherein kings and rulers are admonished to make peace with the Son *before* His wrath is kindled but a little. From the first Messianic prophecy of Genesis on to the time of His official rejection by Israel, which rejection was enacted by His crucifixion, the two advents must be distinguished wholly by the character of the events ascribed to each. This distinction, regardless of how perplexing it was to the prophets of old to whom both advents were yet future, is not difficult even when the events of the two advents are run together in one context, since the first is that which has been fulfilled and the second is future. This added light of the New Testament is such that men are without excuse in this age if they do not distinguish these two great divisions of prophecy.

The two advents are implied in each of the two great covenants—the Abrahamic and the Davidic. In both there is the promise of a lineage and the birth of a son. In the case of Abraham, the birth of a son is to the end that there may be a seed both physical (Gen. 13:16) and spiritual (Gen. 15:5)—the latter is such by virtue of the death of Christ in His first advent. To David the birth of a son was to the end that there might not fail one to sit on David's throne forever (Jer. 33:17).

The Bible teaches that the Lord Jesus Christ will return to this earth (Zech. 14:4), personally (Rev. 19:11–16; Matt. 25:31), and in the clouds of heaven (Matt. 24:30; Acts 1:11; Rev. 1:7). It should not be difficult to believe the testimony of these Scriptures, since God has promised it and since He who went on the clouds of heaven had already spent forty days on the earth in His glorified, resurrection body.

The general theme concerning the return of Christ has the unique distinction of being the first prophecy uttered by man (Jude 1:14–15) and the last message from the ascended Christ as well as being the last word of the Bible (Rev. 22:20–21). Likewise, the theme of the second coming of Christ is unique because of the fact that it occupies a larger part of the text of the Scriptures than any other doctrine, and it is the outstanding theme of prophecy in both the Old and New Testaments. In fact, all other prophecy largely contributes to the one great end of the complete setting forth of this crowning event—the second coming of Christ. The highway of prophecy concerning the second advent follows a line of at least forty-four major predictions, beginning with the first direct mention of it in Deuteronomy

30:3 and continuing to its last word, which is the last promise in the Bible. This list of passages, which is entered below, does not include those Scriptures which set forth the coming of Christ to take the Church, His Bride, unto Himself, which Scriptures are not any part of His glorious appearing, or second advent.

According to that which is anticipated in the vast body of prediction, at least seven distinct achievements are consummated in the second advent:

(a) Christ Himself returns as He went, in the clouds of heaven and with power and great glory.

(b) Christ takes the throne of His father David, which is the throne of His glory, and reigns forever.

(c) Christ comes, not to a converted world, but to the earth in rebellion against Jehovah and against His Messiah, and conquers it by the might of His own infinite power.

(d) At Christ's coming, judgment will fall upon Israel, upon the nations, upon Satan, and upon the man of sin.

(e) Christ's coming is accompanied with the convulsion of nature and accomplishes her release from the curse.

(f) Christ's coming provokes Israel's long-predicted repentance and brings to her salvation.

(g) At His coming Christ establishes His kingdom of righteousness and peace, with converted Israel regathered to their own land, united and blessed under "their king," and Gentiles, as a subordinate people, sharing in that kingdom.

Whatever course the casual reader may pursue, the student is enjoined to study this entire body of Scripture with attention. Unnumbered secondary references to this stupendous event are not included in this list. The major passages are: Deuteronomy 30:3; Psalms 2:1–9; 24:1–10; 50:1–5; 96:10–13; 110:1; Isaiah 9:7; 11:10–12; 63:1–6; Jeremiah 23:5–6; Ezekiel 37:21–22; Daniel 2:44–45; 7:13–14; Hosea 3:4–5; Micah 4:7; Zechariah 2:10–12; 6:12–13; 12:10; 13:6; Matthew 19:28; 23:39; 24:27–31; 25:6, 31–46; Mark 13:24–27; Luke 12:35–40; 17:24–36; 18:8; 21:25–28; 24:25–26; Acts 1:10–11; 15:16–18; Romans 11:25–26; 2 Thessalonians 2:8; 1 Timothy 6:14–15; James 5:7–8; 2 Peter 3:3–4; Jude 1:14–15; Revelation 1:7–8; 2:25–28; 16:15; 19:11–21; 20:4–6; 22:20.

A profitable and almost interminable study is suggested when the details of the two advents are set over against each other. As a mere intimation regarding this investigation, it may be noted that (1) in His first advent Christ came as a Redeemer from sin, which purpose demanded His death, His resurrection, and His present ministry in heaven; in His second advent He comes "apart from sin" unto the consummation of salvation for the Church (1 Pet. 1:5) and unto the inauguration of salvation for Israel (Rom. 11:26–27). (2) In His first advent Christ came "meek and lowly" with respect to birth, life, and death; in His second advent He comes with power and great glory. (3) In His first advent He was rejected of men; but in His second advent He as King of kings and Lord of lords is the judge and ruler of men. (4) In His first advent Christ provided salvation for individual Jews and Gentiles; in His second advent He comes to judge both Jews and Gentiles. (5) In His first advent Christ merely judged (Col. 2:15) and resisted Satan; but in His second advent He binds Satan and conquers the forces of evil (cf. 1 Cor. 15:25–28).

In a contributed article to *The Sunday School Times*, Dec. 6, 1941, Frederick G. Taylor, D.D.S., writes convincingly on the two advents. A portion of this thesis is introduced here:

> In Revelation 19:10, we read, "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy," and we take this to mean that bearing witness unto Him and concerning Him was the special function and mission of all the prophets and all the prophecies. Upon careful examination of the Old Testament Scriptures, we find ourselves confronted with two distinct, separate, and contrasting lines of prophecy. In the first line, the prophets foretold a Messiah who would make His appearance in the world as the "seed" of the woman. According to Isaiah, He was to be born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14). The prophet Micah wrote that His birthplace would be Bethlehem of Judah (Mic. 5:2). It was predicted that He would grow up "as a tender plant," having neither "form nor comeliness" nor "beauty" such as would naturally attract men to Him, but that He would be "despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief"; that He would be "wounded for our transgressions," and that there would be "laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:2–6). Holy men of God, who wrote as they were borne along by the Holy Spirit, declared that it would be Jehovah's pleasure "to bruise him" and "put him to grief" and "make his soul an offering for sin" (v. 10). The prophets foretold that He would be betrayed by His "own familiar friend" (Psa. 41:9) and be sold for "thirty pieces of silver" (Zech. 11:12, 13); that he would be subjected to "shame and spitting" (Isa. 50:6); that His garments would be parted among His enemies, and for His vesture they would cast lots (Psa. 22:18). According to the prophets, His hands and feet were to be pierced (Psa. 22:16), while death by crucifixion is clearly foretold in Psalm 22. He was to suffer with malefactors, but "his grave" was to be "with the rich in his death" (Isa. 53:9). The prophets emphasized the fact that His soul was not to be left in Sheol, neither would His body be

allowed to undergo corruption (Psa. 16:10). On the contrary, He was to be raised from the dead, and, finally, prophecy declares that when raised He would ascend “on high” where He would receive “gifts for men” (Psa. 68:18).

Over against this first line of prophecies, the Bible sets a second and much larger group of prophecies, written by the same “holy men of God” and relating to the same blessed Person. In this second group, Christ is portrayed in His kingly character as “the Lion of the tribe of Juda”; as the mighty King who will one day break the nations “with a rod of iron” and “dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel” (Psa. 2:9). Concerning His coming we read, “Behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, … and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him” (Dan. 7:13, 14; see also Acts 1:9, 11). The particular time when He will make His appearance is characterized by the prophets as “a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness” (Zeph. 1:15; see also Matt. 24:21, 22).

In such a time as this, there will be ten kingdoms ruled by ten kings who are to give their power to one superman who for a season is to exercise world dictatorship (Dan. 7), “Behold, in those days, and in that time, … I will gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat; and I will execute judgment upon them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations” (Joel 3:1, 2, R.V.). Then shall sound forth God’s challenge: “Proclaim ye this among the nations; prepare war; stir up the mighty men; let all the men of war draw near, let them come up. Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. Haste ye, and come, all ye nations round about, and gather yourselves together” (Joel 3:9–11, R.V.). This is the hour when “Jehovah will be a refuge unto his people, and a stronghold to the children of Israel” (Joel 3:16, R.V.). “The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, … and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day” (Isa. 2:11). When this mighty Conqueror descends through the clouds to earth, “His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east” (Zech. 14:4). The nailprints will still be in His hands and they, the Jews, “shall look upon … [Him] whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn” (Zech. 12:10). After that, “The Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one” (Zech. 14:9).

Then shall they “beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more” (Isa. 2:4). “But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid” (Mic. 4:4). “Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree” (Isa. 55:13). “For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea” (Isa. 11:9). “With righteousness shall he judge the poor” (Isa. 11:4). “And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King” (Zech. 14:16).

But how can these two contrasting and seemingly opposing lines of Old Testament prophecy be reconciled? The answer is simple. The prophecies of the first group were literally and minutely fulfilled at Christ’s first advent 1,900 years ago. The prophecies of the second group will have the same minute and literal fulfillment at His second advent. Here then is the true balm for aching hearts today. Before the happenings of that awful judgment connected with the visible appearing of Christ at His second advent, the “bride” of Christ (meaning all true believers) will be “caught up” and away to be forever with the Lord (1

Thess. 4:17). “Wherefore comfort one another with these words,” writes the Apostle Paul (1 Thess. 4:18). “Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord … stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh,” says James (Jas. 5:7, 8). And the Lord Himself saith, “Surely I come quickly,” while the heart of John echoes back, “Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus” (Rev. 22:20).—P. 990

Chapter XVII

Prophecy Concerning Israel's Covenants

Inability on the part of believers to comprehend the prophetic Scriptures may be traced almost without exception to some misunderstanding of an essential truth or to the failure to realize its practical force and value. In this respect, the majority who are unable to follow the great divine predictions are hindered primarily by their negligence in giving to the nation Israel the place and importance which God in His sovereignty has assigned to that nation. This dereliction is the cause of most of the confusion of mind relative to prophetic themes. The sovereign election of the one nation, Israel —sometimes styled "his elect" (cf. Matt. 24:22, 24, 31)—is a revealed fact which the Gentile nations seem unable to realize. It is, however, the attitude of Gentile nations toward God's elect nation which forms the basis on which the destiny of nations is determined (Matt. 25:31–46). The election of Israel is continually emphasized throughout the Scriptures. Moses said, "For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people; but because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt" (Deut. 7:6–8); "For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth" (Deut. 14:2). Jehovah has loved Israel with an everlasting love (Jer. 31:3), and concerning that people His gifts and calling are without repentance (Rom. 11:29). In accordance with this eternal purpose, they are to be regathered, restored, and preserved forever (cf. Isa. 66:22; Jer. 31:36–37; Matt. 24:34). When it is once comprehended that God has an elect nation to whom He has made irrevocable covenants, which covenants are eternal in character, there will be a readiness of mind to follow the divine plan for this people through time and into eternity. Another means to

clarification of mind is found in the separation in one's thinking of the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church of God (1 Cor. 10:32; cf. Eph. 2:11 and Col. 2:11). These three classes of humanity are to be traced from their beginnings on through time and into eternity. Apart from the calling of individual Jews and individual Gentiles out from their original estate to form the Church, these groups never lose their identity, nor are they merged into something else. Israel has never been the Church, is not the Church now, nor will she ever be the Church. A form of Covenant Theology which would thread all of Jehovah's purposes and undertakings upon His one attribute of grace could hardly avoid confusion of mind in matters related to His varied objectives. Covenant Theology, in consistency with its man-made premise, asserts its inventions respecting an Old Testament church, which, it is claimed, is an integral part of the New Testament Church and on the ground that, since God's grace is one unchanging attribute, its accomplishments must be the realization of one standardized ideal. The Covenant theory does retain Israel as such to the time of Christ's death. The Church is thought to be a spiritual remnant within Israel to whom all Old Testament blessings are granted and the nation as such is allowed to inherit the cursings.

Relative to the identity of Israel, Dr. C. I. Scofield declares:

> Genesis 11. and 12. mark an important turning point in the divine dealing. Heretofore the history has been that of the whole Adamic race. There has been neither Jew nor Gentile; all have been one in "the first man Adam." Henceforth, in the Scripture record, humanity must be thought of as a vast stream from which God, in the call of Abram and the creation of the nation of Israel, has but drawn off a slender rill, through which He may at last purify the great river itself. Israel was called to be a witness to the unity of God in the midst of universal idolatry (Deut. 6:4; Isa. 43:10–12); to illustrate the blessedness of serving the true God (Deut. 33:26–29); to receive and preserve the divine revelations (Rom. 3:1, 2; Deut. 4:5–8); and to produce the Messiah (Gen. 3:15; 21:12; 28:10, 14; 49:10; 2 Sam. 7:16, 17; Isa. 4:3, 4; Mt. 1:1). The reader of Scripture should hold firmly in mind: (1) that from Gen. 12. to Mt. 12:45 the Scriptures have primarily in view Israel, the little rill, not the great Gentile river; though again and again the universality of the ultimate divine intent breaks into view (e.g. Gen. 12:3; Isa. 2:2, 4; 5:26; 9:1, 2; 11:10–12; 42:1–6; 49:6, 12; 52:15; 54:3; 55:5; 60:3, 5, 11–16; 61:6, 9; 62:2; 66:12, 18, 19; Jer. 16:19; Joel 3:9, 10; Mal. 1:11; Rom. 9., 10., 11 .; Gal. 3:8–14); (2) that the human race, henceforth called Gentile in distinction from Israel, goes on under the Adamic and Noahic covenants; and that for the race (outside Israel) the dispensations of Conscience and of Human Government continue. The moral history of the great Gentile world is told in Rom. 1:21–32, and its moral accountability in Rom. 2:1–16. Conscience never acquits: it either "accuses" or "excuses." Where the law is known to the Gentiles it is to them, as to Israel, "a ministration of death," a "curse" (Rom. 3:19, 20; 7:9,

10; 2 Cor. 3:7; Gal. 3:10). A wholly new responsibility arises when either Jew or Gentile knows the Gospel (John 3:18, 19, 36; 15:22–24; 16:9; 1 John 5:9–12).—*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 19

This people are sometimes designated *Jews*, which relates them to one of their ancestors, Judah; sometimes *Jacob*, by which title they are seen as the entire posterity of their common ancestor, Jacob; and sometimes *Israel*. This last-named cognomen is always employed when a spiritual group within the whole nation is to be indicated (cf. Isa. 9:8); however, this appellation may be used for the entire offspring of Jacob. Sometimes it is employed as a recognition of the ten tribes who went out under Jeroboam—the northern kingdom, Ephraim with Samaria its capital. The ten tribes were taken into exile in 722 B.C., and from that exile the majority have not returned. They are also known as "the outcasts of Israel," who are thus distinguished from "the dispersed of Judah." The ten tribes will yet be accounted for and the entire nation will be reunited (Isa. 11:11–13; Jer. 23:5–8; Ezek. 37:11–24). It is evident that the people are to come into divine judgments and many will be "purged out" (Ezek. 20:37–38), and "so all Israel [that portion accepted of God] shall be saved" (Rom. 11:26–27). The fact that the Bible recognizes an Israel within the nation itself—sometimes termed "the remnant"—has been seized upon by Covenant theologians as a ground for their contention that the Church is the true Israel of the Old Testament. The Sacred Text hardly sustains this idea. It is true that Gentiles become children of Abraham in the sense that they are born of God on the principle of Abrahamic faith (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:12); but salvation by faith does not introduce a Gentile into the Jewish nation, though, in this age, it does introduce a Jew or a Gentile into the Church. The essential distinction between the nation and a true Israel within that nation was declared by Christ when He said to the Jews, "I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham" (John 8:37–39). In this declaration Christ admits that the Jews are Abraham's seed; but, on the other hand, "if ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." The Apostle is evidently referring to the true Israel, who are saved as Gentiles are saved, when he said, "And as

many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16).

The Jewish nation is the center of all things related to the earth. The Church is foreign to the earth and related to it only as a witnessing people. They are strangers and pilgrims, ambassadors whose citizenship is in heaven. Moses declared, "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. 32:8). This great statement places Israel as the center of all divine purposes for the earth. Jehovah may chasten His people and even use the nations to that end, but invariably judgment falls on those who afflict Israel and simply because they do it maliciously nonetheless. "I will … curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. 12:3) has never failed in its fulfillment, nor will it fail to the end of human history on the earth.

The highway of Israel's covenants will be pursued along two lines: (1) the four major covenants involved and (2) the seven features.

I. The Four Major Covenants

The major covenants which Jehovah has made with His elect nation are four: (1) the covenant made with Abraham, (2) the covenant given through Moses, (3) the covenant made with David, and (4) the new covenant yet to be made in the Messianic kingdom.

1. The Covenant Made with Abraham. In its entirety, the Abrahamic covenant (cf. Gen. 12:1–3; 13:14–17; 15:4–21; 17:1–8; 22:17–18) includes various features and is unconditional in every part of it, being that alone which Jehovah declares He will do for and through Abraham. Being unconditional, it cannot be broken by man. The covenant is restated to Isaac (Gen. 26:3–5), and to Jacob (Gen. 35:10–12), but is always said to be fulfilled for Abraham's sake. This covenant reaches on to eternity, being everlasting in its duration. The features of this covenant are:

(a) "I will make of thee a great nation," which feature is fulfilled in the posterity of Ishmael, of Isaac, and in Abraham's spiritual seed.

(b) "I will bless thee," which is fulfilled in both earthly and heavenly riches.

(c) “I will make thy name great,” and no name is more honored, outside that of Christ’s, than Abraham’s.

(d) “Thou shalt be a blessing.” This blessing extends to Abraham’s physical seed through Isaac and Jacob and to the Gentiles (Gal. 3:13–14).

(e) “I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee,” which, as before observed, is the abiding divine principle in connection with Israel upon which God deals with Gentile nations as such (Deut. 30:7; Isa. 14:1–2; Zech. 14:1–3; Matt. 25:31–46).

(f) “In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed,” which promise looks on to the Seed, Christ, and contemplates all that Christ is or ever will be to the whole earth.

(g) “I will give unto thee the land …,” which territory far exceeds that occupied by Israel when they came out of Egypt. The extent of the land is “from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates” (Gen. 15:18).

2. The Covenant Given Through Moses. The law covenant came by Moses (John 1:17; Ex. 20:1–31:18), and was given by Jehovah as a conditional blessing to those who kept the Mosaic Law. It was made at Sinai where Jehovah said, “Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation” (Ex. 19:5–6). Both the blessings and curses related to this covenant are stated in detail in Deuteronomy 28:1–68. This covenant is a rule of life addressed to a people who are in covenant relation to God by physical birth. This life-governing covenant, being conditional, has been broken by men and will be superseded by the new covenant—yet to be considered.

3. The Covenant Made with David. The covenant made with David (2 Sam. 7:11–16), like the covenant made with Abraham, is unconditional and everlasting in its duration. It guarantees (1) an unfailing house or line of David’s sons—a king without cessation to sit on David’s throne (The necessity of chastisement may cause the throne itself to be unoccupied; but there shall never lack one whose right it is to sit on that throne—2 Sam. 7:14–15; Ps. 89:30–33; Jer. 33:17. The covenant can never—on the oath of

Jehovah—be abrogated.); (2) a throne, the earthly throne of David to continue forever; and (3) a kingdom forever.

4. The New Covenant Yet to Be Made in the Messianic Kingdom. The old, life-governing covenant made when Jehovah took Israel by the hand to bring them out of Egypt was broken, though Jehovah was as a husband to that nation. Upon entering their kingdom, He will make a new covenant with the nation which will govern their life in the kingdom (Jer. 31:31–34).

These four covenants have received this brief treatment at this point in view of the fact that the features which they embody are to be considered more at length under a general sevenfold division of prophecy herewith, namely, (1) a nation forever, (2) a land forever, (3) a King forever, (4) a throne forever, (5) a kingdom forever, (6) a new covenant, and (7) abiding blessings.

II. Seven Features

The division of Israel's varied and manifold benefits into seven general divisions will serve as a means whereby these divine benefactions may be more generally classified. Appeal is addressed to the student to observe the literal and physical character of these predictions, and how impossible it is within the bounds of reason to give these prophecies a spiritual interpretation. The first wrong turn in the road which traces Israel's coming glories is the willingness to misinterpret the meaning of the words employed, and beyond that error is the more pernicious method of ignoring these Scriptures altogether. The whole field of complexity has by many been found to disappear when terms are taken in their normal, grammatical, and natural meaning—Israel is not the Church now, nor is the kingdom the Church; Zion is Jerusalem and not heaven; and the throne of David is precisely what David believed it to be, an earthly institution which has never been, nor will it ever be, in heaven.

1. A Nation Forever. Without reference at this point to the divine dealing with individuals within the Israelitish nation, a positive doctrine will be seen to obtain in the Word of God which asserts, without human conditions to modify it, that God's sacred, elect nation will be preserved as

such forever. Thus they are projected far beyond the thousand-year kingdom and into eternity to come. As their covenants respecting the land are everlasting, it follows, also, that this people as a nation must inherit and inhabit the new earth that is to be (Isa. 65:17; 66:22; Heb. 1:10–12; 2 Pet. 3:4–14; Rev. 20:11; 21:1). The abiding character of this nation is declared in certain Scriptures: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God" (Gen. 17:7–8); "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain" (Isa. 66:22); "Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The LORD of hosts is his name: if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD" (Jer. 31:35–37).

A preservation of this nation throughout this age of her scattering was promised by Christ as recorded in Matthew 24:34, "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Here the word γενεά, translated *generation*, must—since none of the events named in the foregoing prophecy have yet transpired—be given its primary meaning of *race, kind, family, stock, breed*. The nation will be preserved forever, else language fails to express thought. It matters nothing whether modern Jews and modern preachers assert that God has cast off His earthly people. The answer to the question in Romans 11:1 "Hath God cast away his people?" is dogmatically answered by inspiration, "God forbid." The entire eleventh chapter of Romans is devoted to proofs that Israel will never be cast off, but rather be restored to her covenanted blessings. Dr. C. I. Scofield has outlined this chapter in his *Reference Bible:* "That Israel has not been forever set aside is the theme of this chapter. (1) The salvation of Paul proves that there is still a remnant (v. 1). (2) The doctrine of the remnant proves it (vs. 2–6). (3) The present national unbelief was foreseen (vs. 7–

10). (4) Israel's unbelief is the Gentile opportunity (vs. 11–25). (5) Israel is judicially broken off from the good olive tree, Christ (vs. 17–22). (6) They are to be grafted in again (vs. 23, 24). (7) The promised Deliverer will come out of Zion and the nation will be saved (vs. 25–29). That the Christian now inherits the distinctive Jewish promises is not taught in Scripture. The Christian is of the heavenly seed of Abraham (Gen. 15:5, 6; Gal. 3:29), and partakes of the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 15:18, *note*); but Israel as a nation always has its own place, and is yet to have its greatest exaltation as the earthly people of God" (p. 1204).

The entire revelation of the truth of God's elective choice of one nation and the eternal love which prompted it are involved in this theme. The words of Moses clearly declare these stupendous facts—an election of a nation which is based on no other reason than Jehovah's love for that people. Moses wrote: "For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt" (Deut. 7:6–8). That Jehovah loves Israel with "an everlasting love" is assured in Jeremiah 31:3. An everlasting love includes a love from all eternity past and extends on into eternity to come. This nation is thus loved in spite of their evil and multiplied rejections of Jehovah. That everlasting love will yet prevail and this unworthy people will inherit all that Jehovah has determined. As in all divine election, there can be no grounding of God's actions upon a supposed worthiness of men. What God does in realizing His elective purpose is due to His love. It satisfies Him in Himself. An eternal love calls for an eternal reality which answers all its claims.

2. A LAND FOREVER. What is usually termed the *Palestinian Covenant* is the oft-repeated declaration by Jehovah, wholly unconditional, that the land which was promised to Abraham—"Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen. 15:18)—would be Abraham's possession forever. It is thus deeded to

Abraham personally and becomes the legal inheritance of his posterity. On what other ground could it be styled “the promised land”?

In Deuteronomy, chapters 28–30, Jehovah records what is rightfully termed the Palestinian Covenant. This, as has been seen, is preannounced in the Abrahamic Covenant. The Palestinian Covenant is in several parts:

a. The Nation “Plucked from Off” The Land for Its Unfaithfulness. Prophecy respecting Israel’s tenure of the land anticipates three distinct dispossessions of the land (cf. Gen. 15:13–14, 16; Jer. 25:11–12; Deut. 28:63–68 with 30:1–3), and three restorations (cf. Gen. 15:14 with Josh. 1:2–7; Dan. 9:2 with Jer. 25:11–12; Deut. 30:3; Jer. 23:5–8; Ezek. 37:21–25; Acts 15:14–17). The three dispossessions have been fulfilled, so also the first and second restorations. The final restoration for which the nation waits is yet future.

b. A Future Repentance of Israel. The final repentance of Israel is anticipated throughout the Bible. This should be distinguished from their sufferings which are agelong and which do not lead them to repentance. Deuteronomy 28:63–68 foresees their sufferings while 30:1–3 foresees their repentance. They are described as a mourning people, which experience will be theirs when they recognize their true Messiah at the time of His return (cf. Isa. 61:2–3; Zech. 12:10; Matt. 5:4; 24:30). The call to this national repentance was the very essence of the Forerunner’s message, and the same theme —“Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand”—was presented by Christ and His disciples. In their attitude of rejection, they neither repented nor did they receive their King. However, prediction anticipates a national turning to Messiah and a glad reception of Him, which prediction must yet be fulfilled.

c. The Return of Messiah. Specifically, the final possession of the land is, in Scripture, dated to occur at the second coming of Christ. Describing Israel’s final return to her land, Moses wrote: “The LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the LORD thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: and the LORD thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of

thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live" (Deut. 30:3–6). Thus it is asserted that Jehovah will Himself place Israel in their land and at the time of His "return." Naturally, a return implies a previous presence. The same reference to Christ's return and the accompanying events is recorded in Acts 15:16–17, "After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." To this may be added the testimony of the extended passage—Amos 9:9–15.

d. Israel's Restoration to the Land. Many times, indeed, has the Holy Spirit declared the truth that Israel will return to their own land. This event thus becomes one of the major themes of prophecy. In Deuteronomy 30:5, cited above, there is a declaration that this nation will be brought into the land which their fathers possessed; but, according to this context, this will occur after they have been "scattered" among all the peoples of the earth, as now they are, and they will be restored, as has been observed, when the Lord returns. Isaiah prophesies, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth" (11:11–12). This second gathering of Israel, as described by Isaiah, is in contrast with or succession to the removal of that people from Egypt when they entered the land under Joshua. The manifestation of divine power demonstrated in the placing of Israel in her land the last time will far exceed the manifestation of power which accompanied their removal from Egypt and placing in the land under Joshua. Of this contrast Jeremiah writes: "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that

they shall no more say, The LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land" (23:5–8). Here again, it will be noted, this great event when Israel is restored will be in connection with the second advent and the time when Christ comes to reign. Of surpassing interest is Christ's own description of Israel's regathering. He states that it will be accomplished by angelic ministration and in relation to His second coming. He said, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matt. 24:29–31). Here, as throughout this entire Olivet discourse the "elect" is Israel. Failure to recognize that there are two elections—Israel the nation and the Church as individuals—has encouraged some to believe that, since—as in Matthew 24:21–22—there is an elect company seen in the tribulation, the Church will be in the tribulation. The words of Moses, as found in Deuteronomy 4:25–40 are clear about Israel's sin, their scattering, the termination of their national center, the tribulation, their repentance, and the final blessing in the realization of their covenants through the faithfulness of Jehovah (cf. Ezek. 37:21–28).

No title deed of human construction could be more explicit than Jehovah's promise to Abraham regarding the land. Accordingly it is written: "from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates"; "unto thy seed will I give this land"; "I will give it unto thee"; "to give thee this land to inherit"; "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession"; "unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries"; "the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed"; "the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee I will give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land." Isaac spoke of this covenant when he sent Jacob to Laban (Gen. 28:1–4), "And God Almighty bless thee, and make

thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people; and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham" (vss. 3–4). Language could not serve in any legal transfer if this covenant does not stand.

One objection raised against the literal possession of the land is that, since it was given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well also to their seed, these must be resurrected and through resurrection come to the realization of this covenant. Thus is introduced the theme of Israel's resurrection and the place they will occupy after they are raised. To this problem attention will be directed later.

e. Israel's Conversion as a Nation. Of all the multiplied references in the Scriptures to Israel's final regathering, hardly one omits the added truth that, at that time, the nation will be brought into right relations with Jehovah. As a background to this, it should be remembered that this nation is redeemed and in covenant relation to Jehovah. To them He not only gave His Word, but also the sacrifices by which they might be restored constantly to right relations with Him. Their sin and rejection of God is of such a nature that infinite grace alone can bring them again to unbroken fellowship with their God. Here another distinction arises between the two divine elections. Of the election of the Church which is individual, not one could ever be lost. On the other hand, the elect nation will be purged and out of them will be removed all that offend. Zechariah speaks (13:8–9) of but one-third as brought through the fire and refined, while two-thirds will be cut off and die. The major passages which define Israel's judgments are: Ezekiel 20:33–44, Malachi 3:1–6, and Matthew 24:37–25:30. Their Messiah is their Judge and such when He comes again. The portion of Israel which will be refined and purified will be saved, and that restricted company constitutes "all Israel" as designated in Romans 11:26–27. This passage reads: "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." It is significant that Israelites of the old order looked upon eternal life as an *inheritance* rather than a present possession (cf. Matt. 7:13–14; Luke 10:25–28; 18:18–22).

An even more important distinction must be observed, namely, that the present age is a grand exception to all other ages both for Jews and Gentiles. To them alike the Gospel is to be preached and, without reference to any former estate or promises, these people are confronted with the glory of heavenly realities. All of Jewish advantage and Gentile disadvantage is set aside to the end that the heavenly purpose may be accomplished. The world situation that will obtain in the coming tribulation is not a concatenation, or sequence, or development growing out of the present age; it rather is joined directly to the Mosaic age which closed with the death of Christ. This, apparently, is why the Roman empire—the iron kingdom—must be revived and complete that predicted of it (cf. Dan. 2:40–45; 7:7–14). Whatever the history of the Christian era may record for the benefit of a future age, from a religious, political, or racial viewpoint, it will be as though the present age had never existed. When this age is completely written out of the order of earthly history, it is seen that the tribulation follows directly upon the death of Christ. Israel receive at once their request, “His blood be on us, and on our children,” the King returns, Gentiles are judged, and the wrath of God falls upon a Christ-rejecting world. Certainly, under this consideration of world history in its continuity there is no Church to enter the tribulation. She is as foreign to that which follows her history on the earth as she was to that which preceded. There is great force added to the whole program of Israel’s regathering, repentance, restoration, salvation, and realization of her covenants, when, by the proper elimination of the present age, these are seen to follow directly upon the rejection of their King. The present age has been a testing of the nation Israel and a demonstration of Jehovah’s power and purpose to preserve them unto their coming glory; but nothing has been added or fulfilled in this age of all that pertains to Israel’s own relation to her God.

The central passage bearing upon Israel’s future conversion is Romans 11:26–27. To this may be added Deuteronomy 30:4–8; Psalm 80:3, 7, 17–19; Isaiah 66:8; Jeremiah 23:5–6; Ezekiel 11:19–20. The manner of life which Israel will live in their kingdom age speaks definitely of a change of heart for all of them “from the least of them unto the greatest of them.” That manner of life is described in Deuteronomy 30:4–8; Jeremiah 31:31–34; Matthew 5:1–7:29.

f. Judgment on Israel's Oppressors. Anticipation of the judgments that are to fall upon Israel's oppressors began with an announcement at the very beginning of the history of that people. God said to Abraham, "I will curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. 12:3). History verifies this to the present hour, whether it be drawn from that which is termed *sacred* or *profane*. However, the declaration about judgments upon Israel's enemies finds its full expression only when the nations one day stand before Christ's glorious throne and He declares unto them on His left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41). This issue is one respecting the treatment of Israel whom Christ identifies as "my brethren." The question is: Who among the Gentiles are accounted worthy of entrance into Israel's kingdom? To Gentiles who in this peculiar age of divine relationships have built up a notion of superiority and by so much have ignored the Word of God, this prediction is not pleasing. Nevertheless, it is written, "And the people shall take them, and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and handmaids: and they shall take them captives, whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors. And it shall come to pass in the day that the LORD shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve …" (Isa. 14:2–3); "And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted" (Isa. 60:10–12).

g. The Nation Will Be Blessed Then. Much of the truth regarding Israel's future blessings has been contemplated earlier. The particular point in view here is the fact that all her blessings, her riches both temporal and spiritual, become her portion when she enters the land. This is the heart of Old Testament prediction. Israel can never be blessed apart from her land (cf. Ps. 72:1–20; Isa. 60:1–22; 62:1–12; 65:17–25; 66:10–14; Ezek. 37:21–28).

3. A KING FOREVER. Beyond what has been written on this theme, it will suffice to say that the covenant with David provided an unending

occupancy of David's throne. His throne is established forever (2 Sam. 7:16), His seed shall endure forever (Ps. 89:36), and David shall never lack for one to sit upon his throne (Jer. 33:17). The line of kings was continued through five hundred years; after that there was in each generation one entitled to sit upon that throne. In His day, Christ was the rightful heir to that throne and He, from that time on and forever, fulfills the promise to David.

4. A THRONE FOREVER. In addition to the initial covenant with David, three other passages announce the eternal character of David's throne: "His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven" (Ps. 89:36–37); "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (Isa. 9:6–7); "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David" (Luke 1:31–32). Here the observation may be made that David himself believed this promise was of an earthly throne, which would not be located in heaven then or ever. It would be difficult to begin, as one so inclined must do, with David's own understanding or interpretation of Jehovah's covenant with him and then, in tracing subsequent relations between Jehovah and David's line, to find a point where the literal, earthly throne promised to David became a spiritual throne in heaven. David was not promised a heavenly, spiritual throne, and the one who contends that David's throne is now a heavenly rule is by so much obliged to name the time and circumstances when and where so great a change has been introduced.

5. A KINGDOM FOREVER. In Scripture usage, the King, His throne, and His kingdom are inseparable. The reign of the King, however, is over a theocratic kingdom. Its Ruler will be Immanuel—"God with us" (Isa. 7:14).

He will be the virgin-born, incarnate Son of God (Mic. 5:2). He will be the rightful Heir to David's throne (Isa. 11:1–5; Jer. 23:5; Ezek. 34:23; Hos. 3:4–5). The kingdom will be heavenly in its character, since it manifests the rule of heaven over the earth and the heavenly demands (Isa. 2:4; 11:4–5; Jer. 33:14–17; Hos. 2:18). This kingdom will be in the earth (Ps. 2:8; Isa. 11:9; 42:4; Jer. 23:5; Zech. 14:9). It will be centered in Jerusalem (Isa. 2:1–3; 62:1–7; Zech. 8:20–23; Luke 21:24). This kingdom will be over regathered and converted Israel (Deut. 30:3–6; Isa. 11:11–12; 14:1–3; 60:1–22; Jer. 23:6–8 Mic. 4:6–8). Messiah's kingdom will include Gentiles (Ps. 72:11, 17; 86:9; Isa. 45:6; Dan. 7:13–14; Mic. 4:2; Zech. 8:22; Amos 9:12). That kingdom will be established by virtue of the returning King (Deut. 30:3; Ps. 50:3–5; 96:13; Zech. 2:10–12; Mal. 3:1–4).

Since the three features—the King, His throne, and His kingdom—enter into the Davidic covenant, and these are so evidently not only literal in character but eternal also, it is well to note the impiety of those who ignore this covenant. On this George N. H. Peters remarks:

> We see *the fatal mistake* of those systems of Biblical and Systematic Theology, which *entirely ignore the Davidic covenant*. The Abrahamic covenant, probably, obtains the merest mention; the Davidic is not noticed, although *confirmed as strongly* as language can make it; and both are practically discarded for the most elaborate theories concerning covenants of grace (just as if there were not such—covenants made some time in the ages of eternity, etc.). The result follows, that these covenants, being more or less (especially the Davidic) deemed unessential to the development of doctrine, *a one-sided, defective system* arises, lacking unity; and, in addition, a large portion of Scripture relating to these covenants, particularly prophecy, is either passed by without incorporation, or else so spiritualized that it may somehow fit into the hypothesis. To whom are we indebted for a departure so wide from the Scriptural standard? Need we wonder, when the Bible testimony is so much ignored, that men to-day are afraid to adopt its covenanted language; that the early Patristic Theology is cast aside as too "carnal"; and that the doctrine of the Kingdom is covered with a heap of rubbish, the accumulated work of Alexandrian philosophers, monks, Popish schoolmen, mystics, etc., who could not make these covenants blend with their systems? Is it not true, that if a man were to present the Davidic covenant and the Scriptures relating to it, and the hope to the world contained in it, to almost any congregation throughout the land, he would be regarded, such is the ignorance on the subject, as foolish in his belief and as weak in his intellect? What has caused this change, and who are responsible for it? Let us repeat: it is *a fundamental defect* in any professed system of Biblical truth, when it endeavors to give an exhibit of doctrines of God and of Christ without incorporating as *living roots* those blessed, precious "covenants of promise." Instead of erecting new foundations and building on them, we have them *already* laid and built upon in the Word.—*Theocratic Kingdom*, I, 338

6. A New Covenant. Reference at this point is to the new covenant yet to be made with Israel and not to the new covenant now in force in the Church. All unconditional covenants—the Abrahamic, the Palestinian, the Davidic—since they rest on the faithfulness of God and not at all on the unfaithfulness of men, are unbreakable by men. They endure forever. However, Jehovah made a conditional covenant with Israel when He took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 29:1). That covenant related to the daily life and conduct of Israel. When Jehovah brings Israel out of the nations and into their kingdom glory, He will make a new covenant with them—not to supersede any unconditional covenant, but to supersede the law covenant which they have broken. The new covenant is described thus, "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:31–34). If note is taken of the four blessings which this covenant promises, it will be seen that these—and vastly more—are the present possession of those who comprise the Church.

7. Abiding Blessings. Every promise found in Jehovah's covenants, including those just named in the new covenant, will constitute Israel's blessings forever. Isaiah declares, "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of

holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there: and the ransomed of the LORD shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away" (35:5–10). But no blessing is more far-reaching or complete than that oft-repeated assurance from Jehovah, "And I will be their God" (Jer. 31:33; Ezek. 37:27; Zech. 8:8; Rev. 21:3), and they will be His people. This promise suggests that in the Messianic kingdom Israel's relation to Jehovah will be one of unbroken fellowship such as was accorded Adam in Eden before the fall.

As before declared, when reference is made to the kingdom of heaven, the rule of God in the earth is contemplated. This is in marked contrast to the kingdom of God which includes His rule throughout the universe and over all beings who are in subjection to Him. Of necessity, there is much in common between these spheres of authority, which fact accounts for the interchange of these terms; what in Matthew is predicated of the kingdom of heaven, and he alone employs that term, is in Mark and Luke predicated of the kingdom of God. This interchange has been made the basis of a supposition that these terms are identical in their representation. The difference between these spheres of authority will not be discovered within the range of their similarities, but rather in the range of those instances in which they differ. The kingdom of heaven, since it embraces the rule of God in the earth, is subject to various modes of manifestation in Israel's history and that of the world. (1) The theocracy of the Old Testament was a form of divine rule in the earth, and hence an aspect of the kingdom of heaven. (2) The covenant with David is the kingdom of heaven in covenant form. (3) Prophecy concerning the scope and character of the kingdom of heaven is that rule in prophetic form. (4) The announcing of that kingdom by John the Baptist (Matt. 3:1–2), by Christ (Matt. 4:17), and by His disciples (Matt. 10:5–7) was the kingdom of heaven offered. (5) The subsequent rejection and postponement of the kingdom of heaven became a phase of that kingdom. (6) The present age, though so wholly without comparison with that which went before or with that which follows, does, nevertheless, include a form of divine rule in the earth. The purpose of the present age is

the realization of those features which are styled *mysteries*, that is, hitherto unrevealed divine purposes. God is now ruling in the earth to the extent that He accomplishes all that is embraced in these mysteries. This age thus becomes the kingdom of heaven in its mystery form (cf. Matt. 13:11). Certain other truths obtain at the same time, namely, that government is committed to Gentiles until their times are fulfilled (Luke 21:24), that Satan exercises a large authority over the kingdoms of this world (Matt. 4:8–9; Luke 4:5–7), that the "powers that be" are ordained of God (Rom. 13:1). In the last analysis, there is nothing in the realm of authority which is outside the permissive will of God. (7) The final form of the kingdom of heaven is that which will yet be set up in its full manifestation in the earth and in compliance with all that God has spoken. What that final form is to be is disclosed in the predictions, covenants, and promises of God and to all this, attention should be given. None would contend that the kingdom of heaven in its present or past form is free from evil elements such as are never a part of the kingdom of God. Even the very children of the kingdom are to be cast out (cf. Matt. 8:12; 24:50–51; 25:28–30), and all things which do offend will be dismissed, which relates to the present form of the kingdom of heaven. Likewise, the final form of that kingdom will not be free from things that are evil. Just here, the conditions which are to obtain in the kingdom of heaven are often confused with the conditions yet to obtain in the eternal state. With the King upon the throne there will be occasion for Him to judge against evil (Isa. 11:3–4). There will be those who revile and persecute (Matt. 5:11). In His entire millennial reign, Christ will be putting down enemies (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–25). At the end of that age, under the influence of Satan released for a little season, there will be a revolt on the part of those who have heretofore been in outward subjection to the King (Rev. 20:1–9). But none of these features could ever find place in the kingdom of God. The presence of imperfections in the final form of the kingdom of heaven should not be allowed to obscure the glorious truth that, due to the enthroning of Christ and the binding of Satan, righteousness and peace shall then cover the earth as the waters cover the deep.

It has been a constant disposition on the part of certain writers to invest Old Testament saints with the same positions, qualities, and standing as those which belong to the believers who comprise the Church; and there is more recently a disposition to carry the same realities which belong to the

saved of this age over into the kingdom age and to Jews and Gentiles alike. All such attempts are too much the result of mere human reasoning. Such assumptions are avoided when it is recognized that to the Church alone is accorded the heavenly position and glory. Of her alone it is declared that each of her members who make up Christ's Body is made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light. What enters into the earthly purpose, though of knowledge-surpassing character, is to be precisely what the Scriptures, which deal with the past and future ages, declare.

It is granted that the authority of God over the earth in past ages is not directly termed *the kingdom of heaven*. Indeed, not until the present age is this term used respecting the divine authority in the earth. The contrasts between the present form of the kingdom of heaven and that which is future are numerous. It will be evident to all that the present form embraces a vast sphere of profession as well as the highest of all realities, which may be found in the true Church. It is from the present form of the kingdom of heaven that the tares are to be gathered out (Matt. 13:30), the bad fish to be thrown away (Matt. 13:48), and some of the very children of the kingdom are to be cast out (Matt. 8:12; 24:50–51; 25:12, 28–30). The kingdom of God is entered by the new birth (John 3:5), and from it none will ever be separated (Rom. 8:38–39).

Chapter XVIII

Prophecy Concerning the Gentiles

Though Neglected almost more than any other, the highway of prophecy concerning the Gentiles is one of the most extensive of the highways; it is as essential to a right understanding of the prophetic Scriptures as any other, and is earlier in human history with respect to its beginning than the previous one. Like other major highways which concern God's creatures, the highway respecting the Gentiles extends on into eternity to come. Only the highway of history and prophecy relative to the angels exceeds that related to the Gentiles in its vast extent.

Gentile prediction began with Noah's preview of the character and destiny of his three sons. The record declares, "And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant" (Gen. 9:24–27). This almost limitless prediction with its threefold division of humanity—Ham, father of an inferior and servile people, Shem with his particular relation to God, and Japheth who gathers up that which remains—belongs to another science than theology. Suffice it to say that the prediction has been, and is being, fulfilled though the human family be multiplied and though time extends into millenniums.

Of the three divisions of humanity which are given by the Apostle, namely, the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church of God (1 Cor. 10:32), the first and third represent the two major purposes of God—the earthly purpose centered in the Jew and the heavenly purpose centered in the Church. Though they were in evidence from the beginning of human history, and though privileged as individuals to respond to the message of saving grace and be included in the Church, and though some of them are to share with Israel the unending kingdom glory, the Gentiles represent no specific and independent divine purpose; yet their distinctive identity as Gentiles is preserved and their future may be traced into eternity. These numerous predictions respecting the Gentiles are scattered throughout the Bible; but to Daniel is given the complete preview of the history of the

Gentiles, beginning with the Jews' captivity and running on into the kingdom age. The period between the captivity and the second advent of Christ is named by Him "the times of the Gentiles," and its peculiar identification is the fact that, throughout its duration, Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles. The passage reads, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24). No mere fortuitous selection of Jerusalem as the location of this prophetic sign is made by Christ—such as might fall upon any city. The significance is to be seen in the peculiar character of Jerusalem which singles it out above all the cities of the earth. It is the national center of the chosen, eternal people. It is the city of the great King, the theme of marvelous predictions, the location of David's eternal throne, and the center of divine government in the coming millennial kingdom. From Jerusalem shall the whole earth be governed (Isa. 2:1–3). The disclosure is made by Christ that as long as God's purpose with Israel is in abeyance, Jerusalem will be permitted to be trodden down of the Gentiles; but when Jehovah again claims Jerusalem the Gentiles are not only to be driven from that city, but the whole Gentile period will come to its end. Gentiles have never contemplated Jerusalem as the center of their world-governments. That city means no more to them than any other city of the past. World empires have centered in Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome; and Rome will yet be a restored world-dominion—the continuation of that which was in existence when the present age was thrust in. Strictly speaking, this Church age is not a part or development of the Gentile times; but more of this anon.

Though the times of the Gentiles had actually begun, Daniel was, in his long lifetime, given to experience three far-reaching visions of those times. Apart from certain warnings which had been given, the future to the instructed Jew consisted in the continued progress of events leading to the realization of all his earthly glory as anticipated in his covenants and promises; therefore, apart from a distinct divine revelation, the intrusion of a Gentile period could create only perplexity. In Gentile times the question must be answered of what has become of the revealed divine program respecting Israel and the whole world through that people. The question is not answered by the implication that God has changed His mind respecting

Israel. His covenants, being unconditional and everlasting, are immutable. However, divine right to delay their fulfillment in the interests of chastisement was reserved (2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:30–37). Daniel who was by the providence of God pressed into a high place in Gentile dominion, which he held for more than seventy years, was especially fitted to receive and transmit the Word of God respecting the course and end of those Gentile times which began with his captivity in Babylon. To him it was given to see from his own day to the cutting off of Messiah and on to the time when the Messiah would take His everlasting throne (2:44–45; 7:13–14), and every covenant would be fulfilled. Thus Daniel accounts for Gentile times that were being inserted as an intercalation in the predicted program for Israel. When, later on and following the death of Christ, a Church intercalation is added to these Gentile times, the announcement of it is intimated by Christ but is committed in its full revelation to the Apostle Paul. However, neither the first setting aside of Israel's program for Gentile times, nor the second setting aside of Gentile times for the age of the Church, has cast so much as a shadow over the certainty that God will yet in His own faithfulness fulfill every covenant-promise to His chosen people.

By three major visions, which were amplified by lesser visions, Daniel foresaw the times of the Gentiles, which had already begun and which, apart from revelation, must perplex the Jew who had before his eyes the covenants and promises to Israel. Naturally the question arises, in view of the setting aside of Israel's program and the intrusion of Gentile dominion, What has become of that unchangeable, eternal, divine favor upon Israel? In all three major visions, Daniel saw the Gentile times through to their consummation and the final realization of Messiah's kingdom and the fulfillment of every promise to Israel. However, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that Daniel did not see the intercalation period of the Church which would intervene between the two advents of Christ—a period which, as has been indicated, is an intrusion into Gentile times, but which is not emphasized as an extension of Gentile times; rather is it seen to be an added delay in the realization of the major divine purpose for Israel. Thus when the Church age with its unprecedented features is later introduced, it is explained both by the church council in Jerusalem (Acts 15:13–18) and by the Apostle Paul in Romans, chapters 9–11 (cf. 11:25–27), as a delay in Israel's program. Here it should be pointed out, as it will be more fully

when considering Daniel's third major vision, that the Church age, though unrelated to the times of the Gentiles, is not the end of Gentile times. Those times extended back six hundred years before the Church age and must be renewed and taken up again for a period of seven years after that age. It cannot be made too emphatic that God's earthly purpose centers in the Jew, and that, apart from the interruption of a Gentile period which is itself interrupted by the Church age, there would be only the direct outworking and development to fulfillment of every Israelitish covenant. These interruptions, or intercalations, in no way jeopardize the primary earthly purpose in Israel. A delay, which is carefully explained and accounted for in Scripture, should not be interpreted as an abrogation of the primary purpose. Here it is well to be reminded that no divine promise to the elect nation can fail (Rom. 11:29). To summarize: (1) the primary earthly program is that of Israel, which program can never be abandoned; (2) there is, at a time which also serves for Israel's chastisement, an intercalation of Gentile times; and (3) there is an intercalation of the age of the Church into Gentile times, and, therefore, equally into Jewish times and seasons. Daniel is chosen of God to explain the intrusion of Gentile times into Israel's calendar, and Christ and Paul explain the intrusion of the age of the Church into the Gentile and Jewish times. The Apostle's explanation is found in Romans, chapters 9–11; and the first church council was convened at Jerusalem to determine this same fact (Acts 15:13–18). The three revelations given to Daniel may now be considered separately and in their order of occurrence.

Daniel, Chapter 2. This revelation, which is given in the form of the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, foresees the entire course of Gentile times and is a presentation of that period from the human aspect of it. The king's dream contemplated a great image with head of gold, shoulders of silver, thighs of brass, and legs of iron which merge into feet and toes of iron and clay. That these sections of this image represent phases of Gentile dominion is not a matter of human speculation. Daniel so interprets the dream. He declared:

> This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. Thou, O King, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven bath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all.

> Thou art this head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.—2:36–43

This vast program, it will be observed, is terminated by the God of heaven setting up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed—one to be set up by the resistless impact of the glorious return of Christ who is likened in His coming to a smiting stone (cf. Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; Rev. 19:11–16). Of this the prophet declares: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure" (2:44–45).

The historical fulfillment of that which was pure prediction in Daniel's time could hardly be questioned. Five world-dominions in their succession are foreseen—four of these are represented by the portions of the image and the fifth as that which will arise upon the wreckage of the four when the judgments of God fall. The fifth is distinctive as that which is to be set up by the God of heaven, and it is eternal in its duration. The first, Babylon as the head of gold, was already at the zenith of its power when Daniel gave his interpretation. The second was Media-Persia, in which kingdom also Daniel lived to share. The third dominion was Greece under Alexander, and the fourth was Rome, which was in its fullest development in the day that Christ was here on the earth. It is this iron kingdom which merges in its final form into feet of iron and clay. It is in the time of the feet and clay that the Smiting Stone strikes. As each metal in the image represents a phase of human authority and iron represents Rome, so potter's clay speaks of the introduction into the last form of Gentile government of an element which

is without inherent strength. This is properly recognized as the element of democracy. That the two elements, iron and clay, cannot mix is true of the two forms of government—autocracy and democracy—but even now the world is beholding so-called democracies under the contradictory rule of dictators. When the last form of the iron dominion comes into the picture, it will be an attempt to mingle clay with the iron. All of this is the inspired interpretation of the prophet Daniel.

It will be noted that, in the blueprint of Gentile dominions which the image provides, there is, in view of the fact that the final form of Rome has not been reached, a very extended period of time between Rome as she was in Christ's day and the future admixture state which she will assume. All the earlier dominions together occupied but little over six hundred years. The explanation is found in the truth that, beginning with the "cutting off" of Messiah, or the death of Christ, an age unforeseen by any prophet has been thrust into this Gentile calendar. Since this intercalation age is completely unrelated to anything before it or to anything that follows—a truth of transcendent import in the understanding of the prophecy of the Bible—it is time taken out from the Gentile program. That determined for Rome, which was interrupted by this age of the Church, will yet be consummated when the outcalling of the Church is accomplished and she has been removed from the earth. The feet and toe aspect of Rome will be of brief duration and the entire outworking of the iron dominion will be no longer than the dominions which preceded it. It is as though the feet of the image were severed and removed to a great distance from the legs of iron; yet when the intercalation character of this age is considered, it is seen that the story of the iron dominion is consummated as perfectly as though no Church age had ever intruded. Thus, as foreseen in a Gentile program, there is no disproportionate extension of the legs of iron to cover a two thousand-year period, but the legs of iron merge directly and naturally into the feet of iron and clay. In spite of the intrusion of the age of the Church, there is no more disarrangement of the predicted Roman dominion than there was of Babylon, Media-Persia, or Greece.

Regardless of the dreams of ambitious men, there can be no worlddominion set up within that period represented by the iron dominion. From the Gentile viewpoint, Rome is still in process of development, and

will be shattered by Christ's second advent and succeeded by Christ's kingdom.

The second chapter of Daniel, one of the most important in all Biblical prediction, must be approached from the standpoint of the time in which it was written. Then the Babylonian dominion was in evidence; Media-Persia, Greece, and Rome were predictions. At the present moment all this has become verifying history—excepting the iron and clay aspect of Rome, which has not begun to be, nor can it be, until the removal of the Church. Thus the course of Gentile times, considered in its own limitations, is far spent. It is a unified program and interdependent or accumulative in character; for when the Stone strikes the feet of the image it brings to dust the entire image. Of this the prophet asserts: "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth" (2:34–35; cf. vss. 44–45). This kingdom, it will be remembered, is that one and only millennial kingdom, followed by the Messiah's eternal rule, which constitutes the return to Jehovah's primary purpose in Israel and the fulfillment of all her covenants.

Daniel, Chapter 7. There is abundant reason for a restatement, with varying details, of the same succession of Gentile world-powers. Chapter 7 restates the order of chapter 2, but from the divine viewpoint and in a program which is both stupendous in itself and a recognized intrusion into Israel's covenant provisions. The addition of the divine emphasis is most revealing and fitting. A period of about fifty years has elapsed since the vision recorded in chapter 2. The prophet is now advanced in years and seasoned by half a century of service as ruler or secretary of state. He received this second revelation as a dream which is interpreted by an angelic messenger (cf. 7:16). In this vision the four winds of heaven strove upon the great sea. This is doubtless the Mediterranean Sea, the sea about which these kingdoms have been located; but, more specifically, there is reference here to the nations symbolized by the sea (cf. Rev. 13:1). Out of this sea arise four beasts. The human estimation of these successive

kingdoms was represented in the dazzling splendor and authority which the great image pictured; the divine estimation is that of rapacious beasts, self-centered, who rule by cruel force. It is to be noted that Gentile nations have always selected beasts and birds of prey for their heraldic insignia. Nevertheless, whether described by one characterization or the other, the order is the same and the end is determined from the beginning.

Of this succession of beasts, Dr. H. A. Ironside writes:

> In Daniel's visions he was given to see the course of each of the empires which these wild beasts figure. That is, each wild beast is of such a character as to picture the leading features in the entire history of the empire which it represents. For instance, the whole course of Babylon is set forth in the winged lion, which afterward had its wings plucked, a man's heart given to it, and was made to stand erect upon its feet. Then the whole course of Medo-Persia is pictured in the vision of the bear with three ribs in its mouth, which lifted itself up on one side. The entire history of the Grecian empire and its four-fold division is set forth in the four-headed and winged leopard. And the course of the Roman empire right on down to the Time of the End (a condition which has not yet been reached) is depicted in the beast, dreadful and terrible, with the great iron teeth and the ten horns. It is important to see this. Some take it for granted that, as the Roman empire has passed off the scene, all that is connected with this Roman beast is gone too, and so it has no further interest for us who live in the gospel dispensation; but the contrary is the truth. But now, for a moment, look at the 17th verse. There the four beasts are said to be "four kings which shall arise out of the earth." The context makes it plain, however, that the angel did not mean four individual kings; but in prophetic scripture the term "king" is very frequently used for "kingdom." In verse 23 we read, "The fourth beast shall be the fourth *kingdom* on the earth." Necessarily the principle applies to all; though, on the other hand, I would have you notice that in connection with each of them, one king comes out prominently—in each case but the last, the one under whom the kingdom first attains the dignity of a great world-power. Thus Nebuchadnezzar comes before us as the one who stands distinctively for Babylon; just as he was told in chapter two, "Thou art this head of gold." But the winged lion represents both the glory and debasement of the Chaldean empire. Its wings were plucked, it lost its lion heart, and was given instead the weak heart of a man. Cyrus the Great is the leading figure when we think of Medo-Persia. He it was who destroyed the chief cities of Babylon, of which the three ribs in the mouth of the bear seem to speak. The leopard clearly suggests Alexander the Great, the four wings speaking of the almost incredible swiftness of his conquests. But the four heads set forth the four-fold division of his dominions made among his leading generals after his death. But no great potentate in the past epitomizes in himself the Roman authority. We look to the future for one to arise who shall do this—even "the Beast" described in Revelation, chap. 13, who will obtain sway over Europe just prior to the establishment of the kingdom of the Son of Man, when all authority, power and glory will be headed up in our Lord Jesus Christ.—*Lectures on Daniel*, pp. 118–20

After the record of all that enters into this vision (7:1–14), the interpretation by the angelic messenger is given (vss. 17–28). No reverent soul would do other than study these verses with utmost attention and

profound respect. This disclosure is not the opinion of men, but the infallible wisdom of God.

These beasts are four kingdoms (cf. vs. 17) in the Biblical sense that a kingdom is embodied in its king. Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, “Thou art this head of gold” (2:38). To Darius he might have said, *Thou art these shoulders of silver*. To Alexander he might have said, *Thou art these thighs of brass*. To Caesar as the king over Rome before the death of Christ he could have said, *Thou art these legs of iron*; and to the man of sin, yet to be supreme ruler over the last form of the Roman empire, Daniel might have said, *Thou art these feet of iron and clay*.

As there were ten toes to the image, so there are ten horns or kings who together manifest the last form of the fourth beast. Among these a “little horn”—to be considered in the next chapter—or man of sin appears. He it is who maketh war with the saints (Israel) and prevails against them until the coming of the Ancient of Days. Then, with that certainty which belongs to infinity, the saints (Israel) shall take the kingdom and possess it forever. A passing reference should be made at this point to the various descriptions given in the Bible of this same great consummation of wickedness as it is headed up in the man of sin, and the destruction of that ruler and the entire Gentile structure by Christ at His second advent. Consider Psalm 2:1–12; Isaiah 63:1–6; Matthew 25:31–46; 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12; Revelation 13:1–18; 17:1–18:24; 19:11–21. Each of these passages makes its own vital contribution to the full Biblical revelation of those things which are assuredly coming to pass on the earth.

Daniel, Chapter 9. As Daniel, chapter 2, makes known in advance the truth respecting the imposing power and splendor of the Gentile dominions that were yet to be, from Babylon to the glorious return of Christ, with specific details about the way in which this vast portion of earth’s history will end, and as the seventh chapter makes known in advance the same order of kingdoms but with emphasis upon the ungodly and even inhuman character of these dominions and with renewed details concerning the end when Messiah sets up His everlasting kingdom, so the ninth chapter, which records the third major vision bearing upon the Gentile program, enters into details respecting both the first and second advents and essays to measure the time which this Gentile domination will consume. Again the interpretation is angelic and therefore not subject to question. From a

reading of Jeremiah—written at the time of the captivity—Daniel learned that Jehovah would accomplish seventy years in the desolation of Jerusalem (Dan. 9:2; cf. Jer. 25:11–12)—the desolation then in effect because of the captivity which brought Daniel himself into bondage. Observing that the predicted seventy years were about accomplished, he turned to specific prayer, confessing his own sins and the sins of his people. While he was thus in prayer, the angel Gabriel appeared with information which constitutes the vision of the ninth chapter. In this vision the statements are direct; there are no symbolisms of an image or of beasts and thus no interpretation is needed, though this vision must harmonize with those of chapters 2 and 7. The words are, like all plain prediction, to be taken in their natural meaning, just as Daniel himself accepted Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years as seventy actual years. The translation of the Hebrew term for heptad, which means no more than a group of seven of anything, by the word *weeks* is misleading. In this instance, history provides the interpretation, and, as will be seen, these are years rather than weeks. Seventy years of captivity had been predicted and accomplished for the captors. This period must witness at its end the release of the bondmen and their return to Jerusalem; but the angel asserts that, beginning with this release, a new prophetic period begins which is 70 sevens of years, or 490 in all. In this time all prophecy concerning Israel is to be fulfilled, even to the finishing of Israel's transgression (cf. Rom. 11:26–27) and the anointing of the most Holy. This prediction reads: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy" (9:24).

On the exact measurement of the time indicated by Daniel, Dr. Henry C. Thiessen writes (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1935, XCII, 47–48):

> Sir Robert Anderson proves that the luni-solar year was the form of the year in use in Bible times, both at Babylon and at Jerusalem. He shows this from the Scriptures and from authorities on astronomy (*Daniel in the Critics' Den*, pp. 117–23). On the basis of information furnished him by the Astronomer Royal, Sir Robert assigns the 1st Nisan, B.C. 445, the time when the decree was issued to rebuild Jerusalem, to March 14th. On the basis of the chronological data supplied by the Gospels he assigns the 10th Nisan, the day when Christ entered Jerusalem on the colt of an ass, to the 6th April, A.D. 32. This is the Sunday preceding the Passover of that year. "*The interval* [between these two termini]," Sir Robert

says, "*contained exactly and to the very day, 173,880 days, or seven times sixty-nine prophetic years of 360 days*, the first sixty-nine weeks of Gabriel's prophecy" (*The Coming Prince*, pp. 123–29). In computing the time from the 14th March, B.C. 445, to the 6th April, A.D. 32, he uses the following language: "The intervening period was 476 years and 24 days (the days being reckoned inclusively, as required by the language of the prophecy, and in accordance with the Jewish practice). But 476 times 365 is 173,740 days; add (14th March to 6th April, *both* inclusive) 24 days; add for leap years 116 days; and we have 173,880 days. And 69 weeks of prophetic years of 360 days (or 69 times 7 times 360) equals 173,880 days." Cf. Luke 19:42. This careful computation of the time covered by these weeks has all the appearance of accuracy and therefore commends itself as the true one. It makes the sixty-ninth week end on Palm Sunday, and so is in harmony with Daniel's statement that Messiah would be "cut off" *after* these weeks.

It is thus disclosed that the Gentile times run 560 years—70 of the captivity, and 490 more unto the return to the full realization of all Jewish promises.

The period of 490 years, which extends from the end of the captivity to the complete fulfillment of Jewish prediction and the end of Gentile times, is divided into three subdivisions, namely, (1) from the edict which ends Jeremiah's 70 years to the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem, which is said to be 7 seven's, or 49 years; (2) a period of 62 weeks, or 434 years, which is marked with respect to its end by the "cutting off" of Messiah, or the crucifixion of Christ; and (3) a period of 1 week, or 7 years, which must follow the crucifixion. In that eventful seven years all that remains to be fulfilled of the 490 years both as concerns the end of Gentile times and the bringing in of Israel's blessings must be fulfilled—Israel's transgression will then be finished, an end of sin secured, reconciliation by the death of Christ will have been brought in, all vision and prediction will be sealed by fulfillment, and the Holiest anointed. The last period of 7 years is properly termed *Daniel's seventieth week*, and is yet unfulfilled.

In recognizing the point in time when this seven-year period—so momentous in itself—will become history, it is necessary to observe again the unrelated character of the Church age, which as an intercalation is thrust between the death of Christ and the departure of the Church from the earth. This age of the Church, it must be restated, is so perfectly isolated from the rest of human history that it draws nothing into itself of that gone before, nor does it contribute anything to that which follows. If this detached, disassociated, segregated character of this age is not granted, there can be no tracing of God's time-periods as they are revealed; for, as it is clearly

indicated in the outworking of Daniel's 490 years for the Jews and 560 years for the Gentiles, the divine reckoning makes no place for this unforeseen and unpredicted age of grace, as it is manifested in the Church.

The seventieth week of Gentile times is, according to all prediction bearing on it, a period of vital importance and burdened with stupendous events. From the viewpoint of Gentile and Jewish prediction, there is continuity or unbroken sequence between the 483 years which were completed by the death of Christ and the 7 years yet to run. This continuity will be largely governmental and political. In many matters—social, economic, educational, and material—the world will have made its progress during the Church age; but, as in the 483 years, the divine reckoning will be in the last seven years with Gentile authorities and not with the outcalling of the Church. In the continuity of divine reckoning, the feet of iron and clay are attached and their representation follows the iron-leg period without interruption. Likewise, Daniel's seventieth week is in a sequence of 69 which have gone before and completes that belonging to the 69. Though 2,000 years fall in between, prophetic continuity sees only the Gentile realities represented by an unamputated image, and the Jewish history of 490 years unbroken by any unforeseen and unrelated age. As before indicated, though the feet of the image are in point of time removed 2,000 years from the legs of iron and a new divine undertaking runs its course in between, the Smiting Stone is said to destroy that which the image represents—Gentile dominion—and serves no purpose as a judgment upon the Church or world conditions in her age. Similarly, what constituted the character of 483 years will be revived and consummated in the last 7 of the total 490. If the Church was in the 483 years, she may be expected to appear in the last 7; but inasmuch as she was not in the 483 years she could not be in the 7, and no Scripture ever relates the Church to the 7 years of tribulation. Only as students ignore the distinctive, unrelated character of the Church age and fail to comprehend the essential perfection of the Church in Christ, will they presume to assert that the Church even enters upon any moment of the great tribulation.

The time feature between the end of Jeremiah's 70 years of captivity and the cutting off of Messiah is stated in Daniel 9:25–26, "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and

threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself." The period of 490 years is distinctive in the divine measurements. There had been a similar period before Jeremiah's 70 years of the captivity, which span was related to the reign of David's sons and ended with the captivity. However, the 490 years that were to follow the captivity are of a different character. In this time, Jerusalem was to be rebuilt; Messiah cut off in sacrifice; the city and sanctuary were to be destroyed, as they were in 70 A.D.; and the prince's people (cf. Luke 19:44; 21:20–24; Matt. 24:2; 1 Kings 9:8; Ps. 79:1; Isa. 64:11) should do this work of destruction—the Romans. The prince himself does not appear until after the experience defined as "The end thereof shall be with an overflow, and unto the end, war—desolations determined" (vs. 26, Hebrew), which evidently refers to the present age and may be considered the nearest any prophet of old ever came to anticipation of this age (cf. 1 Pet. 1:10–11). It is then, at the end, that the prince himself shall come, and his wickedness is seen in the fact that, having made a covenant with Israel for these eventful seven years, he breaks the covenant when half accomplished, or at the end of three and a half years. He then enters the holy place (cf. Matt. 24:15; 2 Thess. 2:3–4), and there is the overspreading of abominations. It is evident that the "little horn" of Daniel 8:9 is Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria, who was one of the four rulers to whom the dominion of Greece was divided. He is a peculiarly clear type of the "little horn"—the man of sin—of the last days. As Antiochus Epiphanes desecrated the temple, so will the last "little horn." This portion of the prophecy concludes with these words, "And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate" (vss. 26–27).

While the secondary visions of Daniel, chapters 8–11, have to do with the development and conflicts of the second and third world dominions—all of which was prediction in Daniel's day—the three major visions of Gentile times are burdened with important features of revelation and include many

details. The many worthy books which have been written as expositions of these visions may be studied with profit. The Gentile program occupies a very large place in the prophetic Scriptures. It is noticeable, however, that the multiplied revelations do not bear so much upon the early part of Gentile times as they do upon the end; nor do they emphasize events related to the first advent, since that advent had little to do with Gentiles as such. The first advent was one to Israel. “He came unto his own, and his own received him not” (John 1:11). The Gentile judgments are related to the second advent, and their history is brought to light at the end of their program.

Little true understanding of prophecy will be gained until it is recognized that the divine purpose for the earth is centered about Israel. Whatever may intervene, this program begins and ends with Israel. Two intercalations are experienced. The first is that of Gentile times, which began with the Babylonian captivity and serves as a chastisement upon Israel as well as a definite divine arrangement with the Gentiles out of which they are to be judged as nations. The Gentile times are measured precisely as respects time—560 years—but these very Gentile times are interrupted by the second intercalation, which is the age of the Church and which extends from the death of Christ to the removal of the Church from the earth, which age contributes the whole feature of indefiniteness to all that follows looked at from the standpoint of the time it begins. There will yet be seven years of Gentile times following the removal of the Church from the earth. However, since Israel’s program is that which is incomplete, both the intercalation of the Gentile times and the intercalation of the Church within Gentile times are looked upon as gaps in the predicted Jewish program. Though the Church age falls within Gentile times, it is always looked upon as a delay in the allessential and final divine purpose for Israel (Acts 15:13–18; Romans 9:1–11:36). So definite, indeed, is the manner in which Gentile times will end that certain passages should be considered in particular.

Psalm 2:1–12. This Scripture pictures a time when the nations will be raging and the people imagining a vain thing, the kings setting themselves and the rulers taking counsel together against Jehovah and against His Messiah, seeking to cast away all divine recognition and restraint; and yet in the midst of such open resistance Jehovah places His King, the Messiah, upon David’s throne in Jerusalem (vs. 6). It is then that Messiah declares, “I

will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (vss. 7–9). Such will be the crushing defeat of Gentile authority.

Isaiah 63:1–6. In this anticipation of Messiah's judgments upon Gentiles, He is likened to one treading the wine press; His garments are stained with the blood of His foes and He makes them drunk in His fury. He brings down their strength to the earth. This is declared to be "the day of vengeance." It is God's answer to a Christ-rejecting world.

Revelation 19:15. "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."

In this consummating declaration respecting the second advent, both the rod of iron of Psalm 2:9 and the wine press of Jehovah of Isaiah 63:3–6 are restated. All that is here stated—so evidently related to the second advent—confirms the conclusion that both Psalm 2 and Isaiah 63 are descriptions of that advent.

Revelation 6:1–19:21. This extended Scripture would hardly be understood other than as the detail of God's final dealing with Gentile nations. Though judgment must fall upon Israel, those judgments are not emphasized here. That people are seen both shielded and protected, as it is promised in their behalf (cf. Jer. 30:7); and there is no reference to the Church on earth in any of these scenes, since she will be saved—not while passing through the tribulation, as is Israel's lot, but—*from* the tribulation, having no part in it (cf. Rev. 3:10). John experiences what the Church experiences. In all his description, he is not in the tribulation himself, but is a witness of things both in heaven and on earth. Thus the Church will be saved from it and yet witness precisely what John saw, and will hear what John heard. The seals, the trumpets, the vials, and the woes are progressive aspects of divine judgments falling upon Gentile peoples punitively—not upon either Jews or Christians.

Matthew 25:31–46. The conclusion of Gentile times, of Gentile responsibility, and of Gentile judgments is recorded in Matthew 25:31–46 and as declared by the King Himself to whom this and all judgment is

committed. Following upon the complete subjugation of the nations, as described in the preceding passages cited, is this scene of their appearance before the throne of Christ's glory—the throne of David on the earth. They are there judged according to their treatment of Israel, whom Christ designates as "my brethren." It will be remembered, however, not only that Israel is the chosen of Jehovah whom He loves with an everlasting love, but that this scene falls at the close of the tribulation when Israel has suffered her last and most devastating trials at the hands of Gentiles. It is then that the Jewish question will have divided the nations of the earth, that is, after the kingdom gospel will have been preached in all the inhabited earth by the 144,000 Jewish missionaries (cf. Matt. 24:14; Rev. 7). This great national issue was anticipated and preannounced by Jehovah to Abraham when Jehovah declared, "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. 12:3). At no point will Gentile assumption and conceit assert itself more positively than in their resentment of God's revealed purpose respecting Israel. This Gentile resentment and pride is challenged by the Apostle in Romans 11:13–24. Gentiles, in grace, as wild branches have been grafted into the olive tree contrary to nature. From this place of privilege they may be broken off. The regrafting of Israel as natural branches is not only free from difficulty, but is the assured purpose of God.

Thus the times of the Gentiles are measured, their successive dominions anticipated, and the final judgments of God to fall upon them are decreed. With the certainty of infinity Jehovah returns to Israel and all their covenants are fulfilled when the hour of their chastisement is past. No other world-dominion can intrude regardless of the dreams of men. At the judgment of the nations the future of those on the left hand is not traced, for there is nothing to trace; but the future of those on the right hand is traced through the kingdom reign of Christ, and they appear even in relation to the city of God (cf. Rev. 21:24–26).

Chapter XIX

Prophecy Concerning Satan, Evil, and the Man of Sin

The whole doctrine of sin is vitally related to the person of Satan as its originator and to the man of sin as sin's final manifestation. In former extended discussions respecting sin it has been asserted that evil began, not in the Garden of Eden, but in heaven and as a direct repudiation of God on the part of the highest of the angels. Similarly, the notion that evil could be terminated at any time whenever sinners combine to that end is without Biblical support. Revelation not only traces evil back into past ages and into heaven itself, but it declares the very manner in which sin will be terminated in the ages to come. It will not be ended by any human effort, but rather by the direct power of God and accompanied by His righteous judgments upon it. It continues until the divinely appointed time and ends in the divinely appointed way. If the question is raised why God does not end a thing at once which is so abhorrent to Him, it is equally pertinent to inquire why He ever permitted it at all. Having permitted it for worthy reasons which are in harmony with His holy character and being free from all responsibility respecting its manifestations, the full measure of its development is required in order that it may be judged for all that it is in the divine estimation of it. Jehovah said to Abraham, "The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" (Gen. 15:16); in like manner He might say of the *cosmos* world system, "The iniquity of the *cosmos* world is not yet full." The importance to the student of the knowledge of the future of Satan, evil, and of the man of sin is self-evident.

I. Satan

Divine revelation respecting the career of Satan, including his entire future, has been given an extended treatment under Angelology. Only the briefest reference to prophecy concerning Satan need be given here. That line of prediction began with the declaration of Genesis 3:15. In that prediction it was asserted that when Christ bruises Satan's head Satan

would also bruise Christ's heel. This prediction relative to the bruising of Satan's head is an anticipation of that judgment which Christ secured against Satan by means of the death of the cross (cf. John 16:11; Col. 2:14–15), and the final execution of that judgment which is determined from the beginning. There is an order revealed: (1) Satan would thus be judged at the cross. (2) He will be cast out of heaven when defeated in the angelic war which is yet to be (Rev. 12:7–12). (3) He will be cast into the abyss and sealed for a thousand years (Rev. 20:1–3). (4) He will be loosed for a little season for the consummation of his wickedness (Rev. 20:3, 7–9). (5) He will be cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:10). This order of events is not subject to possible changes. When God declares that Satan's head would be bruised, that prediction was fulfilled perfectly. Likewise, when God predicts, as He has done, that Satan will be cast into the lake of fire, it is not with a proviso that some other influence does not arise to defeat that purpose. Nothing could be more certain than that Satan will go to the eternal doom prescribed for him.

II. Evil

Evil, too, follows a predetermined program. It is not gradually overcome by human reformation. The essential features of its development are: (1) for Israel, her transgression will be finished when her Messiah returns and she enters her kingdom (Dan. 9:24; Rom. 11:26–27). (2) Whatever overt evil there may be in the kingdom will be judged instantly by the King (Isa. 11:3–4). (3) Evil will be banished forever from the new heaven and the new earth, for in them righteousness shall dwell (2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:27).

III. The Man of Sin

The Scriptures anticipate the coming of a superman who will serve as Satan's counterfeit of the King of kings and Lord of lords. Prophecy anticipates the coming of one outstanding false Christ among the very many that have been predicted. From Daniel 7:1–8 it is learned that this person will be a ruler of combined nations, and from Revelation 13:2 it is learned that he will receive his power and authority directly from Satan (cf. Luke 4:5–7). Several clear identifications of this ruler are given: (1) in the midst

of the great tribulation, he will be seen to "stand in the holy place," according to the prophecy quoted from Daniel by Christ (Matt. 24:15, note the context), and "sitting in the temple" (doubtless a restored Jewish temple) as predicted by Paul (2 Thess. 2:1–12). (2) He has a deadly wound and yet lives (Rev. 13:3). (3) He is accompanied by a miracle-working "false prophet" (Rev. 13:11–18; 19:20). (4) And he is primarily identified through Scripture by his blasphemous assumption of deity, giving expression thus to the master passion of Satan which is revealed in Satan's own words, "I will be like the most High" (Isa. 14:14). This mighty ruler figures largely in Revelation, chapters 13–19. Ezekiel sees him as "the prince of Tyrus" (Ezek. 28:1–10; cf. Satan as he is shown in 28:11–18). Daniel sees him as the "little horn," the wicked "prince," the willful "king," and the consummator of the "times of the Gentiles" (Dan. 7:8; 9:24–27; 11:36–45). Christ sees him as "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet," and one who comes "in his own name" (Matt. 24:15; John 5:43). Paul sees him as the "man of sin" (2 Thess. 2:1–12). John sees him as the first rider upon a white horse, and the "beast risen up out of the sea" (Rev. 6:2; 13:1–8).

This immense body of prediction places this coming one with reference to his appearance in the time of the second advent of Christ. That sinister person is said to be destroyed by the coming of Christ (2 Thess. 2:8), and then to be cast alive into the lake of fire (Rev. 19:20). The importance which God assigns to this personage is everywhere manifest in His Word. Four major passages combine to give a description of this person.

> *Ezekiel 28:1–10*. "The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying, Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God: behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee: with thy wisdom and with thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures: by thy great wisdom and by thy traffick hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches: therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God; behold, therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness. They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the midst of the seas. Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? but thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that slayeth thee. Thou shalt die the deaths of the uncircumcised by the hand of strangers: for I have spoken it, saith the LORD GOD."

The title by which the man of sin is recognized in this Scripture is that of "the prince of Tyrus." Standing alone, this passage might be assigned to a heathen king who, as many kings have done, assumed to be God; but, when related by title to "the king of Tyrus" of verses 11–18—whose identity as Satan has been completely demonstrated—this personage is seen to be related to Satan as a prince is related to a king. Nowhere in the Sacred Text is the importance of this individual more stressed than in this passage. Not only does he appear thus in a record which, so far as Satan is concerned, reaches back to that dateless past when Satan was created as an unfallen angel and as the guard over the very throne of God, but the record relative to the man of sin precedes in the context the record of the person of Satan. Further identification is afforded by the claim of this person to be God. This is his chief mark by which he is everywhere characterized. Though he assumes to be God, he is, according to this Scripture, only a man. And proof of this fact appears when he is brought to his doom.

Daniel 9:27. "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

Of this passage and concerning the antecedent of the pronoun *he* as used in this text, Dr. H. C. Thiessen writes:

> If the sixty-nine weeks take us to the Cross of Christ, then the seventieth week must come after the Cross. But here we note first of all that there is an interval between the sixty-ninth and the seventieth weeks. Tregelles says: "At the cutting off of Messiah, the recognition ends; then comes the interval, and the time is again taken up for one week at the close" (*Remarks on the Book of Daniel*, p. 110). During this interval "the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined" (Dan. 9:26). This points definitely to the coming of the Romans under Titus and their destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, which occurred in A.D. 70. Concerning the words, "the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined," Ironside says: "These words briefly describe the history of Palestine from the coming of the Roman armies under Titus to the present time. Jerusalem, and Palestine as a whole, have been trodden down of all nations, and shall be, 'until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled' " (*Lectures on the Book of Daniel*, p. 167). Then we note that the city and the sanctuary shall be destroyed by the *people* of the prince that shall come, not by the prince himself. As we have seen, these *people* are the Romans, who fulfilled this prophecy in A.D. 70. The prince comes to the fore in v. 27. The verse reads as follows: "And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in

> the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate; and even unto the full end and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate." There is, however, considerable difference of opinion as to what is the antecedent of the pronoun "he." Most commentators think it is "the Anointed One," in the first part of v. 26; some, taking the pronoun as a neuter, "it," think it is the "week," as if the "week" would confirm the covenant with the many. But how, we would ask, can the reference be to Christ when we have just been introduced to the Roman prince? It seems necessary to make the pronoun refer to him. Furthermore, when did Christ make a firm covenant with many Jews for one week; and how can it be said of Him that "in the midst of the week" He caused "the sacrifices and oblations to cease," when the temple sacrifices continued for about forty years after Christ's death on the Cross? It would seem absurd to refer the pronoun to the "week." How can a "week" make firm a covenant and then break it in the midst of itself? It is more natural to refer the pronoun "he" to the prince mentioned in the last part of v. 26, namely, the Roman prince; however not to Vespasian, Roman emperor from A.D. 69–79, nor to his son and successor, Titus, who ruled from A.D. 79–81. Neither of these made and broke such a covenant with the Jews; and Titus lived only two years after his accession to the throne. The reference is to a Roman prince who shall come after the long interval of the last half of verse 26, which has already lasted 1,900 years; and the last week is still future. Tregelles takes the pronoun "he" of v. 27 to refer to "the prince that shall come" of v. 26, and says: "The prince who shall come is the last head of the Roman power, the person concerning whom Daniel had received so much previous instruction" (*op. cit.*, p. 105).—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1935, XCII, 48–50

When Christ was asked by His disciples for a sign of the end of the age (Matt. 24:3), reference was being made to the age then in progress, namely, that foreseen by Daniel, the Gentile age of 560 years. There could be no allusion to the present age of the Church, concerning which nothing had at that time ever been revealed. The sign, then, is needed to indicate the end of Gentile times, or, more specifically, the remaining seven years yet to be experienced at the close of the age of the Church. The sign which Christ revealed is that of the "abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet," standing in the holy place (Matt. 24:15). This is Christ's own recognition and interpretation of Daniel 9:26–27, which passage is the one being considered. This intimation on the part of Christ respecting the man of sin serves as an introduction to His own description of the great tribulation (cf. Matt. 24:21–22), which, as has been seen, is Daniel's seventieth week—the last seven years of Gentile times. Thus, again, this sinister personage is placed, relative to the time of his appearing, within that yet future hour of trial to come on the earth.

2 Thessalonians 2:4–10. "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the

temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

This especially revealing passage is written by the Apostle Paul and in it most important disclosures are made. (1) The Day of the Lord (not "the day of Christ," as erroneously found in the A.V. of vs. 2; see R.V.) cannot come before the man of sin is revealed (vs. 3). Reference to the Day of the Lord, it will be remembered, is to that extended period of a thousand years long predicted. (2) The man of sin declares himself to be God. (3) He sits in the temple (vs. 4)—evidently a restored Jewish temple. (4) He can be revealed only in God's appointed time (vs. 6). (5) He is destroyed by Christ at His glorious appearing. (6) He exercises Satan's power (vs. 9). (7) He deceives all who "receive not the love of the truth." Upon such, God Himself imposes a "strong delusion" to the end that He may bring into outward manifestation that which is concealed and latent in the evil heart.

> *Revelation 13:1–8.* "And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

This passage should be extended to include all of the remainder of the Revelation up to 20:10, since it is from 13:1 to 20:10 that the career of the man of sin is to be seen. He is here identified as the first beast or the beast out of the sea. An extended analysis of this whole context cannot be introduced here. It stands as a challenge to the student of prophecy.

Here, as in Daniel 2:38, the king and the kingdom are treated as identical. The Roman empire disappeared so far as its emperor is concerned; but when revived, as it will be at the end of Gentile times, that empire will gather into itself, as it had at the time of its first existence, the essential features of the three empires which preceded it—Babylon, Media-Persia, and Greece. This is symbolized by the description of the revived Roman empire in this Revelation passage. Here Revelation 13:2–3 should be compared with Daniel 7:1–8. The last emperor—the beast—holds a universal sway over all excepting those whose names are written in the Lamb's book. He is again identified by his blasphemies. He continues forty-two months, which is the last half of the seven years. He persecutes the saints—Israel (cf. Dan. 7:21–22). He is accompanied by a second beast come up from the earth (Rev. 13:11–18), a false prophet, the antichrist who is to be distinguished from "many antichrists" (1 John 2:18) and the "spirit of antichrist" (1 John 4:3). This second beast is evidently the last ecclesiastical head over an apostate church. The second beast causes the first beast to be worshiped. He makes an image of the first beast, causing that image both to live and to speak. The penalty for not worshiping the first beast is death. Thus the Gentile times began with an image and will close with an image. Both of these beasts are, at the return of Christ, to be cast alive into the lake of fire (cf. Rev. 19:20), where Satan is cast at the end of the kingdom age (Rev. 20:10).

In conclusion it may be restated that a mighty world-ruler will yet arise whose universal sway will be over the revived Roman empire and in the seven years that yet remain of Gentile times. He receives the power of Satan (cf. Luke 4:5–6), is supported and promoted by a false prophet, and these three—Satan and the two beasts—form a trinity of evil which appears to be a satanic counterfeit of the Trinity within the Godhead. The destruction of the two beasts at the second advent of Christ and the final consignment of Satan to the same lake of fire are the consummation of evil

in the earth. In the new earth as in the new heaven that will then be, righteousness will dwell.

Diligent study of these revealing passages is enjoined upon all who would know the prophetic Scriptures.

Chapter XX

Prophecy Concerning the Course and End of Apostate Christendom

The present intercalary age in Gentile times begins at the death of Christ, which event was exactly measured in prophecy and fulfilled in history 553 years after the commencement of the Babylonian captivity, and ends 7 years before Gentile times are terminated. It is wholly unrelated to that which went before or to that which follows. The present age has a distinct character and serves a unique purpose, which character and purpose are not present to any degree in previous or following ages. As emphatically asserted before, the recognition of the essential features of this age is an initial step in the right understanding of all Biblical prophecy. In this age, when both Jewish and Gentile programs are suspended, the gospel of divine grace is to be preached to every creature. A heavenly citizenry is being created. The Bride of Christ is being secured. Those Scriptures which reveal the divine purpose for Jews and Gentiles include no intimation that either Jews or Gentiles, as nationally considered, are destined to heaven's glory. As the gospel has been preached to the multitudes—the vast majority of whom have not received it—and the heaven-high standards of life addressed only to believers have been stressed, a by-product has been created which incorporates an unnumbered company who have been content to adopt certain Christian ideals but have never received Christ as their personal Savior. Many of this number have joined Protestant churches, or are reared under a Romish profession, or have merely subscribed to elementary Christian conceptions. This great company, including the true Church, is termed *Christendom*. Like the "mixed multitude" which followed the camp of Israel, so the Church is accompanied by many who merely respect an ideal, but know not the transforming power of God in salvation. Predictive prophecy recognizes and anticipates the future of this company who fail to possess the divine nature. This whole age with its essential characteristics is foreseen by Christ and recorded in Matthew, chapter 13. So, also, the history of the Church on earth is traced through seven stages, or aspects, by means of the seven letters written to seven churches in Asia

(Rev., chapters 2–3). According to the word of Christ in Matthew, chapter 13, three particular features are prominent throughout the present age, namely, (1) that which is good, represented by wheat, the meal, the pearl of great cost, and the good fish; (2) Israel, represented by the treasure hid in a field, or the *cosmos* world; (3) that which is evil, represented by the tares, the (evil) birds, the leaven, and the bad fish to be thrown away. The divine activity is seen in the sowing of the seed of the gospel. This activity results in but one portion of four becoming wheat. The remaining three portions represent a mere profession which has been superficially moved, but not saved. Other Scriptures indicate that this professing company is increased as the age nears its end. The so-called Dark Ages are accounted for by the letters to the churches at Pergamos and Thyatira, while the final apostasy within Christendom is anticipated in the letter to Laodicea. To this last-named company the glorified Lord says, “So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth” (Rev. 3:16).

All that God commits to men seems to follow the downward course of declension. This was true of Israel, it is declared even of Gentile authority which began as gold and ends as iron and clay, it is true likewise of the professing church. Leaven working in the pure meal symbolizes the permeating power of certain forms of evil within the true Church itself. Leaven is universally the emblem of corruption working subtly. It means mere *formality* (cf. Matt. 23:14, 16, 23–28); *unbelief* (cf. Matt. 22:23–29); and *worldliness* (cf. Matt. 22:16–21; Mark 3:6; 1 Cor. 5:6–8). The elect company of true believers is ever beset with tendencies to formality, unbelief, and worldliness. This condition, as predicted, has continued throughout the age. In 2 Thessalonians 2:3 it is stated, “Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day [the day of the LORD] shall not come, except there come a [the] falling away first.” Here the definite article (cf. R.V.) isolates this apostasy from every other. It precedes the Day of Jehovah, and is evidently that final form of religious union and profession which will obtain in the tribulation after the true Church has been removed from the earth. Various other passages foresee the evil which will exist in the last days of the Church and before that company is removed—1 Timothy 4:1; 2 Timothy 3:1–5, 13; 4:3–4; 2 Peter 3:3–4.

Christendom expands its influence even to governments, which governments must yet be judged for their misleading professions. Though inexplainable to the finite mind, it is nevertheless certain that God brings every unholy assumption, which He has permitted His creatures to advance, to an experimental test and to the end that all may be judged in its reality. Even the purpose of the Church of Rome to gain political ascendency is allowed to come to fruition for a brief period preceding the judgment which is to fall upon her.

By the return of Christ in power and great glory, the governments and political authority of the Gentiles will be ground to powder and blown away like the chaff of the summer threshing floors (Dan. 2:35); but preceding this and as recorded in Revelation, chapter 17, the professing church will be destroyed by political Gentile authority. It is probable that, with the removal of the true Church, all professing Christendom will unite under the authority of Rome. This is not difficult to believe in the light of present tendencies toward church union and the drift into Romish forms. A church composed exclusively of unregenerate persons, as the remaining church must be, will not only have no doctrinal convictions but will fall an easy prey to the notion that the church can best rule the world. Revelation, chapter 17, describes the final ascendency to governmental power on the part of the Church of Rome, and her judgments that must fall upon her. On this chapter an extended quotation from Dr. Ford C. Ottman (*Unfolding of the Ages*, pp. 378–84) is here presented:

> The woman of this chapter is, beyond all possibility of successful contradiction, an apostate ecclesiastical system. Whether she represents the papal church—as many contend—or the entire mass of professing Christendom after the true Church has been taken from the earth, is an open question. But that she stands for one or the other of these is absolutely certain. By no possibility can she be identified with the woman of the twelfth chapter; for that woman, as has been shown, represents Israel, the mother of Christ after the flesh, and can represent *no other*. The woman of this chapter, however false, is in bridal, not maternal, relation to Christ. Claiming to be *His bride* she has fallen from her pure condition and become a harlot. Such a condition shall assuredly be manifest in the apostate church just prior to the return of our Lord with the true Church. The indications are of such a character as to mark out more particularly the ecclesiastical system now known as the papal church. Romanism shall be in existence at the time, but more fearfully apostate than she has ever been. The definite marks here given are such as have in a general way characterized Romanism throughout the entire time of her history. The woman rides a “scarlet beast.” Unquestionably this beast is the first beast of Revelation, and his identity is plain throughout. Scarlet is the symbol of the glory of the world. It characterizes the only glory possessed by

the beast. The fact that the woman *rides* the beast shows clearly enough that she is in control. If she represents the papal church—and this seems most consistent throughout—then the long dream of the papacy is found here to be fully realized. She has not only ecclesiastical, but also temporal authority. The purple and scarlet in which she is arrayed are the symbols of royalty and earthly glory. She is also decked, literally, *gilded* "with gold and precious stones and pearls." These are the symbols of divine truth: but here they are only seen in outward adornment for which there is no inner corresponding reality. She holds in her hand a golden cup full of abominations and the unclean things of her fornication. One has but to look into the pages of history to find how the introduction of these abominations has marked the Romish church in every stage of her history. In fact the fundamental doctrines of the Romish church are not only opposed to evangelical Christianity; but they are abominations of the worst character, and correspond exactly with the pagan and idolatrous practices from which they were derived. The woman is further characterized as having upon her forehead a name written: "Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." The word Babylon means "confusion," and, therefore, Babylon the great is nothing but "confusion the great." Romanism is characterized not only by abominations, but by mystery. The whole system is shrouded in inextricable confusion. Both mystery and abomination are manifest in such teaching; as, the mediation of human priests between God and man; baptismal regeneration; the celibacy of the theurgic priest; the doctrine of purgatory; apparitions of deities and saints; the worship of these and of the virgin mother; auricular confession and priestly absolution. Her name is *Mystery*, but it is written on her forehead, so that all may see it. By the mystery of her performances she has held the superstitious in captivity. A little magic of priestly power, and behold, the bread and wine of the eucharist are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ. Mysterious and without meaning are such vagaries; as, the constant signing with the form of the cross and the adoration paid to it; the turning to the east in worship; the placing of the lights on either side of the altar but not in the center; and the use of incense. These are mysteries, truly enough, and all of them can be easily traced to their pagan source of origin. The use of holy water, the exhibition of mystery plays, and the carrying of images in processions, originate likewise in paganism; and they are all of priestly design to attract the eye, while the heart remains unreached. The great central doctrine of Romanism is salvation by one's own works and sufferings. To reach heaven through a tower built by their own hands was the attempt made by the company that first appeared on the plains of Shinar. God in judgment turned their language into confusion, and the word "Babel," or "Babylon," defines the judgment falling on every effort since to reach heaven by works, whether they be wrought by men of the Romish church, or of any other ecclesiastical system. The Romish church is the most conspicuous illustration of the effort to rebuild the old tower of Babel, and the confusion everywhere manifest in her system is the result of that attempt. Thus the mystery of Romanism is here branded as Babylon. It is, however, "Mystery, Babylon." The old evil, but not so open and straightforward. What further characterizes the woman is so plain, that even Romanists are forced to accept the application of it to themselves. "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great wonder." Surely no one, with the long and bloody record of Romish history before them, can fail to see the force of the expression: "Drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." This has always characterized Rome, when not under restraint of temporal authority as she now is, but let Rome be given full field to work out in practice what her doctrines teach, and there would be enacted once more the same violent and fanatical persecutions as of old. Rome is, of necessity, intolerant. She claims to be the bride of Christ

and, therefore, the mistress of the world. As if unconscious of her infidelity to Christ, she has grown into an enormous system of ever increasing power and world-wide influence, and, when the true Church of Christ has been called out of the world, this mysterious system, perhaps gathering into herself all the rest of the apostate mass of Christendom, shall be found in full control of the imperial power of the last days. Directed by Satan, and under his energy, Romanism shall gain temporal control for a brief period, and then, as here predicted, shall be destroyed. The apostle interprets for us the mystery of the woman and the beast that carried her. The beast is identified by the seven heads and ten horns. Throughout Revelation there is but one political beast. This political beast is the entire Roman empire or the imperial head of that empire, and the context must determine which of these two is intended. For example, it is obvious that the imperial head is he that is cast alive into the burning lake. In every case the context is sufficiently clear to keep us from error. It is not difficult to understand the expression: "The beast which thou sawest, was, and is not, and is about to rise out of the abyss and go into destruction." This statement is equally applicable to the whole Roman empire, or to the imperial head of it. The rule of the woman, as has been well said, necessarily destroys the beast character while it lasts. This explanation has been given, and accepted by some, as sufficiently satisfactory. Rome pagan, in its revived form, is bestial in its character; while Rome papal, whatever it be in reality, retains throughout the *human* form. When, therefore, the woman rides the beast, it shall, during the period of her rule, cease to be bestial in appearance. John's point of vision, being the time of the woman's rule, is still future. The ecclesiastical government, with temporal authority subject to it, shall for the time being deprive the beast of power, and this justifies the expression, "The beast that was, and is not." Its existence as bestial in form continues until it comes under ecclesiastical control of the woman, and so during the time of her rule can be spoken of as, "is not." The destruction of the woman is followed by the revival of the empire in its *bestial* form, and this is spoken of as a rising out of the abyss and a going into destruction. There is, however, another view that may be taken which is equally satisfactory, if not more so. The beast, let it be remembered, is either the Roman empire, or its personal head. We of course know there was a time when that empire had an existence. At the present time this empire is not, but, after the removal of the Church, it shall be restored under satanic energy, and therefore can be spoken of as rising out of the abyss, and subsequently going into destruction. This representation may apply either to the empire itself, or to the imperial head of it. It is generally agreed that the seven heads represent the seven hills of Rome, and this view is supported by the statement that "the seven heads are seven mountains whereupon the woman sitteth." They are also interpreted as being "seven kings," of whom five had fallen, one being in existence at the time the apostle wrote, and another to come at some future period. The beast, moreover, is here identified with *one of his heads*. This is an important fact to consider. The heads are not introduced into the picture in order to convey the idea that the beast had seven heads at one and the same time. As a matter of fact he never had the seven heads all at once. Though spoken of as having seven heads he is, nevertheless, a single-headed beast, and the heads are here mentioned for the purpose of interpretation which is divinely given when John declares these heads to be either seven hills, or seven kings. The seven heads are not synchronous, but consecutive. They are kings, and one follows another. Five had fallen before John's time. Another was in existence when he wrote, and the seventh was yet future. The beast is next declared to be an *eighth* head and yet one of the seven. Of this an explanation has already been given. Rome declined and fell under the sixth form of empire. It will revive under a *seventh* form. The imperial head shall, of course, be the seventh head. Receiving a death-stroke which is afterwards healed, he shall return to power as the *eighth* head. Thus it is

> easily seen how "the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is *of the seven*." … "The woman which thou sawest is the great city that hath sway over the kings of the earth." That great city is Rome. Not merely Rome pagan, but Rome papal, which shall yet from the literal site of Rome exercise the supremacy here spoken of over the kings of the earth.

"After these things" is the terminology with which the eighteenth chapter of Revelation begins, thus indicating that the destruction of ecclesiastical Babylon, as described in chapter 17, is followed at once by the destruction of political Babylon. In his notes on Isaiah, chapter 13, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes in his *Reference Bible*:

> The *city*, Babylon, is not in view here; as the immediate context shows. It is important to note the significance of the name when used symbolically. "Babylon" is the Greek form: invariably in the O.T. Hebrew the word is simply Babel, the meaning of which is *confusion*, and in this sense the word is used symbolically. In the prophets, when the actual city is not meant, the reference is to the "confusion" into which the whole social order of the world has fallen under Gentile world-domination. Isa. 13.4 gives the divine view of the welter of warring Gentile powers. The *divine* order is given in Isa. 11. Israel in her own land, the centre of the divine government of the world and channel of the divine blessing; and the Gentiles blessed in association with Israel. Anything else is, politically, mere "Babel." In Rev. 14.8–11; 16:19 the Gentile world-system is in view in connection with Armageddon (Rev. 16:14; 19:21), while in Rev. 17. the reference is to apostate Christianity, destroyed by the nations (Rev. 17:16) headed up under the Beast (Dan. 7:8; Rev. 19:20) and false prophet. In Isaiah the political Babylon is in view, literally as to the then existing city, and symbolically as to the times of the Gentiles. In the Revelation both the symbolical-political and symbolical-religious Babylon are in view, for there both are alike under the tyranny of the Beast. Religious Babylon is destroyed by political Babylon (Rev. 17:16); political Babylon by the appearing of the Lord (Rev. 19:19–21). That Babylon the *city* is not to be rebuilt is clear from Isa. 13:19–22; Jer. 51:24–26, 62–64. By political Babylon is meant the Gentile world-system. It may be added that, in Scripture symbolism, Egypt stands for the world as such; Babylon for the world of corrupt power and corrupted religion; Nineveh for the pride, the haughty glory of the world.—Pp. 724–25

In his analysis of this chapter of Isaiah, Dr. Scofield also states, "Verses 12–16 look forward to the apocalyptic judgments (Rev. 6.–13.). Verses 17–22 have a near and far view. They predict the destruction of the literal Babylon then existing; with the further statement that, once destroyed, Babylon should never be rebuilt (cf. Jer. 51:61–64). All of this has been literally fulfilled. But the place of this prediction in a great prophetic strain which looks forward to the destruction of both politico-Babylon and ecclesio-Babylon in the time of the Beast shows that the destruction of the actual Babylon typifies the greater destruction yet to come upon the mystical Babylons" (*Ibid.*, p. 725). Similarly, in reference to Revelation 17

and 18, Dr. Scofield states: “Babylon, ‘confusion,’ is repeatedly used by the prophets in a symbolic sense. Two ‘Babylons’ are to be distinguished in the Revelation: ecclesiastical Babylon, which is apostate Christendom, headed up under the Papacy; and political Babylon, which is the Beast’s confederated empire, the last form of Gentile world-dominion. Ecclesiastical Babylon is ‘the great whore’ (Rev. 17:1), and is destroyed by political Babylon (Rev. 17:15–18), that the beast may be the alone object of worship (2 Thes. 2:3, 4; Rev. 13:15). The power of political Babylon is destroyed by the return of the Lord in glory. The notion of a literal Babylon to be rebuilt on the site of ancient Babylon is in conflict with Isa. 13:19–22. But the language of Rev. 18. (e.g. vs. 10, 16, 18) seems beyond question to identify ‘Babylon,’ the ‘city’ of luxury and traffic, with ‘Babylon’ the ecclesiastical centre, viz. Rome. The very kings who hate ecclesiastical Babylon deplore the destruction of commercial Babylon” (*Ibid.*, pp. 1346–47).

Nothing is more fundamental respecting the will of God for this earth than that Israel, His elect nation, shall be in their own land in peace. Gentiles are related to this situation only as those who derive secondary advantage from the divine benefits for Israel. Through the apostasy of Israel which was predicted and wholly within the plan of God (cf. Deut. 4:26–28; 30:18–19; Isa. 1:2) and through the chastisement which fell upon that nation, a period of Gentile times intruded, and these times—a theme of much prediction—must run their determined course, and receive those judgments of God which belong to a Christ-rejecting world. The complete divine judgment upon Israel, upon the nations, and upon angels—to the end that evil may be banished forever—will have its larger treatment in Chapter XXVI. The destruction of both the religious and political confusion (Babylon)—that which unavoidably obtains when Israel is out of her land and void of blessing—is, as has been stated, described in many Scriptures and in each description the Gentile judgments end in the setting up of Israel’s kingdom with its final divine rule over the earth. The revelation respecting the oncoming destruction of religious Babylon has drawn out little disagreement on the part of expositors; but equally sincere teachers have disagreed regarding the destruction of political Babylon. Some contend that the ancient city of Babylon must be rebuilt in order that it may be destroyed as a literal fulfillment of certain prophecies. To this contention

it may be replied that the text in Revelation, chapter 18, uses the figure of the city, which was, both with respect to corruption and divine judgment, a type of the world-wide Babylon. Regardless of how imposing the supposed restored Babylon might be, the destruction of any single city would not answer the demands which arise for the destruction of the whole *cosmos* world system. The theme of Gentile judgments is of immediate interest, for the citizens of the earth are living in those conditions which foresee these on-coming destructions.

Chapter XXI

PROPHECY CONCERNING THE GREAT TRIBULATION

I. The Doctrine in General

UNAVOIDABLY, MUCH has been written in preceding pages concerning the great tribulation period. It has been observed that it is the seventieth week of seven years which was predicted by Daniel; that it completes Gentile times and in it Gentile judgments are accomplished; that it is characterized by the reign of the beast, the man of sin; that it is the time of Jacob's trouble; that it is unrelated to the Church; and that it is terminated by the glorious appearing of Christ. Such an array of allied features cannot but establish the truth that this brief period is incomparable in its significance and realities. The transition from Gentile times, involving the complete destruction of their institutions, their governments, the accomplishment of their judgments, and the setting up of Messiah's kingdom of righteousness and peace, is the climax of all previous human history. It is the consummation of the divine purpose for the earth. It is the defeat and overthrow of all the forces of evil in this sphere, which defeat is to be followed immediately by the destruction of all forces of evil in angelic spheres (1 Cor. 15:25–26). That so much will be accomplished in a seven-year period and that period shortened a little (cf. Matt. 24:21–22), emphasizes the importance of that period as more eventful than any other known to history or prophecy. The student is encouraged to make a careful study of the Scriptures which reveal (1) the fact of this period (note Deut. 4:29–30; Ps. 2:1–10; Jer. 30:4–7; Dan. 9:27; 12:1; Matt. 24:9–28; 2 Thess. 2:8–12; Rev. 3:10; 7:13–14; 11:1–19:6), (2) the judgments that must fall on the nations then (note Ps. 2:1–10; Isa. 63:1–6; Matt. 25:31–46), (3) the judgments on, or the sufferings, and salvation of Israel to come then (note Isa. 63:1; Ezek. 20:33–44; Mal. 3:1–6; Matt. 24:32–25:30).

As previously indicated, the book of Revelation is the consummation of all Biblical prophecy and it is of the utmost import that nearly onehalf of that book is devoted to the description of the last half of Daniel's seventieth week or the great tribulation period, and that nearly two thirds of that book

is devoted to the events transpiring within the entire seven years of the duration of that period. The most fanciful effort of the imagination is demanded when the world-transforming judgments of Revelation, chapters 6–19, are applied to past history. A few writers have attempted this adjustment in detail. More of them prefer to remain in the realm of indefinite generalities, and to excuse their own uncertainty by the contention that the Revelation is veiled and obscure at best. All writers on this book who wish to ride a hobby, or to strain an interpretation, avail themselves of sufficient latitude for their theories by stressing the supposed mystery concealing its message. The book, however, is a *revelation*.

Because of its accuracy and clarity, the following extended quotation from Dr. Henry C. Thiessen's article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* is incorporated here:

> By the "Tribulation Period" we mean more than mere tribulation. The Scriptures tell us that "through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22), and that in the world we have "tribulation" (John 16:33). These tribulations may be due to national calamities (Acts 11:27–30), to the persecution of wicked men (2 Tim. 3:12; Matt. 13:12), to personal sin in the believer (1 Tim. 5:23–25; 2 Sam. 12:10), to the manifestation of the self-life (Job 42:1–6; Heb. 12:10; 2 Cor. 12:7; John 15:2), or to God's sovereign purpose to glorify Himself thereby (John 9:1–3). Over against such personal afflictions, the Tribulation Period is a definite time during which the world will experience unprecedented tribulation. As we shall see, this period is directly related to the second coming of Christ.

1. *The Fact of Such a Period*.A careful examination of the Scriptures discloses the fact that there is to be a definite *period* of tribulation. Such references as Romans 2:9; 2 Thessalonians 1:6; Revelation 2:22, speak of tribulation to come as a punishment for sin, but they do not definitely refer it to the tribulation period. Only some of the evidence can be presented. In Daniel 12:1 we read: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Notice the expression, "a time of trouble." In Jeremiah 30:7–9 we read: "Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith Jehovah of hosts, that I will break his yoke from off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds; and strangers shall serve Jehovah their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them."

In verse 7 we have the same Hebrew words for "time of trouble" as in Daniel 12:1. The New Testament likewise teaches the coming of a time of tribulation. Jesus said: "For then shall be great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, nor ever shall be. … But immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun shall be darkened; and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24:21, 29–30). If we combine the statement in verse 29, "immediately after the tribulation of those days," with the words in Mark 13:24, "But in those days, after that tribulation," we see that our Lord is speaking of a *period* of tribulation. In Matthew 24:22, He says that "those days" will be shortened. The ascended Christ says to the Church in Philadelphia: "Because thou didst keep the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of trial, that hour which is to come upon the whole world, to try them that dwell upon the earth" (Rev. 3:10). The word "hour" indicates that the Lord is speaking of a *period* of trial. Moffatt rightly refers this verse to the future. He says: "The imminent period τοῦ πειρασμοῦ refers to the broken days which, in eschatological schemes, were to herald the messiah's return. Later on, this period is specifically defined as a time of seduction to imperial worship (cf. 13:14–17; 7:2; with Dan. 12:1, LXX)" (*Expositor's Greek Testament, in loc.*). Alford uses similar language. He says: "The appointed season of sore trial, τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, of the well-known and signal temptation. … The time imported is that prophesied of in Matthew 24:21 ff., viz., the great time of trouble which shall be before the Lord's second coming. As such it is immediately connected with ἔρχομαι ταχύ following" (*Greek Testament, in loc.*). This same period is referred to in Revelation 7:14, where the correct translation reads thus: "These are they that come out of the great tribulation" (lit. the tribulation the great). The Greek has the article, and it should be translated. Moffatt says on this phrase: "The great distress is plainly the period of persecution and martyrdom (6:11) predicted (e.g., Matt. 24:21, from Dan. 12:1) to herald the final catastrophe. It is still expected by Hermas (*Vis*. ii, 2.7, iv. 2.5, 3.6)" (*Op. cit., in loc.*). Charles says that this particular tribulation "is the last and final tribulation which the present generation is to experience. Cf. Daniel

12:1; Mark 13:19. … It is quite wrong to take it as meaning generally the tribulation that the faithful must encounter in the world. This great tribulation is still in the future. It consists first and chiefly in the actual manifestation of the Satanic powers on earth, and only in a secondary degree in social and cosmic evils" (*The Revelation o f St. John*, in the *I.C.C.* series, *in loc.*). Alford strangely sees in this verse the "whole sum of the trials of the saints of God, viewed by the Elder as now complete, and designated by this emphatic and general name: q.d. 'all that tribulation'" (*Op. cit., in loc.*). But he admits that others have "explained the words of that last great time of trial which is to try the saints before the coming of the Lord" (*Ibid.*). The language is so clear that it does not seem necessary to refute Alford's interpretation. Nor does it seem necessary to multiply references, showing that such a period is predicted in the Scriptures.

2. *The Nature of the Period*.

Again we cannot present all the evidence. All that we can do is to show in broad outline the character of this period. In general terms, it is a period during which God will speak to the nations of the earth "in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure" (Ps. 2:5). They have taken counsel against Jehovah and His anointed; they have killed the Son of God (Ps. 2:1–4; Acts 4:25–28). He will visit judgment upon them and yet set His King upon His holy hill of Zion (Ps. 2:6–12). Isaiah 24 gives a vivid description of this world-catastrophe to come. It is the hour of trial which is to come upon the whole world, to try them that dwell upon the earth (Rev. 3:10). Futuristic interpreters hold that Revelation 6–19 deals with this period. Assuming this to be the true view, we find in these chapters a dark picture of the tribulation period. We learn that there will be a federated world, i.e., the old Roman empire will be restored, with a Satan-energized ruler at the head. Ten kings will reign under him. It will be a despotic form of government. Rev. 13:1–10; 17:1–18; 19:17–21; cf. Dan. 2:40–45; 7:23–27. At the beginning this government will be strongly influenced by the federated church, the false bride of Christ, the mother of harlots; but after a time the emperor will prohibit all former worship, represent himself as god, and require the world to worship him. The ten kings under the emperor will turn against the federated religious system and destroy it, and the beast out of the earth will then induce the world to worship the emperor. Opposers will be persecuted and killed, or by means of an absolute boycott be forced to flee for their

lives. Rev. 17:1–17; 13:11–18; 2 Thess. 2:3–12. Along with this Israel will have returned in large numbers to Palestine, rebuilt its temple in Jerusalem, and by treaty with the world-emperor obtained permission to restore its temple worship, including the offering of sacrifices and oblations (Ezek. 37:7–14; Dan. 9:27). But the period will prove to be the "day of Jacob's trouble" (Jer. 30:7; Dan. 12:1, 9–13). The emperor will break his covenant with Israel, stop the sacrifices and oblations, and set up an image of himself in the temple (Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; Matt. 24:15–31; 2 Thess. 2:4; Rev. 13:14, 15). A remnant will be sealed before these troublous times reach their climax and be preserved in the midst of them (Rev. 7:1–8; 14:1–9). Satan himself will instigate the fiercest persecution against the woman and the rest of her seed, that is, Israel, but God will providentially intervene in behalf of His people (Rev. 12:13–17). The northern nations, represented as Gog and Magog, will gather against Jerusalem (Ezek. 38, 39); and when the conflict is at its height Christ will suddenly appear, defeat the beast and the false prophet with their armies, and deliver His people (Zech. 14:1–9; Rev. 19:17–21). The spirit of grace and supplication will be poured upon Israel, and they will recognize and mourn for their Messiah (Zech. 12:8–14). Economic conditions will play a large part during that period. Wealth will have greatly increased in the last days, but so also will injustice and consequent poverty (Jas. 5:1–6). The submission to and worship of the world-emperor will be made a condition to buying and selling (Rev. 13:16–18). A great commercial city [?] will be built on the Euphrates, and just at the time when it begins to enjoy its wealth God will suddenly destroy it (Rev. 18:1–24). In connection with the opening of the seals, the sounding of the trumpets, and the pouring out of the wrath vials, God will visit judgment upon the Christ-and God-rejecting world. But in spite of the awfulness of these days, there will be a witnessing remnant of Israelites (Isa. 66:19; Zech. 8:13; Matt. 24:14; Rev. 7:1–8), and multitudes will be converted (Rev. 7:9–17).–1935, XCII, 40–45

II. The Church and the Tribulation

Attention must be given at this point to a disagreement which obtains between premillenarians of equal sincerity over whether the Church will enter or pass through the great tribulation. A somewhat extensive literature

is being created as the problem is argued, and the student would do well to read with attention. It is contended in this work that the Church never enters or passes through the tribulation and for certain reasons, namely, because of

1. The Nature of the Tribulation. Proof has been presented earlier which demonstrates that the tribulation period, yet to be experienced in the world, is the completion of a sequence of predicted years, all of which should intervene between the plucking of Israel off the land, which occurred at the time of the Babylonian captivity, and the final return of that people to their land in the full realization of their covenanted blessings under Messiah's reign. But for the intercalary age of the Church, this period is precisely measured as 560 consecutive years, which time is divided into intervals, namely, 70 years of the Babylonian captivity as predicted by Jeremiah (Jer. 25:11–12), 49 years in which Jerusalem would be rebuilt (Dan. 9:25), 434 years to the cutting off of Messiah (Dan. 9:26), and 7 years in which the covenant between the prince and the many will be confirmed. Such is the precise measurement of Gentile times, though these years are equally laden with events which are Jewish. In the final 7 years the last Roman—emperor—the beast—arises, and Gentile times are terminated by the glorious appearing of Messiah. Whatever belongs to the Gentile times began with the Babylonian captivity and aside from the intercalary age of the Church is revived and consummated in the yet future 7 years. It therefore follows that only as the Church is found to be a part of Gentile times before the cutting off of Messiah will she be rightfully present in the consummating 7 years. Only the blindest form of Covenant Theology would ignore the overwhelming evidence in the Scriptures that the Church is not in Daniel's 483 years, or in any period of the Old Testament history. Those who would thrust the Church into the last 7 years of Gentile times are guilty of introducing an element into that period which has no place in that period since it is not to be on the earth during the eventful years which that period consummates. As a confirmation of these distinctions, it may be asserted again that no New Testament Scripture necessitates the placing of the Church in that period, nor does any New Testament Scripture warn the Church regarding the tribulation as though she were in danger of it.

Again, the purpose of the great tribulation is wholly extraneous to the Church. That period is declared to be for the final judgments of God upon a

God-and Christ-rejecting world. It is the ending of the *cosmos* system. Over against this, the Church is neither a part of the *cosmos* (cf. John 15:18–19; 17:14, 16; 1 John 5:19), nor is she ever to be brought into condemning judgment (John 5:24; Rom. 8:1). She will be judged relative to rewards which belong to faithful individuals, which judgment is not on the earth but is in heaven, and certainly is no feature of the earthly tribulation. To demand that believers must experience the terrible judgment and destruction which must fall on unbelievers is to do violence to every feature of the saving grace of God.

2. The Nature of the Church. Far more conclusive than all else in determining the question at issue is a right understanding of the nature of the Church. That she could not share in the great tribulation is settled finally for all who comprehend the essential truth of the individual believer's relation to God. Not only is the Church a product of this specific age with no relation whatsoever to any other age, but each believer is perfectly accepted now and forever before God on the ground of his place in Christ, the righteousness of God is imputed unto him, and, being saved out of this cosmos world, he is no more of this world than Christ is of this world (John 15:18–19; 17:14, 16). The coming tribulation is the judgment of this world. Israel has her part in it since, being not yet saved (Rom. 11:26), she is of the world (cf. Matt. 13:44). The believer, being what he is in Christ, has no more a rightful place in this *cosmos* world's judgments than Christ Himself or any unfallen angel. Back of the theories that the Church will enter or pass through the tribulation is the Arminian heresy that the believer contributes something to his own acceptance before God, and, having failed to some extent in this responsibility, he will be purged and purified by the suffering which the tribulation affords. There is a line of truth which concerns the believer's personal faithfulness; but this, as has been seen, is consummated before Christ at His judgment seat in heaven. As for any condemnation, or other judgment, the Christian is wholly delivered forever on the most righteous ground that a Substitute bore the condemnation and judgment and has provided a perfect standing before God. It is established by unqualified Scripture that the believer is delivered from all condemning judgments (John 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 5:1; 8:1, 33–34; 1 Cor. 11:31–32). In general, those who contend that the Church will experience the tribulation assert that all

believers—spiritual and unspiritual—will enter that period of suffering, though there are those believing in a partial rapture who assert that the Church will be divided and the spiritual element, which always includes those who advance this notion, will go directly to heaven, while the unspiritual will suffer for their sins in the tribulation. This constitutes a Protestant purgatory. The answer to all such conceptions is the recognition of the truth that, when members of this sinful race go to heaven, it is not on the ground of their own merit, but only through the merit of Christ. It is to be remembered that each believer is already perfectly justified forever (Rom. 5:1; 8:30, 33–34) and this wholly within the range of divine justice (Rom. 3:26). Thus the contention that the Church will enter or pass through the tribulation becomes an insult to, and unbelief towards, the measureless grace of God in Christ. To suppose, as some are asserting, that the great tribulation is greatly overestimated with respect to its sufferings becomes no less than a direct contradiction of the words of Christ. He said, "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened" (Matt. 24:21–22). What Christ declares to be supreme and incomparable is not an overestimation of the facts (cf. Dan. 12:1).

Let those who teach that the Church—or any part of it—will enter the great tribulation, state how saved ones who are clothed in the righteousness of God, justified forever, and wholly rescued from this cosmos world could in accord with either reason or revelation be thrust into those last judgments which fall upon a Christ-rejecting, Satan-ruled, *cosmos* world.

3. Must the Last Generation of the Church Suffer Especially? Those who entertain the idea that the Church experiences the great tribulation must reckon with the fact that of upwards of seventyfive generations who comprise that company all but the present generation have entered glory without the supposed benefits of that purging experience. Why, then, should the last generation suffer that from which the vast host have been spared? On this point a specious argument has been advanced, namely, that as the Church has suffered martyrdom in certain periods of her history she may be expected to suffer thus again at the end of the age; but back of this claim is the failure to recognize that past sufferings were due to

the attack of wicked men upon the Church, while the great tribulation is God's judgments upon wicked men. Wholly justified believers have no place among evil men who are destined to eternal doom.

4. The Testimony of the Scriptures. The Bible is far from silent on this important theme; however, there is no more occasion for the Word of God to state specifically that the Church is not in the great tribulation than for it to declare that the Church is not in the Babylonian captivity, though in one text it is directly declared that the Church is not to be tested in that trial. The evidence of the Scriptures is gained from that which may be deduced. As has been stated, no Scripture intimates that the Church is in the tribulation, nor is the Church warned as though in danger of so great a trial. Certain aspects of this phase of the subject should be considered separately.

a. The Imminent Return of Christ. Whether it be that coming of Christ to the earth in glory when Israel is to be delivered or that coming into the air to receive His Bride, the coming is imminent. Scripture which directs Israel in the tribulation, which time is terminated by the glorious return of Christ as their judge and Deliverer, warns her to *watch*, for He will then come "as a thief in the night" (cf. Matt. 24:32–25:13; 1 Thess. 5:1–8; 2 Pet. 3:8, 10). Over against this, the Church is instructed to *wait* and to *look* for His return for her (1 Thess. 1:9–10; Titus 2:13; Heb. 9:28). In both instances the return of Christ is unannounced and therefore impending, within the period to which each event belongs. The return of Christ for His Church was not impending in Old Testament days; nor is the glorious appearing impending until the tribulation (2 Thess. 2:3).

The imminent return of Christ to receive His Church is held before every believer as a "blessed hope." It is written, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John 14:1–3). The very absence of a date in this passage, addressed to the eleven in the upper room, extends that promise to all succeeding generations until He comes. Again, it is recorded, "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this

present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:11–13). Here, as above, the promise extends to all generations until He comes. In a similar way it is declared, "For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from Heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess. 1:9–10). In this Scripture the important fact is revealed that it was in the divine purpose that the very first generation of Christians were appointed, not to look for the tribulation or for death, but for the imminent coming of Christ. So, also, it is written, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure" (1 John 3:2–3). This purifying hope was as much a reality to those of the earliest days of the Church as it has been to any later generations. The force of this argument is inescapable. The tribulation is not the hope of the coming of the Lord; it is not *at hand*, but "the Lord is at hand" (Phil. 4:5). The Apostle Paul by a fivefold use of the self-including pronoun *we* placed himself among those who were actuated by the hope of Christ's return (cf. 1 Cor. 15:51–52; 1 Thess. 4:15–17).

b. The Anticipation of the Element of Time. It will be recognized that no prediction could be made of events within this age without a veiled intimation that the element of time would intervene. The problem is not one engendered by man; it is wholly of God. Therefore, it is, as other problems of a like nature, solved only in the mind of God. Both things are true—the Lord has always been at hand; yet certain times and events are predicted. Peter would grow old and die (John 21:18). The nobleman would delay a long time in a far country (Luke 19:11)—which parable teaches more the requirement that service is to continue than that time intervenes. The gospel is to be preached in all the world; but had it been commanded to convert all nations the case would have been different. Every new generation extends the evangelizing effort which, of itself, knows no end. It will be terminated whenever the Lord returns, and, since there is no revealed goal to be reached, the termination by His return could be at any time and is therefore impending.

The conclusive feature of this particular argument is the truth that the very men to whom it was disclosed that there would be times and events related to this age are the ones who in their writings declare that the return of Christ is imminent.

c. The Dispensational Feature. The interpretation of the Scriptures as advanced by those who teach that the Church will enter or pass through the tribulation is subject to errors which are traceable to a failure to discern dispensational distinctions, as well as to discern the true nature of the Church or of the tribulation. One writer builds his argument upon the statement that for the elect's sake the days of the tribulation will be shortened (Matt. 24:22). It does not occur to this individual that there are two elect companies—Israel and the Church—and that the context of Matthew where the declaration occurs is dealing only with Israel. Evidence of this is seen in the truth that the Church is never "hated of all nations" (Matt. 24:9), nor will its members —the members of Christ's Body—"hate one another" (vs. 10), nor will they ever be related to the "Sabbath day," nor will they ever pray that their "flight be not in the winter" (vs. 20).

d. The Major Scripture. The determining passage is Revelation 3:10, which is an address by the glorified Christ to the Philadelphian church. The Lord declares, "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." It is generally agreed that Philadelphia represents the true Church which has continued from the beginning and will continue until removed by translation. It is also conceded that "the hour of temptation" is a reference to the great tribulation. Those who would relate the Church to the tribulation interpret this passage as a guaranty that the Church will be preserved while passing through the tribulation. Those who oppose this view assert that the guaranty is that the Church will be kept out of that hour. It becomes a study of the original Greek words. On this passage, Dr. Henry C. Thiessen, whose advanced knowledge of the Greek language is established, writes:

> Assuming then that the Philadelphia Church represents the Missionary Church and that the "hour of trial" refers to the future Tribulation, we need to examine the words: "I also will keep thee from the hour of trial." More especially do we want to know what is the meaning of the verb "will keep" (τηρήσω) and of the preposition "from" (ἐκ). Alford says on the preposition ἐκ, that it means "out of the midst of: but whether by immunity from, or by being

brought safe through, the preposition does not clearly define." He goes on to say that the distinction which Duesterdieck, et al., attempt to set up between τηρεῖν ἐκ and τ. ἀπό cannot be safely maintained, for, as he well says, it is not easy to see that in John 17:15 ("but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one"), where we have the former, and in James 1:27 ("and to keep oneself unspotted from the world"), where we have the latter, "the former implies passing scatheless through the evil, while the latter imports perfect immunity from it." He adds: "This last we may grant: but is it not equally true in the other case?" Thus he points out that grammatically the two terms can have the same meaning, so that Revelation 3:10 may mean, not "passing unscathed through the evil," but "perfect immunity from it." Alford's own preference for the former of these alternatives has nothing to do with the grammar of the statement (*Greek Testament, in loc*.). Moffatt similarly explains the terms. He says: "It is impossible from the grammar and difficult from the sense, to decide whether τηρεῖν ἐκ means successful endurance (pregnant sense as in John 17:15) or absolute immunity (cf. 2 Pet. 2:9), safe emergence from the trial or escape from it entirely (thanks to the timely advent of Christ, v. 11)." Again we may say that Moffatt's acceptance of the former interpretation does not vitiate his statement that the grammar of the text permits the latter sense (*Expositor's Greek Testament, in loc*.). Other scholars say the same thing as to the use of the preposition ἐκ. Buttmann-Thayer say that ἐκ and ἀπό "often serve to denote one and the same relation." They give John 17:15; Acts 15:29; Revelation 3:10 as examples of this usage (*Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, p. 326 f.). Abbott doubts "if in the LXX and John ἐκ always implies previous existence in the evils from which one is delivered when used with σώζω and τηρέω" (*Johannine Grammar*, p. 251 f. I owe this note to Dr. A. T. Robertson). Westcott says on the former of these two phrases that it "does not necessarily imply that that is actually realized out of which deliverance is granted (comp. 2 Cor. 1:10), though it does so commonly (John 12:27)" (*Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 128). Similarly we read in 1 Thessalonians 1:10, that Jesus delivers us "from (ἐκ) the wrath to come." This can hardly mean protection in it; it must mean exemption from it.

It would seem, then, to have been abundantly shown that the language of Revelation 3:10 permits the interpretation that the Church is promised complete exemption from this hour of trial; indeed, it seems to favor it. Dr. Moorehead's explanation is unsatisfactory. He says: "The natural and obvious meaning is, the safekeeping of them in the midst of world-wide trial, not exemption from it by being caught up to heaven. The preposition 'out of' (ἐκ) signifies exactly this, and not rapture before the trial begins" (*Studies in the Book of Revelation*, p. 55). He says on John 17:15: "None can possibly mistake what the Lord meant in His prayer: His disciples were to remain in the world, but He asks that they be kept from its evil, or from the evil one who is its god. So precisely in Revelation 3:10, Philadelphia saints are to be in the trial, but safeguarded therein" (*Ibid.*). But Plummer more satisfactorily explains John 17:15 than either. Moorehead or Moffatt (above). He says: "Just as Christ is that *in* which His disciples live and move, so the evil one is that *out* of which (ἐκ) He prays that they may be kept" (*Cambridge Greek Testament, Gospel of John, in loc*.). Besides, we should note that the promise is not merely to be kept from the *trial*, but from the *hour* of trial, i.e., it holds out exemption from the period of trial, not only from the trial during that period. And finally, when it would have been so easy to write ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ, if the writer had meant preservation *in* that hour, why should he write ἐκ τῆς ὥρας, as he did? Surely, this is no accident.

We conclude, therefore, that we have in this text a promise that the whole Church will be taken away before the hour of temptation begins, and not merely an assurance of protection in it. Strange to say, interpreters who in one breath explain Revelation 3:10 as teaching that

> the Church will pass unscathed through the Tribulation, in the next breath explain the persecutions and martyrdoms in the Revelation as suffered by the Church! Consistency would demand that they seek some other solution of the problem.—*Ibid.*, pp. 201–3

e. The Twenty-Four Elders. In His desire to inform the saints concerning the future (cf. Gen. 18:17; John 16:13), which is the divine motive for providing all prophetic Scriptures, God calls John into heaven (Rev. 4:1) and causes him to see and hear what will be experienced by the Church in heaven and what will occur on the earth during the period of the last seven prophetic years. The purpose of this unveiling to John is that he may write these things, to the end that they may be transmitted as information to all believers (Rev. 1:1–2, 19). John sees twenty-four elders in heaven—even before the tribulation begins. It is pertinent to inquire into the identity of these elders.

Following the futuristic interpretation of Revelation 4:1 to the end of the book—that interpretation which alone is tenable or in harmony with all Biblical prophecy—it is concluded that the words μετὰ ταῦτα, twice used in Revelation 4:1, mark a turn in the message of this book from the history of the Church on earth, as disclosed in chapters 2–3, to that which will immediately follow that earthly history. These elders are to be distinguished from the "four living creatures," from the angels, and from the "great multitude" which, it is declared, came out of the great tribulation. Ford C. Ottman writes: "There ought to be very little question as to the identification of these crowned elders. They constitute the united royal priesthood predicted alike of Israel and the Church. They are seen here in one company redeemed and *glorified*. The prophet Daniel has a vision of the time when the Son of man comes to take His kingdom, and in that vision thrones are set, but they are without occupants. As a matter of fact, in Daniel's day, the thrones though established were vacant. Now we are come to the time of the accomplishment of Daniel's prophecy, and the thrones are filled" (*Unfolding of the Ages*, p. 109). Such indeed is the identification of these elders by the majority of worthy expositors. It is concluded, therefore, that the twenty-four elders represent the saints from earth who are in heaven. Their praise is both identifying and revealing when they sing: "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nations; and hast

made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth" (Rev. 5:9–10). Their own declaration indicates that they represent a vast throng and that they are in heaven only through the virtue of the redeeming blood of Christ. The presence of this company in heaven before the tribulation points clearly to the truth that they have been caught up to heaven before the hour of trial begins.

f. The Restrainer Removed. Another determining Scripture is found in 2 Thessalonians 2:6–7: "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way." The context treats of the man of sin, of the evil he promotes, and of his destruction by the breath of the returning Christ. The central truth of the passage under discussion is that, though Satan would long ago have consummated his evil program for his *cosmos* world, and have brought forward its last human ruler, there is a Restrainer who restrains to the end that Satan's program shall be developed and completed only at God's appointed time. The purpose of this age is not the development of evil, it is rather the outcalling of the Church; and Satan's enterprise will be timed to end at the moment God concludes the major age-purpose. Satan's program is only permitted of God at most and he must be subject to the thing God is doing. With due recognition of various opinions abroad, the Restrainer is the Holy Spirit. To achieve all that is to be accomplished, the Restrainer must be one of the Godhead. Even a casual contemplation of the power required will convince the open mind of this necessity; and, since the Holy Spirit is the active Executor of the Godhead in the world during this age, it is reasonable to conclude that He it is who restrains. Doubtless His restraint operates both directly and through the Church in which He dwells. When His work of gathering out the Church is completed—that for which He came into the world—He, the Spirit, the Restrainer, will be removed from the world as resident here and reassume His position as omnipresent only, as He is everywhere. The right understanding of this important Scripture depends upon recognition of the distinction to be observed between the Spirit's relation to the world as resident therein or omnipresent. He who was always omnipresent became resident on the Day of Pentecost; He who is now resident will become merely omnipresent on the completion of that which

He came on the Day of Pentecost to achieve. It is as clearly asserted that the believer can never be separated from the Holy Spirit. Christ's prayer that cannot go unanswered was that the Spirit should abide with believers forever (John 14:16); therefore, when the Spirit, the Restrainer, is "taken out of the way," the Church will of necessity be removed with Him. It cannot be otherwise; but the appearance of the man of sin, who is the essential character of the great tribulation, follows the removal of the Restrainer and the Church. The Church is not bereft of the Holy Spirit and left to suffer in the world.

Closely related to this consideration of the removal of the Church from the world is the fact that time is required between the rapture and the return with Christ in glory, so that appointed events may be accomplished. All Bible expositors, who enter at all into these issues, agree that the Church must be caught up to meet Christ before she can return with Him in glory (cf. Rev. 19:11–16). Those who teach that the Church goes through the tribulation agree that the Church must be translated thus; but to save a theory they declare that the Church is raptured to meet the Lord and then returns immediately with Him to the earth. But before she returns, as will yet be indicated, she must pass through the judgment for her rewards, be married to the Lamb, and participate in the marriage supper (Rev. 19:1–10). The post-tribulation rapture theory is forced to omit these great events or to contend that they are accomplished instantaneously.

It is to be concluded, then, that from every line of available evidence the Church will not, because she could not, either enter or pass through the great tribulation.

Chapter XXII

PROPHECY CONCERNING THE CHURCH

PROPHECY RESPECTING the true Church is to be distinguished from that respecting the final apostate church—that which has been considered already. The first prediction relative to the true Church was uttered by Christ, being recorded in Matthew 16:18. He said: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." In this declaration Christ not only implies that His Church was not then in existence, but that He by His own power would construct her and that the gates of hell would never prevail against her. No human resources could protect this company against the injury Satan might inflict; yet, according to this prediction, she will remain in her perfection before God forever. This is secured by her position in Christ. The course of the Church on earth is to be traced through the Acts and the Epistles, and the record of her earthly pilgrimage closes with Revelation 3:22. From Revelation 4:1, as before stated, she is seen in heaven; and, after her judgment with reference to her rewards and the marriage of the Lamb, she is seen returning to the earth with Christ (cf. 1 Thess. 3:13; Jude 1:14; Rev. 19:11–16), and reigning with Him upon the earth (Rev. 20:4–6). She is then identified as the Bride, the Lamb's wife. To the Church is given a day to celebrate—*the Lord's Day*, the first day of the week—and a day of triumph—the Day of Christ.

Of seven major features which form the theme of prophecy concerning future experiences of the Church, four of them (numbers two to five as here itemized) take place within the Day of Christ. These seven events are: (1) the last days for the Church, (2) the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, (3) the translation of living saints, (4) the judgment seat of Christ, (5) the marriage of the Lamb, (6) the return of the Church with Christ, and (7) the reign of the Church with Christ.

I. The Last Days for the Church

Again, distinction must be made between the "last days" for Israel—the days of her kingdom glory in the earth (cf. Isa. 2:1–5)—and the "last days"

for the Church, which are days of evil and apostasy (cf. 2 Tim. 3:1–5). Likewise, discrimination is called for between the "last days" for Israel and for the Church and "the last day," which, as related to the Church, is the day of the resurrection of those who have died in Christ (cf. John 6:39–40, 44, 54). A very extensive body of Scripture bears on the last days for the Church. Reference is to a restricted time at the very end of, and yet wholly within, the present age. Though this brief period immediately precedes the great tribulation and in some measure is a preparation for it, these two times of apostasy and confusion—though incomparable in history—are wholly separate the one from the other. Those Scriptures which set forth the last days for the Church give no consideration to political or world conditions but are confined to the Church itself. These Scriptures picture men as departing from the faith (1 Tim. 4:1–2). There will be a manifestation of characteristics which belong to unregenerate men, though it is under the profession of "a form of godliness" (cf. 2 Tim. 3:1–5). The indication is that, having denied the power of the blood of Christ (cf. 2 Tim. 3:5 with Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 1:23–24; 2 Tim. 4:2–4), the leaders in these forms of righteousness will be unregenerate men from whom nothing more spiritual than this could proceed (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14). The following is a partial list of the passages which present the truth respecting the last days of the Church: 1 Timothy 4:1–3; 2 Timothy 3:1–5; 4:3–4; James 5:1–8; 2 Peter 2:1–22; 3:3–6; Jude 1:1–25.

II. The Resurrection of the Bodies of the Saints

The entire program of resurrection as presented in the Bible is a major theme of prophecy and concerning it theology has remained strikingly silent. There has been a slight recognition of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, but theologians, generally speaking, have almost wholly ignored the resurrection of Christ. It has been taught also by these worthy men that there is one general resurrection at one and the same time. John 5:25–29 reports Christ as saying that resurrection is universal. He does not indicate that there will be a time intervening between the resurrection of the two classes which He names, nor does He intimate that there will not be an intervening time. The *hour* which He declared "is coming, and now is" has already extended over nineteen hundred years, and there is nothing to

hinder it from extending an added thousand years if He wills it so. Christ's germinal teachings are usually expanded in the Epistles and Revelation. Accordingly in 1 Corinthians 15:20–26 the universal character of resurrection is again asserted, but with the added truth that there are companies in resurrection with intervals between. Christ is first raised as First-fruits; then they that are Christ's at His coming, which means that at least nineteen hundred years intervene; and finally the end of the resurrection program, with a millennium between, in which all contrary authority is put down forever (cf. Rev. 20:1–6, 12–15).

Respecting the resurrection of the bodies of believers, there are no more revealing Scriptures than 1 Corinthians 15:42–50 and 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18, in which contexts the one trump of God is said to raise the bodies of the saints and to summon living saints to meet the Lord in the air. This trump of God is designated in 1 Corinthians 15:52 as *the last trump*. It will be observed that there is no connection whatsoever between the seventh and last trump of Revelation and the last trump for the Church, as though God is restricted to one series of trumpets. Those who connect the last trump for the believers with the climax trumpet of the tribulation not only force the Church into the tribulation, where no Scripture ever places her, but burden the seventh trumpet of the tribulation with a mission which is not even remotely related to it in the Revelation text.

III. The Translation of Living Saints

Though there is disagreement over *when* the living saints will be translated, there is concord among devout expositors respecting the truth that living saints will be translated to heaven without the experience of death and resurrection. Christ implies just this when He said "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die" (John 11:26). This statement is in contrast to the declaration of the preceding verse, namely, "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." However, the two more direct revelations are found in the two passages cited above—1 Corinthians 15:51 and 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18. In the former it is said that a secret of God is revealed when the Apostle writes, "We shall not all sleep"; and in the latter it is said, "We which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air."

A highway of prophecy concerning resurrection and translation of saints begins with John 5:25–29 and terminates with various passages in the Revelation (cf. John 5:25–29; 14:1–3; Rom. 8:19–23; 1 Cor. 1:8; 15:20–28, 51–57; 2 Cor. 5:1–9; Phil. 3:11, 20–21; 1 Thess. 4:13–18; 2 Thess. 2:1; Heb. 9:28 and passages in the Revelation).

IV. The Judgment Seat of Christ

Among all the judgments—yet to be considered—is that one of specific import for believers, when before the judgment seat of Christ they will be judged relative to the service they have rendered. On the central passage—2 Corinthians 5:10—Dr. C. I. Scofield writes: "The judgment of the believer's works, not sins, is in question here. These have been atoned for, and are 'remembered no more forever' (Heb. 10:17); but every *work* must come into judgment (Matt. 12:36; Rom. 14:10; Gal. 6:7; Eph. 6:8; Col. 3:24, 25). The result is 'reward' or 'loss' (of the reward), 'but he himself shall be saved' (1 Cor. 3:11–15). This judgment occurs at the return of Christ (Matt. 16:27; Luke 14:14; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Tim. 4:8; Rev. 22:12)" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1233).

V. The Marriage of the Lamb

The truth that the Church is the Bride of Christ has been established under Ecclesiology. It is true that she will be married to Christ and that there will be a wedding supper when the Church is welcomed into heaven. A declaration of this is given in Revelation 19:7–8, "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." Two truths are to be recognized in this passage beyond the central fact that there will be a marriage in heaven: first, this marriage precedes the glorious return of Christ, as that is described later in verses 11–16; and, second, the Bride will have made herself ready. This seems to be a recognition of the completion of the gospel ministry which has been committed unto believers (2 Cor. 5:19–20). Their soul-winning efforts will have wrought much in the gathering out of the elect company.

VI. The Return of the Church with Christ

Of the stupendous future exploits of the Church, nothing could be known apart from revelation. The predicted return of the Church with Christ is recorded with uncomplicated certainty in various passages: “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory” (Col. 3:4); “To the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints” (1 Thess. 3:13); “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints” (Jude 1:14); “And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. … And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean” (Rev. 19:8, 14).

VII. The Reign of the Church with Christ

The future activity of the Church after having returned with Christ to the earth is also a matter of divine revelation. As the bride of a king is not a subject of the king, but a consort with the king in his reign, so the Church will share the reign of Christ. The office of king and priest combined belongs to Christ and His Church alone. To ancient Israel was given the opportunity of this position (Ex. 19:5–6), but she failed. The high calling is extended to the Church and through the perfecting which infinite grace secures there can be no failure of this divine purpose. It is written, “And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen” (Rev. 1:6); “The four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne” (4:10); “And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years” (20:4).

There is no intimation in these Scriptures that the Church does not possess and enjoy her home in heaven. She goes whithersoever the Lamb goes, and there is no reason to believe that He in this time of His angelic judgments (cf. 1 Cor. 15:25–26) will be confined to the earth. Similarly, as Christ will continue to reign forever, it is to be accepted that the Church, His Bride, will continue to reign with Him forever.

Conclusion

The great highways of prophecy, as traced in this section of Eschatology, account for very much in the prophetic themes of the Bible. Unavoidably these themes must yet appear again, to some extent, in the other considerations of prophecy which are to follow. Repetition will not be in vain if thereby the student is made familiar with these lines of truth.

Chapter XXIII

MAJOR THEMES OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY

THE OLD TESTAMENT is a book characterized by far-reaching predictions, the greater part of which were not fulfilled when the records contained in the book were completed. While the scope of Old Testament prophecy reaches out into multiplied details, the subject matter presented may be pursued under seven major themes, namely, (1) prophecy respecting the Gentiles, (2) prophecy respecting Israel's early history, (3) prophecy respecting the nation Israel, (4) prophecy respecting the dispersions and regatherings of Israel, (5) prophecy respecting the advent of Messiah, (6) prophecy respecting the great tribulation, and (7) prophecy respecting the Day of Jehovah and the Messianic kingdom. In attempting a consideration of these themes, some repetition of prophetic truths already presented is unavoidable.

I. Prophecy Respecting the Gentiles

The general theme of prediction related to the Gentiles is itself subject to a sevenfold division.

1. THE FIRST GENTILE PREDICTION. A far-reaching prophecy was given by Noah with reference to the character that would be exhibited by each of his three sons as progenitors of the races to repeople the earth (Gen. 9:25–27), which anticipation has been fulfilled to the present hour.

2. THE JUDGMENTS UPON NATIONS ADJACENT TO ISRAEL. Much of this body of truth has been fulfilled. These predictions are set forth in various portions of the Old Testament, e.g.: Babylon and Chaldea (Isa. 13:1–22; 14:18–27; Jer. 50:1–51:64), Moab (Isa. 15:1–9; 16:1–14; Jer. 48:1–47), Damascus (Isa. 17:1–14; Jer. 49:23–27), Egypt (Isa. 19:1–25; Jer. 46:2–28), Philistia and Tyre (Isa. 23:1–18; Jer. 47:1–7), Edom (Jer. 49:7–22), Ammon (Jer. 49:1–6), Elam (Jer. 49:34–39).

3. THE TIMES OF THE GENTILES. In contrast to *times and seasons,* which term refers to the divine dealing with Israel (cf. Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1), is

the phrase *the times of the Gentiles*, which relates to divine dealings with the Gentiles. The latter term was introduced by Christ (Luke 21:24) and measures the period in which Jerusalem will be under the overlordship of Gentiles. It has been observed before that Gentile times are measured out to continue approximately 560 years. The events belonging to this period occupy much prophecy, covering as it does both its course and end. This period, however, is interrupted by the intercalary age of the Church, which age, being undefined with respect to duration, serves to introduce an element of indefiniteness into the period when Gentile times will end. Nevertheless, it is clear that Gentile times are now accomplished but for the seven years which will be experienced immediately upon the removal of the Church, which event closes this intercalary age.

4. The Succession of Monarchies. Again, only a passing reference will be called for upon a subject which has already been considered at length. Four world powers were foreseen by Daniel—Babylon, MedoPersia, Greece, and Rome. These, as foreseen by the prophet, were to dominate Gentile times and be terminated by the glorious coming of Christ, when the Messianic kingdom will supersede all human rule and authority. In the purpose of God this Roman authority was to be interrupted by the ushering in of the present age. Doubtless the elements of Roman government are abroad in the earth throughout this age; yet the empire itself will return to existence and active power, and will complete the course prescribed for it in the seven years that remain. As the present age was unforeseen, the Old Testament predictions bearing on the last of the four monarchies must be interpreted in the light of later revelation.

5. The Judgment of Gentile Nations. While this stupendous event is drawn out in its immeasurable importance in the New Testament, it is fully anticipated in the Old Testament (cf. Ps. 2:1–10; Isa. 63:1–6; Joel 3:2–16; Zeph. 3:8; Zech. 14:1–3).

6. Gentile Nations and the Lake of Fire. The destruction of opposing Gentile nations is also anticipated in the Old Testament; but Christ Himself —their judge—has declared their actual destiny (Matt. 25:41). Being unregenerate persons, they are subject to eternal condemnation (John 3:18)

and doom; but in relation to Israel, as an immediate issue, the opposing nations are, at the time of their judgment, dismissed to the lake of fire.

7. Gentile Nations and the Kingdom. Much Old Testament prophecy foresees the share Gentiles will have in Israel's kingdom (cf. Isa. 11:10; 42:1, 6; 49:6, 22; chapters 60, 62, and 63). It has already been stated that Gentiles will be a subservient people attending upon Israel (cf. Isa. 14:1–2; 60:12; 61:5). Later revelation (Matt. 25:31–40) asserts the entrance of Gentiles into the kingdom by the authority of the King and as predetermined by the Father from the foundation of the world.

II. Prophecy Respecting Istael's Early History

The early history of Israel both in the land and in bondage presents a group of events which will be found to be subjects of prediction. Practically all of these have been fulfilled and in a literal manner. These features are recorded in the Pentateuch and the Old Testament historical books. The extended list includes: Israel's Egyptian bondage and release (Gen. 15:13–14), the character and destiny of Jacob's sons (Gen. 49:1–28), Israel in the land following the Egyptian bondage (Deut. 28:1–62, 63–67; see also Ps. 106:1–48; Deut. 30:1–3; Lev. 26:3–46; Neh. 1:8; Jer. 9:16; 18:15–17; Ezek. 12:14–15; 20:23; 22:15; James 1:1).

III. Prophecy Respecting the Nation Israel

Beginning with the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 12:1–3; 13:14–17; 15:1–7; 17:1–8) and continuing throughout the Old Testament, there is prediction concerning the chosen earthly people of God. To them has been promised: a national entity (Jer. 31:36), a land (Gen. 13:15), a throne (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:36), a King (Jer. 33:21), and a kingdom (Dan. 7:14). All of these divine blessings are endless in their duration; yet reservation is made whereby these blessings may be interrupted as a chastisement upon the nation, though never can they be abrogated. The importance of the chosen people in the reckoning of God and the extent of the Scriptures bearing upon their past, present, and future is disclosed, when it is seen that all Scripture from Genesis 12:1 to the end of Malachi relates to them directly or indirectly. As for their future, this people will, according to prophecy, take the leading

place among all the peoples of the earth, planted forever upon their own land under the gracious reign of David's greater Son sitting on David's throne.

IV. Prophecy Respecting the Dispersions and the Regatherings of Israel

As before indicated, there were to be three dispersions of Israel from the land and three returnings. That nation is now in the third dispersion and awaiting the third return. By the Assyrian captivity of the northern kingdom, the ten tribes of Israel were, as prophecy anticipated, taken off the land as a punishment for their sins and scattered through all nations of the earth, followed later on by the southern kingdom also. Prophecies bearing on this final dispersion are extensive (cf. Lev. 26:32–39; Deut. 28:63–68; Ps. 44:11; Neh. 1:8; Jer. 9:16; 18:15–17; Ezek. 12:14–15; 20:23; 22:15; James 1:1).

In no case would Israel's national entity be lost even through centuries of dispersion (Jer. 31:36; Matt. 24:34). They refused the divine offer and provision for their regathering and kingdom glory which was made by their Messiah at His first advent (Matt. 23:37–39); and, as at Kadesh-barnea where their wilderness experience was extended (Num. 14:1–45), their chastisement has been continued, and will be continued until He comes again. At that time He will regather His people into their own land and cause them to enter into the glory and blessedness of every covenant promise of Jehovah concerning them (Deut. 30:1–10; Isa. 11:11–12; Jer. 23:3–8; Ezek. 37:21–25; Matt. 24:31).

V. Prophecy Respecting the Advent of Messiah

From 1 Peter 1:10–11 it is clear that the prophets of the Old Testament were unable to distinguish the two advents of the Messiah. So perfectly was the present age a secret in the counsels of God that, to the prophets, these events which were fulfilled at His first coming and those which are to be fulfilled at His second coming were in no way separated with respect to the time of their fulfillment. Isaiah 61:1–2 is an illustration of this. When reading this passage in the synagogue of Nazareth, Christ ceased abruptly when He had concluded the record of those features which were predicted

for His first advent (Luke 4:18–21), making no mention of the remaining features which are to be fulfilled when He comes again. In like manner, the angel Gabriel, when anticipating the ministry of Christ, combined as if one the undertakings which belong to both the first and the second advents (Luke 1:31–33). According to Old Testament prophecy, Christ was to come both as a sacrificial, unresisting Lamb (Isa. 53:1–12) and as the conquering and glorious Lion of the tribe of Judah (Isa. 11:1–12; Jer. 23:5–6). Considering these two divergent lines of prediction, there need be little wonder that there was perplexity in the minds of the Old Testament prophets about the "manner of time" when all this would be fulfilled.

Prophecy stipulated that the Messiah must be of the tribe of Judah (Gen. 49:10), of the house of David (Isa. 11:1; Jer. 33:21), born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14), in Bethlehem of Judea (Mic. 5:2), that He must die a sacrificial death (Isa. 53:1–12), by crucifixion (Ps. 22:1–21), rise again from the dead (Ps. 16:8–11), and come to earth the second time (Deut. 30:3) with the clouds of heaven (Dan. 7:13). Jesus of Nazareth has fulfilled and will fulfill every requirement of prophecy concerning the Messiah.

VI. Prophecy Respecting the Great Tribulation

Old Testament prophecy anticipates a time of unprecedented tribulation in the earth (Deut. 4:29–30; Ps. 2:5; Isa. 26:16–20; Jer. 30:4–7; Dan. 12:1). By the removal of the Church before this period begins, the human representation on the earth is again reduced simply to Jews and Gentiles. This period is the completion of Gentile times in that it is the outworking of that last form of imperial government which is indicated by the feet and toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image. It is the time of the dissolution of all Gentile institutions (Rev. 17–18), and the judgment and disposition of Gentiles (Matt. 25:31–46). Similarly, it is the consummation of Israel's afflictions, the hour of her judgments (Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 24:37–25:30), and is ended by the return of her Messiah.

VII. Prophecy Respecting the Day of Jehovah and the Messianic Kingdom

This extended period which begins with the Lord's return as a "thief in the night" and ends with the passing away of the present heaven and earth (cf. 2 Pet. 3:8–10), includes in it the glorious reign of Christ over the earth when all covenants are fulfilled for Israel, and when Christ, having put down human authority, will also put down all angelic rebellion against God (1 Cor. 15:25–26).

In respect to the amount of Scripture involved, there is no theme of Old Testament prophecy comparable to that of the Messianic kingdom. Lying beyond all the predicted chastisements that are to fall on Israel is the glory which will be theirs when regathered into their own land, with unmeasured spiritual blessings under the glorious reign of their Messiah-King. This vision was given to all the prophets, and as certainly and literally as Israel, in fulfillment of prophecy, was removed from the land and caused to suffer during these many centuries, so certainly and literally will she be restored to marvelous blessings in a redeemed and glorified earth (Isa. 11:1–16; 12:1–6; 24:22–27:13; 35:1–10; 52:1–12; 54:1–55:13; 59:20–66:24; Jer. 23:3–8; 31:1–40; 32:37–41; 33:1–26; Ezek. 34:11–31; 36:32–38; 37:1–28; 40:1–48:35; Dan. 2:44–45; 7:14; Hos. 3:4–5; 13:9–14:9; Joel 2:28–3:21; Amos 9:11–15; Zeph. 3:14–20; Zech. 8:1–23; 14:9–21).

Conclusion

While the major themes of prophecy may be indicated in a textbook, there is nothing, in the matter of the student's progress, that can take the place of tireless reading and study of the text of the Bible itself.

Chapter XXIV

Major Themes of New Testament Prophecy

The Old Testament having closed without realization of the presence of the Messiah or of Israel's kingdom, the New Testament opens with the appearance of the King and the offer to Israel of her long-predicted kingdom (cf. Matt. 1:1; 2:1–2; 4:17; Rom. 15:8). The same records go on to declare the rejection of the King and His Kingdom (Matt. 23:37–38), and indicate that all these divine purposes will be fulfilled without failure when the King returns. Certain new themes of prophecy are introduced in the New Testament in addition to the continuing unto consummation of Old Testament themes. The major New Testament themes are: (1) the new age, (2) the new divine purpose, (3) the nation Israel, (4) the Gentiles, (5) the great tribulation, (6) Satan and the forces of evil, (7) the second coming of Christ, (8) the Messianic kingdom, and (9) the eternal state.

I. The New Age

As before stated, the present dispensation, which has extended already nearly two thousand years and which lies between the two advents of Christ, was never anticipated in any Old Testament prophecy. Also, in virtue of being mentioned as a "mystery" (Matt. 13:11), it is declared to be one of the sacred secrets hidden in the counsels of God until the appointed time of its revelation; for a "mystery" in the New Testament use of the word is something hitherto unrevealed (note Rom. 11:25; 2 Thess. 2:7; Col. 1:27; Eph. 3:1–6; 5:25–32; 1 Cor. 15:51). The phrase "the kingdom of heaven" refers to any rule God may exercise at any time in the earth. Being limited to the earth, it is to be distinguished from "the kingdom of God," which kingdom embraces not only that which is good within the sphere of the kingdom of heaven, but all in heaven and the whole universe that is subject to God. While the long-predicted millennial reign of Christ in the earth is the final form of the kingdom of heaven and that which was foreseen by all the prophets and announced by Christ in His earthly ministry, the present dispensation, being that form of divine rule in the earth in which God is ruling to the extent that He is realizing the accomplishment of those things

which are termed “mysteries,” is rightly called “the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 13:11), or the kingdom in mystery form. The first twelve chapters of the Gospel by Matthew present Christ as Israel’s Messiah and record the first indication of His rejection by that nation. Following these indications of His rejection, He, as recorded in chapter 13, announces by seven parables the features of the new age and indicates its character at its beginning, during its course, and in its end. At the opening of chapter 13, the sphere of the divine purpose is changed from its focus on the nation Israel to include the whole world, and Israel is seen only as a “treasure” hid in a field (13:44). The seed of the gospel is sown in the world and the harvest is an outcalling of those who believe. These will be received and preserved as the children of God, while those who do not believe are to be rejected and judged. This new age at its beginning was said to be evil (Gal. 1:4), and its course is characterized by the parallel development of both the evil and the good (Matt. 13:24–30, 36–43). Its “last days” and their evil character are set forth in one of the most extensive bodies of New Testament Scripture (2 Thess. 2:1–12; 1 Tim. 4:1–3; 2 Tim. 3:1–5; James 5:1–10; 2 Pet. 2:1–3:8; Jude 1:1–23; Rev. 3:14–22). In no sense of the word does the Bible predict a converted earth in this dispensation (Matt. 13:1–50; 24:38–39; 2 Tim. 3:13), but it does anticipate the perfect realization of the purpose of God.

II. The New Divine Purpose

The New Testament introduces the Church as a new classification of humanity in addition to the Jews and the Gentiles who have been seen throughout the Old Testament (1 Cor. 10:32). By the word *Church* (note its first use—Matt. 16:18) reference is made to those from all kindreds and tribes who in this age are born again, and thus, by receiving the new resurrection life of Christ and by being baptized with the Spirit, are in Christ, forming with Him the New Creation. Into this company both Jews and Gentiles are gathered (Eph. 3:1–6) through the preaching of the gospel of divine grace. This redeemed company is now related to Christ as His sheep (John 10:6–16), the branches in the Vine (John 15:1–6), the stones in a building (Eph. 2:19–22), a kingdom of priests (1 Pet. 2:5; Heb. 8: 1), the New Creation (2 Cor. 5:17), the Body (Eph. 1:22–23; 3:6), and they will be

related to Him as His Bride in heaven (Rev. 19:7–8; 21:9). When the divine purpose in the outcalling of the Church has been completed, Christ will come to receive His own (John 14:1–3; 1 Thess. 4:13–17). Those who have died will be raised (1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:13–17), and those then living will be translated (1 Cor. 15:51; 1 Thess. 4:13–17), and all, whether by resurrection or translation, shall receive a new body like His glorious body (Phil. 3:21) .

New Testament prophecy carries the Church through all the pilgrim experiences on the earth (Rev. 2:1—3:22), sees her received into heaven at the coming of the Lord, and sees her returning with Him to reign with Him on the earth (Rev. 19:14; 20:6).

III. The Nation Israel

The New Testament resumes the history of Israel where the Old Testament left them—a disorganized and partly scattered people, a portion of whom are dwelling in the land but without right or title to that whole land. Nationally, they are, in this dispensation, set aside; but as individuals they are on the same plane before God as Gentiles (Rom. 3:9; 10:12)—though formerly so different (cf. Rom. 9:4–5 with Eph. 2:11–12)—and are subject to the same offer of salvation by grace alone. At its beginning it was predicted that, throughout this dispensation, the nation Israel would be *hid* (Matt. 13:44); *blind* (Rom. 11:25); *broken off* (Rom. 11:17); *without their national center* (Luke 21:24); and *scattered* (Matt. 10:6; James 1:1); that in the tribulation they are to be *hated* (Matt. 24:9); and in the kingdom they are to be *regathered* (Matt. 24:31); and *saved* (Rom. 11:26). Christ predicted that the wrath of God would fall upon them and that their beloved city would be destroyed (Luke 21:20–24), which prophecy was fulfilled by the siege under Titus in the year 70 A.D. Likewise, He predicted the sorrows of the tribulation (Matt. 24:9–26), their sifting judgments preparatory to entrance into their kingdom glory (Matt. 24:37–25:30; note also Ezek. 20:38), and His own occupancy of the throne of David (Matt. 25:31; note also Luke 1:31–33; Acts 15:16–17), when their blessings under the Davidic covenant will be realized. The Apostle Paul prophesied of Israel’s national conversion (Rom. 11:26–27), and the Apostle John prophesied of their place

in the tribulation (Rev. 7:4–17; 12:13–17) and of their coming kingdom in the earth (Rev. 20:4–6).

IV. The Gentiles

Much has been presented earlier regarding Gentile history and prophecy. It has been observed that prediction relative to Gentiles falls within a period which Christ designated as “the times of the Gentiles” (Luke 21:24). This period began with the Babylonian dispersion and continues with its successive world empires and concluding judgments until terminated by the glorious return of Christ (Dan. 2:44–45). The Gentile times are interrupted by the intercalary age of the Church and continue for seven years after the Church age is ended. Gentile nations will be judged, with some entering the kingdom and some dismissed to the lake of fire (Matt. 25:31–46).

V. The Great Tribulation

Continuing with greater detail the Old Testament predictions concerning the great tribulation, the New Testament is both explicit and extensive here. Christ spoke of that time in relation to Israel (Matt. 24:9–26), the Apostle Paul writes of it in its relation to the forces of evil (2 Thess. 2:1–12), while the Apostle John records at length the tremendous divine program which will be enacted in those days (Rev. 3:10; 6:1—19:6). In this brief period which probably lasts at most but seven years (Dan. 9:27; and shortened a little, Matt. 24:22), judgments are accomplished in the earth, the forces of evil are first released and then terminated, while both ecclesiastical and political Babylon are destroyed.

VI. Satan and the Forces of Evil

Prophecy concerning Satan begins in the Old Testament (Ezek. 28:11–19; Isa. 14:12–17) and concludes with his expulsion from heaven and restriction to the earth (Rev. 12:7–12), his binding and confinement to the abyss (Rev. 20:1–3), and, after he has been released from the abyss for a little season and has led the last revolt against the authority of God (Rev. 20:7–9), his final doom in the lake of fire (Rev. 20:10). Closely related to prophecy concerning Satan is that of the man of sin, which prophecy also

begins in the Old Testament (Ezek. 28:1–10; Dan. 7:8; 9:24–27; 11:36–45) and includes the prophecy by Christ in which the coming of that wicked one is pointed out as a sign to Israel of the end of the age (Matt. 24:15). Likewise, the Apostle Paul foresees him desecrating the restored temple, declaring himself to be God, and then destroyed by the glorious appearing of Christ (2 Thess. 2:1–12), while the Apostle John sees him in both his governmental power and his final doom (Rev. 13:1–10; 19:20; 20:10).

VII. The Second Coming of Christ

This the greatest theme of all prophecy was the subject of the first prediction by man (Jude 1:14–15), and is the last message of the Bible (Rev. 22:20). It is the dominant feature of all Old Testament prophecy concerning the Day of Jehovah and, likewise, is the major theme of New Testament prophecy. Beginning in connection with the first evidence of Israel's rejection of His Messianic claims, this great event was continually upon the lips of Christ (Matt. 23:37–25:46; Mark 13:1–37; Luke 21:5–38). Again, it is emphasized by the Apostle Paul (Rom. 11:26; 1 Thess. 3:13; 5:1–4; 2 Thess. 1:7–2:12), by James (5:1–8), by Peter (2 Pet. 2:1–3:18), by Jude (1:14–15), and by John in the Revelation.

VIII. The Messianic Kingdom

Continuing this major theme of Old Testament prophecy, the New Testament again adds many details. The kingdom teachings of Christ, addressed to Israel as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, portray the character and glory of that coming age, while the Apostle John reveals its duration to be a period of one thousand years (Rev. 20:4, 6).

IX. The Eternal State

As the Old Testament enters into the eternity past and discloses the origin of all things, so the New Testament penetrates the future and discloses the consummation of present things with the revelation respecting what will be in the eternity to come. The destiny of men, both saved and lost, the destiny of angels, both unfallen and fallen, and the outworking of

every covenant God has made with His elect nation are declared in the New Testament.

Conclusion

The detail of New Testament prophecy appears throughout the entire consideration of Eschatology.

Chapter XXV

Predicted Events in Their Order

Much is gained from a clear comprehension of the right order of those events which are the major subjects of prophecy. It is found to be most advantageous for the student to memorize the following list of forty-five events and to become equally familiar with the Scriptures cited with each. These events in their chronological order are:

I. Noah's Prediction Respectings His Sons

This far-reaching prophecy (Gen. 9:25–27) is supernatural in every respect since Noah could have had no knowledge of the future of which he spoke. The entire declaration has been verified and fulfilled by all subsequent history.

II. Israel's Bondage in Egypt

To Abraham was given the revelation regarding the Egyptian bondage (Gen. 15:13–14). This was reported by Abraham and thereby he became a prophet. This was, also, as is all prophecy, a supernatural message both in respect to its reception by Abraham and the anticipation of its literal fulfillment.

III. The Future of Jacob's Sons

An unlimited field of study is compressed into Jacob's prediction regarding each of his sons; and, while all of this has been verified, the prophecy will have further confirmation in the outworking of God's purpose for Israel. Of special import are the words relative to Judah and Joseph. In the former, the Messianic anticipation is announced by the words, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be" (Gen. 49:10). In the latter prediction respecting Joseph, the same

anticipation relative to a Savior (vs. 24) is carried back to Jacob as the patriarchal progenitor.

IV. Israel in the Land

That Israel would enter the land was foreseen by Moses (Deut. 4:14–30; 31:14–23), as also by Abraham (Gen. 15:13–14). The historical books of the Old Testament record the fulfillment of this prophecy.

V. Israel's Captivities

Three dispossessions of the land were foretold for Israel and three restorations—(a) the Egyptian bondage (Gen. 15:13–14), (b) the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities (Jer. 25:11–12), and (c) the final scattering among all the nations, where that nation is to the end of the present age (Deut. 28:63–68; cf. Deut. 30:1–3; Lev. 26:3–46; Neh. 1:8; Ps. 106:1–48; Jer. 9:16; 18:15–17; Ezek. 12:14–15; 20:23; 22:15; James 1:1).

VI. Judgments to Fall Upon Surrounding Nations

From the call of Abraham to the death of Christ, the Gentile nations are in evidence in the divine record only as they come into contact directly or indirectly with Israel. The enmity of the nations against Israel has always drawn out the judgments of God. Many of these judgments are already fulfilled. The nations mentioned in this line of prophecy are: (a) Babylon (cf. Isa. 13:1–22; 14:18–27; Jer. 50:1–51:64); (b) Moab (cf. Isa. 15:1–9; 16:1–14; Jer. 48:1–47); (c) Damascus (cf. Isa. 17:1–14; Jer. 49:23–27); (d) Egypt (cf. Isa. 19:1–25; Jer. 46:2–28); (e) Tyre (cf. Isa. 23:1–18; Jer. 47:1–7); (f) Ammon (cf. Jer. 49:1–6); (g) Edom (cf. Jer. 49:7–22); (h) Elam (cf. Jer. 49:34–39).

VII. A Partial Restoration

A clear distinction should be made between the partial restoration of Israel to the land under Ezra and Nehemiah and the final and complete restoration that will yet be when Messiah returns. The partial restoration is anticipated in Isaiah 44:28, Jeremiah 25:11–12, and Daniel 9:2.

VIII. The Coming and Ministry of John the Baptist

As before indicated, great importance belongs to the coming and ministry of John the Baptist. His was a message and ministry in preparation for Messiah. With the rejection of the King and the postponement of His kingdom, John's ministry failed, though one like it will yet be resumed before the second advent. As to John's ministry, the prophets spoke with certainty (cf. Isa. 40:3–5; Mal. 4:5–6; note Luke 1:5–25).

IX. The Birth of Christ

An extensive number of predictive Scriptures anticipate the life of Christ on the earth. Only a very restricted portion may be cited here. The first of these is of His birth (cf. Gen. 3:15; Isa. 7:14; 9:6; Luke 1:31–35).

X. The Offices of Christ

Among the most consequential features of revelation regarding Christ are those of His offices—Prophet, Priest, and King—and these bulk largely in prophecy.

1. Prophet. Deuteronomy 18:15–19 anticipates the prophetic ministry of Christ—a ministry which is to be recognized in its broadest scope, for He was both a forthteller and a foreteller (cf. John 1:1–2, 45; 7:16; 8:28; 12:49–50; 14:10, 24; 17:8; Acts 3:22–23; 7:37).

2. Priest. It is in connection with the office of Priest held by Christ that the types serve as predictions. Both Aaron and Melchizedek are the foreshadowings of the final Priest—Christ (cf. Ps. 110:4; Zech. 6:12–13; and much of the letter to the Hebrews).

3. King. In the sphere of His kingly office, prediction relative to Christ is multiplied. Former portions of this work have emphasized this fact (cf. 2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 2:6–10; 72:1–19; Isa. 9:6–7; Zech. 9:9; Matt. 21:1–9; 27:11; Luke 1:32–33).

XI. The Ministries of Christ

In addition to the offices of Christ, prediction foresees the ministries of Christ (cf. Isa. 49:1–7; 61:1–3).

XII. The Death of Christ

Both by type and by prophecy the death of Christ is extensively anticipated in the Scriptures. It is directly predicted (cf. Ps. 22:1–21; Isa. 52:13–53:12). It was prophesied by Christ Himself (cf. Matt. 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22; 18:31–34; John 12:32–33).

XIII. The Death of Christ

As the burial of Christ takes a large place in the statement of the gospel (cf. 1 Cor. 15:1–4) and in the sanctification of the believer (cf. Rom. 6:1–10), in like manner it is foreshadowed in the scapegoat type and directly predicted in Isaiah 53:9 (cf. Matt. 27:57–60).

XIV. The Resurrection of Christ

Again, multiplied types and predictions anticipate the resurrection of Christ (cf. Lev. 14:4 ff.; Ps. 16:8–11 with Acts 2:25–31; Ps. 22:22 with Heb. 2:12; Ps. 118:22–24 with Acts 4:10–11). Christ's own expectation is also recorded (cf. Matt. 12:38–40; 16:21; 17:9, 23; 27:63; Mark 8:31; 9:9, 31; 10:34; 14:58; Luke 9:22; 18:33; John 2:19–22).

XV. The Ascension of Christ

The one direct prophecy of the ascension is by Christ Himself as recorded in John 20:17, "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (cf. Ps. 24). In type the ascension is seen in the wave sheaf (Lev. 23:9–12). Christ resurrected and ascended into heaven is the First-Fruits of all believers yet to be raised and, like Him, to appear in heaven in glorified bodies. The waving of the representative sheaf was on "the morning after the Sabbath," that is, the resurrection day, or the first day of the week.

XVI. The Present Age

Previous emphasis upon the truth that this age was unforeseen will be recalled. The age was preannounced by Christ in Matthew, chapter 13, and its character is seen in various declarations which anticipate its course and its end (Matt. 24:4–8; Gal. 1:4; 2 Tim. 4:10). The age has special significance to Jews (cf. Matt. 23:37–39; Rom. 11:20; James 1:1), to Gentiles (cf. Luke 21:24), and to the Church (cf. Matt. 16:18; Acts 15:13–14; Rom. 11:25).

XVII. The Day of Pentecost

Pentecost is anticipated typically in the wave loaves of Leviticus 23:15–21. It should be noted that the wave loaves were presented exactly fifty days after the wave sheaf, which marks the precise period between the first ascension of Christ (John 20:17) and Pentecost. Thus by type, the Church—represented by the loaves—is seen to originate at Pentecost and not in the Old Testament or at the end of the period covered by the Acts. Direct prediction relative to Pentecost was uttered by Christ (John 14:16–17, 26; 15:26; 16:7–15). Naturally, no leaven—the symbol of evil—is found in the wave sheaf which previews Christ in His ascension; but leaven is found in the loaves, for, at best, believers are imperfect in themselves.

XVIII. The Church

Many details of the Church respecting her beginning, character, course, and end on earth are found in the New Testament; but specific prophecy by Christ is recorded in Matthew 16:18, “And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

XIX. The Destruction of Jerusalem

Likewise, one important statement by Christ foresees the destruction of Jerusalem. This declaration is recorded in Luke 21:20–24, and was fulfilled in the year 70 A.D. (cf. Matt. 24:2; Mark 13:1–2).

XX. The Last Days for the Church

Upon this particular period, comment has been made in earlier pages. The general character of these days—always to be dissociated from the last days for Israel (cf. Acts 2:17)—is described in a well-defined body of Scripture (cf. 1 Tim. 4:1–3; 2 Tim. 3:1–5; James 5:1–10; 2 Pet. 2:1 ff.; Jude 1:1–25; Rev. 3:14–22).

XXI. The First Resurrection

Three diverse resurrections are named in 1 Corinthians 15:20–24, and two in John 5:25–29 and Revelation 20:4–6. When three are indicated it is of Christ, of believers, and of the unsaved. Between the resurrection of Christ and that of believers, the present age obviously intervenes. Between the resurrection of believers and the end or final resurrection, which is of the unsaved, is the kingdom reign of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–26). The two resurrections of humanity are termed the first and the second (cf. Rev. 20:4–6; Phil. 3:11; 1 Thess. 4:13–18).

XXII. The Rapture of Living Saints

Closely related in view of the time and circumstances with the resurrection of the bodies of believers is the translation, apart from death, of the living saints. Having described at length the resurrection of the bodies of believers who have died (1 Cor. 15:35–50), the Apostle goes on to declare a mystery, or sacred secret hitherto unrevealed (1 Cor. 15:51–57), namely, that “we shall not all sleep,” but with essential changes which are wrought in a moment, the child of God goes on in this body to meet the Lord in the air (cf. John 14:1–3; 1 Cor. 15:51–52; 1 Thess. 4:13–18; 2 Thess. 2:1; Heb. 9:28).

XXIII. The Church in Heaven

As the book of Revelation is almost wholly predictive and as it forecasts not only the Church in her entire earthly history (chapters 2–3) but also that which follows (4:1 ff.), it is to be expected that the identification of the Church in heaven will be clearly signified in the matter which follows the

description of her life here on the earth. John's experience as forerunner or representative of the Church is largely that which the Church will yet experience; therefore, when he was caught up through a door into heaven (4:1), in like manner it may be understood that the Church will be caught up when her pilgrim days on earth are completed. It is significant, also, that the twenty-four elders appear in heaven at once after the removal of the Church from the earth. These, as has been indicated, are they who, according to their song (5:9–10), are from the earth, from every kindred, tongue, people, and nation who have been redeemed to God by the blood of the Lamb. No identification for this company can be found other than that they are symbolic of the Church in heaven. Being of every nation, it could not be the one nation Israel, nor have the tribulation saints begun to be as yet (cf. 7:14). Those who contend that the Church passes into or through the great tribulation have difficulty identifying the twenty-four elders, and also in discovering an intimation in the Revelation of the removal of the Church from the earth after 4:1. As indicated in 19:7–9, the Church is in heaven for the marriage supper and up there before the Lord returns in power and glory; but no hint is given in any passage subsequent to 4:1 relative to her removal from the earth.

XXIV. The Believer's Rewards

Much Scripture sustains the truth that rewards are to be given to faithful believers for their service while in the world (1 Cor. 3:12–15; 9:16–27; 2 Cor. 5:9–11; Rev. 3:11; 22:12). These rewards are to be bestowed by Christ from His judgment seat in heaven and after the believer has been received into heaven.

XXV. The Marriage of the Lamb

Like an interlude between the record of the judgments that are recounted in Revelation chapters 17 and 18 and the description of the glorious coming of Christ set forth in chapter 19, is the statement that the marriage of the Lamb has come, which event is accompanied by the marriage supper (19:7–9). There is a chronological order being observed, since the marriage and the supper occur in heaven before the King returns. In this connection, light

is thrown by Christ upon the order of events through a word spoken to Israel in Luke 12:35–36, “Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately.” Israel is always on the earth, and the return of Christ is to His earthly people accompanied by His Bride. Distinction is called for at this point between the marriage supper which is in heaven and celebrated *before* Christ returns, and the marriage feast (Matt. 25:10, R.V.; Luke 12:37) which is on the earth *after* His return.

XXVI. The Great Tribulation Per Se

There are various features which are a part of the great tribulation which belong as major prophetic events in this list. Much has already been written regarding this brief period of seven years. Its duration is determined by Daniel’s prophecy of the seventieth week of years. Its character is described by much Scripture (cf. Deut. 4:29–30; Ps. 2:5; Jer. 30:4–7; Dan. 12:1; Matt. 24:9–28; 2 Thess. 2:8–12; Rev. 3:10; 7:13–14; 11:1–19:6). Beyond all human estimation is the array of divine accomplishments to be consummated in that brief period. It is the time of Israel’s most severe sufferings and the hour of the termination of Gentile times and Gentile institutions. In that period a demonstration will be made of unrestrained human wickedness. It will be a complete manifestation of the untruthfulness of all assumptions regarding supposed human character and quality apart from God.

XXVII. The Appearing of the Man of Sin

For an extended discussion on this theme, the student is again referred to earlier pages of this work. The appearing of this person, his career, and his end are well set forth in the prophetic portions of the Bible (cf. Ezek. 28:1–10; Dan. 7:8; 9:27; 11:36–45; Matt. 24:15; John 5:43; 2 Thess. 2:1–12; Rev. 6:2; 13:1–9; 19:19–20; 20:10).

XXVIII. Israel’s Final Sufferings

Though the entire period of their absence from the land—extending from the captivities to the second advent of Christ—is characterized by suffering, Israel enters her last and bitterest trial while in the tribulation. No flesh, Christ said, could endure the full duration of that time; but for His elect Israel's sake those days are to be shortened (cf. Deut. 28:63–68; Jer. 30:4–7; Matt. 24:21–27).

XXIX. The Destrution of Ecclesiastical Babylon

The federated church that will be under the leadership of Rome, having attained suddenly to great power in the earth, will be destroyed by the political and commercial authorities of the world. This destruction is previewed in Revelation, chapter 17.

XXX. The Battle of Armageddon

Of this particular event, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes: "Armageddon (the ancient hill and valley of Megiddo, west of Jordan in the plain of Jezreel) is the appointed place for the beginning of the great battle in which the Lord, at His coming in glory, will deliver the Jewish remnant besieged by the Gentile world-powers under the Beast and False Prophet (Rev. 16:13–16; Zech. 12:1–9). Apparently the besieging hosts, whose approach to Jerusalem is described in Isa. 10:28–32, alarmed by the signs which precede the Lord's coming (Mt. 24:29, 30), have fallen back to Megiddo, after the events of Zech. 14:2, where their destruction begins; a destruction consummated in Moab and the plains of Idumea (Isa. 63:1–6). This battle is the first event in 'the day of Jehovah' (Isa. 2:12), and is the fulfillment of the smiting-stone prophecy of Dan. 2:35" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 1348–49).

XXXI. The Destruction of Political and Commercial Babylon

The destruction of political and commercial Babylon is the termination of the entire *cosmos* world system. It is evidently brought to its end by divine power and in the execution of those judgments which have been determined. This great event is closely related to the second advent of Christ and is the first such judgment in the Day of Jehovah. The stupendous

character of this consummating judgment is beyond human comprehension. The record is given in Revelation, chapters 18 and 19.

XXXII. The Day of the Lord Per Se

This lengthened period of a thousand years begins, generally speaking, with the second advent of Christ and the judgments connected therewith, and ends with the passing of the present heaven and the present earth. The second coming of Christ is, to Israel, as “a thief in the night” (cf. Matt. 24:42–44; 1 Thess. 5:4; 2 Pet. 3:10). It is therefore worthy of special note that Peter, having referred to the truth that a day with the Lord is as a thousand years and a thousand years as a day, goes on to state, “But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night,” and within that same prolonged day and as a termination of it “the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up” (2 Pet. 3:10). The Day of the Lord is characterized by the reign of Christ over Israel and the world on David’s throne in Jerusalem accompanied by His Bride—the Church. In that time the believers will not only share in Christ’s reign and the judgments of mankind (1 Cor. 6:2), but also in His judgments of the angels (1 Cor. 6:3). The judgment of angels continues throughout the thousand years (1 Cor. 15:25–26).

XXXIII. The Second Coming of Christ Per Se

In His second Advent, Christ, accompanied by the Church (Rev. 19:11–16), is to Israel their Judge (Ezek. 20:33–44), their Deliverer, the Fulfiller of all their covenants, and their Savior (Isa. 63:1, 4; Rom. 11:26–27); and to the Gentiles the Smiting Stone and the Terminator of all their authority and institutions, and their Judge (Ps. 2:7–9; 96:13; 98:9; Isa. 63:1–6; Dan. 2:44–45; Matt. 24:29–30; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; Rev. 19:11–16).

XXXIV. Satan Bound and Confined

A clear prediction is given in Revelation, chapter 20, of the binding and sealing of Satan in the abyss. Partly because of Satan’s banishment, wars

cease on the earth; but, more directly, righteousness and peace cover the earth because of the reign of Messiah as King over all nations.

XXXV. The Regathering and Judgment of Sorrowing Israel

Mourning is the normal expression of repentance and along with Israel's future repentance is their mourning (Isa. 61:2–3; Matt. 5:4; 24:30). Israel will be gathered from all nations and into their own land (cf. Deut. 30:1–8; Isa. 11:11–12; Jer. 23:7–8; Ezek. 37:21–28; Matt. 23:37; 24:31). Thus, also, must Israel be judged. Two major passages declare the future judgment of Israel, namely, Ezekiel 20:33–44 and Matthew 24:37–25:30. Similarly, a resurrection is in store for Israel (cf. Ezek. 37:1–14; Dan. 12:1–3), but there seems to be no revelation of the precise time when it will take place. The passage in Daniel relates this resurrection to the great tribulation. The passage in Ezekiel, if interpreted as a bodily resurrection, is definitely, according to the whole context, a part of the restoration of Israel to their own land. It is worthy of special note that not all of Israel will enter the kingdom. As five out of ten virgins are refused admission to the marriage feast on earth (cf. Matt. 25:10, R.V.), so a portion of Israel will be rejected. The hope of the kingdom has been before the nation throughout all her generations, and it is reasonable to suppose that Israel's judgments will include those raised from the dead and of these many shall inherit eternal life in the kingdom. The promise to Daniel is significant, "But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (12:13).

XXXVI. The Judgment of the Nations

Following the judgment of Israel (at least it follows in the context of Matt. 24:37–25:46) is the judgment of the nations. That judgment, as has been seen, terminates all Gentile authority and its basis is the treatment accorded Israel by the nations (cf. Matt. 25:31–46 with Gen. 12:1–3; note also Joel 3:2–16; Ps. 96:13; 98:9).

XXXVII. Human Life in the Earthly Kingdom

An extended body of prediction anticipates human life in the kingdom. Eternal life will have been inherited and the Spirit will have been poured out on all flesh. It will be the time of Israel's glory and, with Israel, some of the Gentiles will be blessed (cf. Isa. 11:10; Matt. 25:34); but Gentiles must serve Israel (cf. Isa. 14:1–2; 60:12; 61:5). The divided nation shall be one (Ezek. 37:22). Life will be tranquil (cf. Isa. 11:6–9; 65:18–25; Jer. 31:31–33). The King shall reign in righteousness (cf. Isa. 11:1–5; Ps. 72:1–19; Matt. 5:1–7:29). Creation, too, shall be restored to Edenic blessedness (Rom. 8:18–23).

XXXVIII. The Loosing of Satan and the Last Revolt

Within one chapter alone (Rev. 20) is the revelation given which asserts that Satan must be loosed for a little season from his thousandyear imprisonment. Mere speculation over why he is loosed is uncalled for. Evidently, it completes the ground upon which divine judgment against this great angel may be imposed. It is to be seen, however, that wars which had ceased when he was bound are resumed, and that those who had lived in the peace and glory of the kingdom are deceived, as people of this age have been; and war follows only to be terminated by supernatural destruction of those armies.

XXXIX. The Doom of Satan

As a consummation of Satan's career, he is cast into the lake of fire to remain there forever (Rev. 20:10). He was judged at the cross (John 16:11), and is to be banished from heaven (Rev. 12:7–12) and cast into the abyss (Rev. 20:1–3) before the final doom. The judgment upon Satan will not be revoked. He is not subject to redemption.

XL. The Passing of the Present Earth and Heaven

On this stupendous theme certain passages are to be noted—Isaiah 65:17; 66:22; Hebrews 1:10–12; 2 Peter 3:3–13; Revelation 20:11; 21:1.

XLI. The Great White Throne Judgment

A final judgment awaits those of all the ages who will not have been saved. To this end they must be raised from the dead after the millennial period. They are to be judged according to their works and are then committed to the lake of fire, which is the second death (cf. Rev. 20:12–15; 21:8; 22:10–15).

XLII. The Destiny of the Wicked

The fearful destiny of the unsaved cannot be minimized (Rev. 20:14–15). Christ Himself said more regarding it than did any other. Though no mind can comprehend it, the revelation remains unchanged forever. When the awfulness of it is contemplated, the invitation of the gospel by which one may be saved therefrom grows more definite and sweet. Men do not have to be lost. Christ has died for them.

XLIII. The Creation of a New Heaven and a New Earth

Of all the final works of God, none could surpass the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. The Scripture bearing upon this stupendous event has been cited above in relation to the passing of the present earth and the present heaven. Though only the angels may have witnessed the creation of the present order, all living creatures will observe the final act of creation.

XLIV. The Destiny of the Saved

Among those who stand in eternal favor with God are the earthly citizens whose destiny it is to go on into eternity as the dwellers on the earth (cf. Rev. 21:3–4; Isa. 66:22), and the heavenly citizens whose destiny it is to occupy the new heaven (cf. Heb. 12:22–24; Rev. 21:9–22:7; John 14:1–3).

XLV. The Day of God

In distinction from the Day of the Lord which is terminated by the ending of the thousand years and the passing of the present heaven and the present earth (2 Pet. 3:10), is the eternity to come which is designated *the Day of God* (cf. 2 Pet. 3:12 with 1 Cor. 15:28).

Conclusion

Only major events have been included in this listing. Unnumbered lesser events—all of them themes of prediction—should have their full and worthy consideration.

Chapter XXVI

THE JUDGMENTS

OF EIGHT JUDGMENTS announced in the Bible, one is wholly past, two pertain to the present, and five are wholly future. The five, being future, are themes of unfulfilled prophecy. To the end that the entire field of judgment may be appraised under this general division, those judgments which are not predictive in character will be included in this thesis; and the two pertaining to the present, because of their interrelationship, will be considered together. By their recognizance of but one socalled *final judgment*, theologians in general have laid themselves open to the suspicion that they have not been worthy firsthand students of the Sacred Text. It is here contended that there are various judgments which are widely separated with respect to time, theme, subjects, and circumstances. This body of truth bearing on these judgments is not only comprehensive but free from complications. These judgments are:

I. The Divine Judgments Through the Cross

Three features of divine judgment, already indicated under Soteriology, were achieved by Christ's death on the cross. These are (1) the judgment of the sin of the world, (2) the judgment of the believer's sin nature, and (3) the judgment of Satan. These, it will be seen, were perfectly met by Christ when He died.

1. THE JUDGMENT OF THE SIN OF THE WORLD. Regardless of objections raised by some theologians who have a theory to defend, the New Testament asserts with unqualified assurance that Christ died for the sin of the world (cf. John 1:29; 3:16; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2). It is true that out of at least fourteen objectives in His death Christ had a specific design regarding the sins of the elect, or those who would believe (cf. John 10:11; Eph. 5:25–27; 1 John 2:2); but His inclusion of the sins of the elect as a particular class does not exclude the essential truth that He also had a world-wide purpose in His death. Though it may not be comprehended wholly by finite minds, the message is to be received, as declared in the Word of God, which asserts

that full pardon and deliverance from the penalty of sin has been perfectly secured for all those who believe. Without discussing again the theological implications of this declaration, it may be pointed out that this is a divine judgment for sin which falls upon Another, who bears it as a Substitute. In this judgment unrestricted demands are imposed and these are endured to infinite completeness.

2. The Judgment of the Believer's Sin Nature. Evidence that this important judgment is not extended to the unregenerate is conclusive, since no Scripture relates it to them. The value to the believer of the accomplishment of a sufficient and final divine judgment of the sin nature (cf. Rom. 6:1–10) is far-reaching. That value does not accomplish any change in the present vital forcefulness of that nature. This judgment consists rather in a divine reckoning which disposes of every moral objection that the sin nature would otherwise impose upon the indwelling Holy Spirit so as to preclude His control of that nature. Thus the entire possibility of the overcoming power of the Spirit in the daily life of the Christian is involved. Since there is no divine intention that the unsaved shall be empowered to holy living in their unsaved state—having not the Spirit (cf. Jude 1:19)—there is neither provision nor promise which extends the value of this judgment beyond the limits of those who are saved. It could not be questioned that Christ's death for the believer's sin nature is a form of divine judgment (cf. Rom. 6:1–10; Gal. 5:24; Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 3:9–10).

3. The Judgment of Satan Through the Cross. Since it is but partially revealed, to human minds the relationship between God and the angels is incomprehensible. The particular relation between Christ and Satan is equally veiled. Though vast in its scope, some light is gained on the relations existing between Christ and the angels from the protevangelium of Genesis 3:15, the temptation in the wilderness (Luke 4:1–13), the war in heaven (Rev. 12:7–12), the thousand-year reign in which angelic powers are subdued (1 Cor. 15:25–26), but more especially from the judgment of Satan by Christ in connection with the cross (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; Col. 2:14–15).

Thus it is disclosed that the cross of Christ in its threefold outreach is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all divine judgments.

II. The Self-Judgment of the Believer and the Chastening Judgments of God

Two distinct judgments are in view under this general head and, as before stated, because of their interdependence. The child in the Father's household and family must understand that God is a perfect disciplinarian. Disobedience must in His own time and way result in chastisement. The central passage on the Father's discipline is Hebrews 12:3–15. In this context it is declared that every son in the Father's household is subject to chastisement as occasion may arise. Verse 6 makes reference to both chastisement and scourging. These are to be distinguished. Scourging aims at a once-for-all conquering of the human will, and when the will is yielded there is no more need for scourging. On the other hand, chastisement may be many times repeated and may be administered to the end that the believer may be strengthened thereby, or to prevent him from going into evil paths. A good man may by discipline become a better man. Christ said, "Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth [pruneth] it, that it may bring forth more fruit" (John 15:2). As for chastisement which is a correction for wrong, it is written of those who partake of the communion unworthily, "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep" (1Cor. 11:30). Immediately following this declaration and closely related to it is the added truth that the Christian may avoid chastisement for wrongdoing by making a confession of it to God, which confession is self-judgment. Should the confession be withheld, there must be chastisement. The passage reads, "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:31–32).

It is in this passage that two aspects of judgment appear with the one dependent upon the other. First, the believer is to confess to God every known sin, and, second, the Father may judge His child by chastisement when the confession is refused (cf. 1 John 1:9). The divine provision is gracious to the last degree. When the Christian has sinned, God awaits the

confession of that sin. Should the confession be withheld, God, in His own time and way, must correct His child.

III. The Judgment of the Believer's Works

Though in infinite faithfulness—which is based on infinite provisions—the believer cannot come into judgment respecting the sins which Christ has borne (cf. John 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 8:1, R.V.), it yet remains true that the believer will be brought into judgment concerning his service for God—the use he has made of his ransomed powers after he has been saved. This judgment is to the end that suitable rewards may be bestowed on those who have served in faithfulness. This form of judgment, so far as it is related to believers who have not been faithful, brings it about that such works as they may have wrought will be burned, but with the assurance that, in spite of the burning of the works, the believer himself will be saved. He must remain saved, since his salvation rests not at all upon his works but upon the worthiness of Christ who never changes, He who is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Heb. 13:8).

The doctrine of rewards—treated elsewhere in this theology at length—must be considered an essential companion doctrine to the doctrine of saving grace. Since the saved one is in no way allowed to contribute to the ground of his acceptance, it becomes certain that his service is not credited to his salvation; therefore, his service is subject the rather to rewards, which are the divine acknowledgment of the sacrifice and service rendered. This judgment is wrought at the βῆμα, which is "the judgment seat of Christ" (2 Cor. 5:10). Scripture bearing on this form of judgment may be considered, in part.

1 Corinthians 3:9–15. "For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work

abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

In this passage, the believer who is once-for-all established on the Rock, Christ Jesus, is said to be building on that Rock either of materials that are subject to burning by fire or of materials which are purified by fire. There is no reference here to "character building" since Christian character, under the economy of grace, is produced in the child of God as a fruit of the indwelling Spirit (Gal. 5:22–23). It is the believer's works or service which he is building, that are in view. These are the works foreordained that he should walk in them (Eph. 2:10).

1 Corinthians 9:27. "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."

Having dwelt at length upon the truth that rewards are in store for believers who are faithful and having borne testimony to his service for Christ (vss. 16–26), the Apostle expresses fear lest his own service should be ἀδόκιμος—*disapproved*. The exact meaning of ἀδόκιμος is *disapproved* and not *castaway*, as in the A.V. It is the negative form and its positive is rightly translated in 2 Timothy 2:15, "Study to shew thyself approved [δόκιμος] unto God." The disapproval which the Apostle dreaded is none other than the burning of unworthy works of service (cf. 2 Cor. 5:11).

2 Corinthians 5:9–10. "Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he bath done, whether it be good or bad."

Here, as before intimated, the word βῆμα is translated "judgment seat" and it is definitely declared that all believers must appear before the judgment seat of Christ (cf. Rom. 14:10). The judgment is in heaven and raises neither the question of whether the believer shall enter heaven nor of whether he shall remain in heaven.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that this judgment is unrelated to the problem of sin, that it is more for the bestowing of rewards than for the rejection of failure; and it is clearly asserted in 1 Corinthians 4:5 that, in spite of all failure, every (Christian) man shall have praise of God.

Additional Scriptures bearing on this particular judgment are Romans 14:10; Ephesians 6:8; 2 Timothy 4:8; Revelation 22:12.

IV. The Judgment of Israel

In the order in which the future judgments occur, the judgment of Israel is next. It occurs in connection with the second advent of Christ. That the judgment of Israel precedes the judgment of the nations is indicated by the fact that these judgments are recorded in that order in the Olivet Discourse (Matt. 24:1–25:46); however, both of these great judgments are related to the second advent and occur at the end of the tribulation. Quite in contrast to the experience accorded the Church (cf. John 5:24), the nation Israel must be judged, and it is reasonable to believe that this judgment will include all of that nation who in past dispensations have lived under the covenants and promises. Therefore a resurrection of those generations of Israel is called for and must precede their judgment. The glorious Messianic kingdom has been the hope of the Old Testament saints and in conformity to this hope they ordered their lives. In the same immediate context in which a resurrection of Daniel's people is promised, Daniel is himself told that he would "rest" and "stand" in his lot at the end of the days. Of those raised he declares, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. 12:2–3). Some in Daniel's day, as in all of Israel's generations, are written in the book. Malachi declares of the Israel of his day what was equally true of all of Israel's generations, "Then they that feared the LORD spake often one to another: and the LORD hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the LORD, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the LORD of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him. Then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth not" (Mal. 3:16–18; cf. Dan. 12:1). Their rewards will be for them when they "return," which term anticipates the day of Israel's regathering.

Three major passages set forth the future judgment of Israel, and attention is called to these:

Ezekiel 20:33–44. This portion of Scripture should be read at this point. Only a part of this prediction is quoted here, "As I live, saith the Lord GOD, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you: and I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord GOD. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the LORD" (vss. 33–38). In this Scripture it is revealed that this judgment will occur in "the wilderness of the people"—evidently the very place where Jehovah pleaded with the fathers when they came out of Egypt. This pleading will be "face to face" and the judgment will result in a separation of the rebels and those that transgress from the rest of the congregation of Israel. These, it is said, shall not enter the land of Israel. This announcement of an oncoming judgment is not only a prediction which is to be fulfilled at the time of Israel's return to her land, but concerns that generation to whom Ezekiel wrote and all generations of that people. Therefore, it may be concluded that this judgment is not restricted to the last generation alone who will be on the earth at the time of this judgment.

Malachi 3:2–6. "But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former years. And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right,

and fear not me, saith the LORD of hosts. For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed."

In Malachi 3:1 there is a distinction between "my messenger," who is John the Baptist, and "the messenger of the covenant," who is Christ the Messiah. The question about "who may abide the day of his coming?" is not of John, therefore, but of Christ, and, while the prophet saw no distinction between the first and second advents, the passage describes the final judgment of Israel that will occur when the King returns.

Matthew 24:37–25:30. This entire context, too extended for quotation, should be read at this point, bearing in mind (1) that it is an address to Israel, (2) that, up to 25:13, it is a warning to that nation of the unexpected character of the return of their Messiah—a passage which, like many others, will come to have its primary application in the time of the great tribulation. It is declared in 24:33 that Israel may be aroused to expectation "when ye shall see all these things." Certain Scriptures are related to events which are wholly past, while other Scriptures—and this is one of them—are wholly related to that which is future. In the day when these things begin to come to pass (cf. Mark 13:28–29; Luke 21:29–31), Israel will welcome these direct words of instruction and be held responsible for heeding them.

The parable of the householder (Matt. 24:45–51) asserts that the servants will be judged according to their faithfulness, and the unfaithful, so far from being admitted into the grace and presence of their Master, will be cut asunder and consigned to the portion of the hypocrites. There shall be "weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Similarly, the parable of the virgins (Matt. 25:1–13) teaches the importance of preparation as well as the unexpectedness of the King's return. Israel is enjoined to *watch*. Certain features of this passage have been indicated on earlier pages. The virgins are Israel (cf. Ps. 45:8–15); according to certain Greek manuscripts the value of which is unquestioned, these virgins go forth to meet the Bridegroom and the Bride (cf. Luke 12:35–36). The event is the return of Messiah to the earth, and it is Israel's portion to welcome Him and to enter with Him and His Bride into the marriage feast here on earth (cf. 25:10, R.V.). It is clearly declared that a large portion of the virgins will be refused entrance into the feast, which is equivalent to failure to enter the kingdom. Hence they are told to watch (25:13).

Again, and finally, entrance for Israel into her kingdom is made to depend upon the right use of talents (Matt. 25:14–30). In this parable the verdict is certain. It is written that Christ said, “For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth” (vss. 29–30).

If no other evidence were present that would demonstrate that Matthew 24:37–25:30 refers to Israel, it could be shown in the twofold fact that the Church is not to be judged, and that the nations are judged (not with Israel but) separately according to the context which immediately follows (cf. Matt. 25:31–46). If the Church is never judged and if the nations are not judged until after the judgment recorded in Matthew 24:37–25:30, it is evident that this prior judgment must be of Israel (cf. Ps. 50:1–7). It may be added that the portion of Israel represented by the five wise virgins—those who pass this national judgment—become the final representation of that nation—those who are appointed to enter the kingdom. These are referred to in Romans 11:26–27, “And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.”

V. The Judgment of the Nations

The period designated as “the times of the Gentiles,” which times but for the intercalary age of the Church extend from the Babylonian captivity to the close of the great tribulation, ends in judgment upon the nations. Unlike other judgments which reach backward to include past generations, this judgment falls only upon the then existing generation of Gentiles upon the earth. This is an equitable arrangement since those involved are to be judged for their treatment of Israel during the seven years of the tribulation. But one generation is thus involved. God has judged individual nations in the past because of their treatment of Israel and it has never failed to be true that a curse has rested upon those nations which have cursed Israel, and a blessing has rested upon those nations which have blessed Israel (cf. Gen. 12:3); but a specific curse and a specific blessing await the nations who in

the great tribulation have either cursed or blessed Israel. In like manner, the judgment of one generation of Gentiles does not take the place of the final judgment at the great white throne of all nations and peoples of all the ages who have rejected the counsels of God. So, likewise, when at the judgment of the nations some are dismissed to the lake of fire (cf. Matt. 25:41), it need not be implied that they are thus doomed solely because of their treatment of Israel in the tribulation; it is rather that they, like all Christ-rejecting peoples, are consigned to the lake of fire. The time of that consignment is probably at the close of the millennium and among all others at the great white throne (cf. Rev. 20:11–15; Matt. 13:30).

The basis of the judgment of the nations will be recognized only as it is seen that the one nation Israel is chosen of God above all the nations of the earth. For this elect people God has an unchangeable and imperishable love and purpose. No right approach will be made to an understanding of the divine program for the earth unless the sovereign, divine favor toward Israel is acknowledged. If that sovereign favor is acknowledged, little difficulty will arise respecting the issue upon which the nations are judged at the end of the tribulation.

The judgment of the nations includes not only their appearance before the King on His throne (Matt. 25:31–32), but also the defeat of those nations when they rise up in opposition to God. The utter subjugation of all nations by the returning Messiah is predicted in various Scriptures (cf. Ps. 2:1–10; Isa. 63:1–6; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; Rev. 19:11–21). It is when these nations have been thus vanquished by the returning Christ that they stand in awful silence before the throne of His glory and there receive the sentence respecting their divinely appointed destiny. Two extended passages describe the incomparable time when the nations are judged—Joel 3:9–16 and Matthew 25:31–46. Joel pictures Jehovah as both the judge of the nations and the hope of Israel in that hour. Matthew records the King’s own prediction in which He describes the assembling of the nations before Him, the ground of their judgment—their treatment of His brethren, Israel—and the verdict which invites some into the kingdom prepared for them by the Father and dismisses others to the lake of fire.

VI. The Judgment of Angels

Having conquered the nations at the time of His return to the earth, Christ will then undertake the stupendous task of subduing angelic powers, and this will be extended over His entire millennial reign. It is predicted that, before the end or final resurrection of the wicked dead, Christ must put down all rule and authority. The passage reads, “Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:24–26). Satan the chief of the fallen angels must be consigned to the lake of fire with all his angels, and this after the thousand years in the abyss and after the last revolt (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:7–10). Thus the activities of Christ in subduing angels which have been extended for a thousand years will be consummated before the creation of the new heavens and the new earth. Both Peter and Jude refer to the judgment of angels and especially of those that have been reserved in chains of darkness until the day of their judgment: “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment” (2 Pet. 2:4); “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day” (Jude 1:6).

VII. The Judgment of the Great White Throne

This, the final judgment which consummates the judgment of the cross and the judgment of all people who are unredeemed, occurs at the close of the millennium. These people will be raised for that judgment and will be judged according to their works. These works are a matter of divine record in books which are opened at that judgment. The book of life is also in evidence, but probably with a view to demonstrating that no errors have been made and that those gathered before the great white throne have not the gift of God which is eternal life. The doom that awaits them is terrible beyond comprehension; but it is the last word of a holy God respecting sin and all unrighteousness.

In view of the general tendency to confuse the judgment of the nations with that of the great white throne, the distinctions between them should be

observed. At the judgment of the nations three classes are present —“sheep,” “goats,” and Christ’s “brethren,” while at the judgment of the great white throne there is but one class—the wicked dead. In the former the scene is on earth, while in the latter it is in space. In the former the issue is the treatment of the Jew, while in the latter it is the evil works of those being judged. In the former some enter the kingdom at its inception and some go to the lake of fire, in the latter all go to the lake of fire.

Conclusion

From the foregoing it will be seen that the theological assertion that there is but one general judgment is a great error; and it will be recognized, as well, that the whole theme of divine judgment is not only farreaching but vital in the right understanding of all prophecy.

Chapter XXVII

The Eternal State

That Feature of prophecy which unveils the future state of men may be contemplated under several general divisions, namely, (1) the intermediate state, (2) the creatures of God who enter the eternal state, (3) various spheres of existence, (4) theories relating to a future state, (5) the new earth, (6) hell, and (7) heaven.

I. The Intermediate State

In theological usage, the term *intermediate state* refers to the manner of existence of the human soul and spirit in the interval between death and resurrection. But for the translation of some of the saints, death and resurrection are universal; and, since death is never represented as an unconscious condition, the souls and spirits of all men, because they remain cognizant, are subject to both location and conditions. In this, as in all problems of a future existence, human speculation is useless. Only the Word of God can lend authoritative teaching. Three divisions of this theme are apparent: (a) two important words of location, (b) the doctrine of sleep, and (c) an intermediate body.

1. Two Important Words of Location. The Old Testament word *sheol* and the New Testament word *hades* are identical, referring as they do to the place those go who die. These terms are often used as equivalent to the grave, sometimes to the place of waiting for resurrection of the body, and sometimes to the eternal destiny of men. To the natural man who receives no revelation from God, sheol and hades are no more than the grave where, so far as human observation goes, life is terminated; but sheol is a place of sorrow (cf. 2 Sam. 22:6; Ps. 18:5; 116:3). It is a place into which the wicked are turned (Ps. 9:17) and where they are conscious (Isa. 14:9–11; Ezek. 32:21; Jonah 2:2). Thus, also, the rich man was in hades and wholly possessed of all his faculties (Luke 16:23). Of hades before and after the ascension of Christ, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes:

> *Hades before the ascension of Christ*. The passages in which the word occurs make it clear that hades was formerly in two divisions, the abodes respectively of the saved and of the lost. The former was called “paradise” and “Abraham’s bosom.” Both designations were Talmudic, but adopted by Christ in Lk. 16:22; 23:43. The blessed dead were with Abraham,

> they were conscious and were "comforted" (Lk. 16:25). The believing malefactor was to be, that day, with Christ in "paradise." The lost were separated from the saved by a "great gulf fixed" (Lk. 16:26). The representative man of the lost who are now in hades is the rich man of Lk. 16:19–31. He was alive, conscious, in the full exercise of his faculties, memory, etc., and in torment. *Hades since the ascension of Christ*. So far as the unsaved dead are concerned, no change of their place or condition is revealed in Scripture. At the judgment of the great white throne, hades will give them up, they will be judged, and will pass into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:13, 14). But a change has taken place which affects paradise. Paul was "caught up to the third heaven … into paradise" (2 Cor. 12:1–4). Paradise, therefore, is now in the immediate presence of God. It is believed that Eph. 4:8–10 indicates the time of the change. "When he ascended up on high he led a multitude of captives." It is immediately added that He had previously "descended first into the lower parts of the earth," i.e. the paradise division of hades. During the present church-age the saved who died are "absent from the body, at home with the Lord." The wicked dead in hades, and the righteous dead "at home with the Lord," alike await the resurrection (Job 19:25; 1 Cor. 15:52).—*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 1098–99

2. The Doctrine of Sleep. In the New Testament the word *sleep* is the softened term for the believer's death. Christ employed it in the case of Lazarus (John 11:11–13), and the Apostle Paul used it likewise (cf. 1 Cor. 15:51). Some have confused the fact that the body sleeps with a notion that the soul sleeps. No ground is found in the Word of God for the supposed sleep of the soul. On the other hand, by terms which cannot be mistaken it is declared that those who die go on in consciousness, and, in the case of believers, into the immediate presence of the Lord. To the thief on the cross Christ said, "To day shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43), and the Apostle, speaking of the believer's death, said, "To depart, and to be with Christ is far better" (Phil. 1:23), and "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:6–8).

3. An Intermediate Body. A declaration is made in 2 Corinthians 5:1–5 that, should this "earthly house of this tabernacle" be dissolved, "we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," and that the human spirit earnestly desires not to be unclothed or disembodied but to be clothed upon; and to this end a body "from heaven," eternal—with respect to its qualities as any body from heaven must be—awaits the believer who dies. He will thus not be unclothed or bodiless between death

and the resurrection of that original body which will be from the grave. The body "from heaven" could not be the body which is from the grave, nor could the body from the grave serve as an intermediate body before the resurrection. Apart from the divine provision of an intermediate body, the believer's desire that he should not be unclothed or bodiless could not be satisfied.

II. The Creatures of God Who Enter the Eternal State

The creatures of God are subject to a fourfold classification—the angels, the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Christians—and there are certain well-defined distinctions to be recognized among the angels, among the Gentiles, and among the Jews. Since no creature of God can ever cease to exist, though some will experience the second death, which is the lake of fire, all these creatures of God go on into the eternity to come. There are at least twelve divisions or classes of beings to be considered, namely, (1) unfallen angels, (2) fallen angels, (3) saved Gentiles, (4) unsaved Gentiles, (5) Gentiles of the kingdom, (6) Gentiles debarred from the kingdom, (7) Jews in the kingdom, (8) Jews excluded from the kingdom, (9) Jews saved by entry into the Church, (10) Jews condemned for rejecting the gospel, (11) the unsaved as a whole, and (12) Christians. Since there are important distinctions to be drawn between these various groups of God's creatures, they may well be considered separately.

1. Unfallen Angels. The unfallen angels are those who have kept their first estate. They are as holy as they were when they were created and this estate, it is evident, they will keep through all eternity to come. This company includes vast empires of beings who are engaged in unceasing worship and adoration of their Creator. That they endure forever is certain both because of their imperishable natures and because of the fact that they are indicated as present in those scenes which characterize eternity to come. Angels remain angels forever.

2. Fallen Angels. This group of beings are more commonly known as "Satan and his angels" (Rev. 12:9). Under Angelology much has been written relative to this entire company. They may number one-third part of all angelic beings (cf. Rev. 12:4). They are identified with Satan in his

present activities and share with him the doom that awaits him. This destiny is sealed. They with Satan will be forever in the lake of fire (Rev. 20:10). and the fact that they are tormented forever indicates that they cease not to have conscious existence (cf. Matt. 25:41).

3. Saved Gentiles. Whatever may be the eternal estate of such patriarchs as Adam, Enoch, Noah, Job, and Melchizedek, who are classed as of the original stock which Gentiles perpetuate, a very distinct company of Gentiles are being called out and saved by God's grace into an eternal likeness to Christ and are destined to share His glory forever.

4. Unsaved Gentiles. An unnumbered company of Gentiles of all past ages have by death gone into an estate of everlasting separation from God, awaiting the day of the resurrection of their bodies (cf. John 5:25–29) and the judgment of the great white throne, from which they pass to the lake of fire which is the second death (Rev. 20:14–15)—an estate of consciousness which terminates never.

5. Gentiles of the Kingdoms. A peculiar and distinguished group of Gentiles are those of the last generation which appear before the throne of Christ's glory at the end of the tribulation, and on the basis of their ministry to Israel are received into the earthly kingdom. This kingdom, it is said by the King, is one prepared for these Gentiles from the foundation of the world. A purpose which thus originates in eternity past may well be expected to continue into eternity to come. It is evidently given to these Gentiles to continue with Israel in the new earth under the everlasting reign of Messiah. It is written of Gentiles in relation to the eternal city that will be, "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it" (Rev. 21:24–26). The same allotment of Gentiles is to be seen in their relation to the everlasting kingdom in Acts 15:17, where they are described as "all [that is, all of those particularly] the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called." Those Gentiles who are of one generation and who enter Israel's kingdom and continue with Israel forever, will be distinguished from those

Gentiles who throughout this age have been called and saved into heavenly glory.

6. Gentiles Debarred from the Kingdom. While many Gentiles of all generations have gone on to eternal doom, there is a special curse imposed upon those of the last generation who in the great tribulation have failed to minister to Israel. These are they of the nations who are on the King's left hand and are dismissed to the lake of fire (cf. Matt. 25:41–46).

7. Jews in the Kingdom. As indicated before, Israel in all her generations—exclusive of those who have entered into the exalted privilege of the present age of grace—will come up for judgment, some to everlasting life and others to everlasting contempt (cf. Dan. 12:2; Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 24:37–25:30). The portion of this people who are destined to enter the kingdom become the "all Israel" who will be saved (cf. Isa. 63:1) when the Deliverer comes out of Sion according to God's unalterable covenant (Rom. 11:26–27, 29). These, like all other creatures of God, are traced into the eternity to come; for the kingdom is "an everlasting dominion" (Dan. 7:13–14). Great grace from God will be upon those who enter the land (cf. Ezek. 20:44; Rom. 11:27).

8. Jews Excluded from the Kingdom. The judgment of Israel, already cited, results in a portion of Israel, denoted by the five unwise virgins, being rejected (cf. Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 25:1–13). What the destiny of this company will be may be judged from certain Scriptures. Ezekiel says, "And they shall not enter into the land of Israel" (20:38); Matthew reports Christ as saying "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth. … And while they went away to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage feast: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not" (Matt. 24:50–51; 25:10–12, R.V.); "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth"

(Matt. 25:29–30). Whatever this estate thus described may be, it abides forever.

9. Jews Saved by Entry into the Church. Within the present age there is no difference between Jew and Gentile either with regard to their lost estate—they are *under sin* (cf. Rom. 3:9)—or the terms upon which they may be saved (cf. Rom. 10:12) or the perfection of the salvation of those who believe, since they are all, with Gentiles, one Body in Christ Jesus (cf. Eph. 2:14–17). In the present age the whole human family—Jew and Gentile alike—are placed upon a unique ground so as to be those who are objects of divine grace. Because the supreme divine purpose in this age is the outcalling of the Church, there is but one message to be preached to all men, namely, salvation into heavenly glory through faith in Christ. In all generations of this age the Jews have to some extent believed on Christ. The population proportion of one Jew to ninety-nine Gentiles may have its representation in the Church. Until nine years after Pentecost the Church was exclusively Jewish. As is true of Gentiles, those from among Israel who have believed have been wholly changed with respect to their estate. They as sons of God have come upon new ground where there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but where Christ is all and in all (cf. Gal. 3:26–28; Col. 3:11). Jews saved in this age are not destined to an earthly kingdom, but will go on to the highest glory with Christ and be like Christ.

10. Jews Condemned for Rejecting the Gospel. As certainly as Jews are shut up in this age to the gospel and saved through simple faith in Christ, so certainly the Jews of this age who reject the gospel are subject to the doom which rests upon Christ-rejectors. They are not now given the option of whether they will be saved into heavenly glory or enter the earthly kingdom. The judgment that rests upon those who refuse divine grace is never restricted to Gentiles, but is upon all men alike (cf. John 3:18; 8:24).

11. The Unsaved as a Whole. Much New Testament Scripture contemplates all the unsaved in one category and without recognition of various classes named above. These are the lost for whom Christ died, and yet they are excluded from the glory of the redeemed. Their estate is to be in perdition forever. This theme, yet to be examined, is the necessary counterpart to the saving grace of God.

12. The Christians. This company—composed of Jews and Gentiles who are saved and safe in Christ—is never divided in the divine purpose. They are one Body. Every device of Satan is abroad to distort an outward manifestation to the world of this unity. All sectarian divisions of the church, like the theory of a partial rapture, are violence against this unity and are branded by the Apostle as the fundamental sin which causes carnality (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1–4; John 17:21–23; Eph. 4:1–4). Each believer within the Church is perfected by his present position in Christ; thus he is accepted (Eph. 1:6), and thus and only thus he enters heaven. The entire notion that some believers are, through their supposed merit, better than other believers is an insult to that grace which perfectly saves the lost on the one condition of faith in Christ, apart from all works.

III. Various Spheres of Existence

Building on a portion of the Scriptures, which portion recognizes but two classes of humanity—the saved and the unsaved—it has been concluded by many that there are but two spheres of existence in eternity, namely, hell and heaven. However, in many Bible passages (cf. Isa. 65:17; 66:22; Heb. 1:10–12; 2 Pet. 3:10–14; Rev. 20:11; 21:1–4) it is declared that there shall be a new earth as well as a new heaven, and that the earthly people, Israel, go on forever in the glorified earth that is to be (cf. Isa. 66:22; Jer. 31:36–37), and that the Davidic kingdom which is earthly and to be centered in Jerusalem will continue forever and ever (cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Dan. 7:14; Luke 1:31–33; Rev. 11:15). The glory of the eternal earth is described, apparently, in the words, “And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away” (Rev. 21:3–4). The human understanding, accustomed as it is to the corruption that obtains in the earth, can hardly comprehend the idea of a new earth “wherein dwelleth righteousness” (cf. 2 Pet. 3:13)—an earth as pure and holy and as appropriate for the residence of God as heaven could ever be.

In addition to these two spheres of abode—the new heaven and the new earth—there is a city which three times is said to come down from God out of heaven (cf. Rev. 3:12; 21:2, 10). The natural conclusion is that in some way this city is separate from the new heaven from which it comes down. The description of that city, identified as "the bride, the Lamb's wife," is given in Revelation 21:10–22:7. No glory could be more exalted, and this may be the glory of heaven itself. Hebrews 12:22–24 records those who have right to this city. The passage reads, "But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." It will be seen that this description articulates with the description of the city given in Revelation 21:10–22:7. God will be there, Christ will be there, the angels will be there, the Church will be there, and the "spirits of just men made perfect"—according to Hebrews—and the twelve tribes of Israel—according to Revelation—will be there. The reference to the "spirits of just men made perfect" may designate saints of other dispensations or ages than the present.

There yet remains one eternal abode which the Apostle John styles "without" and "the lake of fire" (cf. Rev. 20:15; 22:15; Matt. 25:41, 46; Rev. 21:8, 27; 22:11).

IV. Theories Relating to a Future State

Human speculation on man's estate after death is natural and as old as the race. On this subject, however, there is more disposition to ignore divine revelation than on any other. Concerning the future estate of the lost, men otherwise amenable to the Word of God often, for want of a right understanding of the doctrine, turn from it, and wantonly intrude their useless opinions. Certain theories have been advanced which demand refutation.

1. Death as Cessation of Existence. This aspect of animalism has been held by atheists in spite of the natural desire for continued existence on the

part of all men. The Bible consistently and universally asserts the unending existence of all created beings.

2. Transmigration of the Soul. The idea that the soul passes from one incarnation to another has been held by men in all generations. That there is no ground for such a belief, either Biblical or otherwise, need not be argued. Though believed by the native of India, Max Müller states that there is no trace of it (a *metempsychosis*) in the Veda: "There is in the Veda no trace of metempsychosis, or that *transmigration* of souls from human to animal bodies, which is generally supposed to be a distinguishing feature of Indian religion" (*Chips*, I, 44, cited by *New Standard Dictionary*, 1913 ed., *s.v.* 'transmigration').

3. Conditional Immortality. Drawn somewhat from the Bible, in that immortality is recognized, this theory, which embraces the atheistic notion of the cessation of existence at death for the unregenerate, originates in mere human reason. The theory avers that, apart from the gift of God which is eternal life, men are no higher than the animals and like the animals cease their existence at death. It denies the Word of God relative to the endless subsistence of all rational beings, and sometimes includes in its field of error the sleep of the soul in the grave between death and resurrection. In the face of clear Scriptural teaching that the unregenerate are raised from the dead (cf. Dan. 12:2; John 5:25–29; Rev. 20:12–15), some modify their views to the point of contending that the unsaved when raised are annihilated and such is the meaning of the second death (cf. Rev. 20:14–15; 21:8). But the second death is only a continuation of spiritual death—the separation of the soul from God. That it is a continued consciousness is seen when Revelation 19:20 is compared with 20:10, observing the truth that the terms *second death* and *lake of fire* are identical (cf. Rev. 20:14–15). Dr. B. B. Warfield writes in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, (I, 183 ff.) as follows:

Definition and Classification of Theories

Annihilationism is "a term designating broadly a large body of theories which united in contending that human beings pass, or are put, out of existence altogether." These theories fall logically into three classes, according as they hold that all souls, being mortal, actually cease to exist at death; or that, souls being naturally mortal, only those persist in life to which immortality is given by God; or that, though souls are naturally immortal and persist in existence unless destroyed by a force working upon them from without, wicked souls are actually thus destroyed. These three classes of theories may be conveniently called respectively, (1) pure mortalism, (2) conditional immortality, and (3) annihilationism proper.

1. *Pure Mortalism*

The common contention of the theories which form the first of these classes is that human life is bound up with the organism, and that therefore the entire man passes out of being with the dissolution of the organism. The usual basis of this contention is either materialistic or pantheistic or at least pantheizing (e.g. realistic); the soul being conceived in the former case as but a function of organized matter and necessarily ceasing to exist with the dissolution of the organism, in the latter case as but the individualized manifestation of a much more extensive entity, back into which it sinks with the dissolution of the organism in connection with which the individualization takes place. Rarely, however, the contention in question is based on the notion that the soul, although a spiritual entity distinct from the material body, is incapable of maintaining its existence separate from the body. The promise of eternal life is too essential an element of Christianity for theories like these to thrive in a Christian atmosphere. …

2. *Conditional Immortality*

The class of theories to which the designation of "conditional immortality" is most properly applicable, agree with the theories of pure mortalism in teaching the natural mortality of man in his entirety, but separate from them in maintaining that this mortal may, and in many cases does, put on immortality. Immortality in their view is a gift of God, conferred on those who have entered into living communion with Him. Many theorists of this class adopt frankly the materialistic doctrine of the soul, and deny that it is a distinct entity; they therefore teach that the soul necessarily dies with the body, and identify life beyond death with the resurrection, conceived as essentially a recreation of the entire man. Whether all men are subjects of this recreative resurrection is a mooted question among themselves. Some deny it, and affirm therefore that the wicked perish finally at death, the children of God alone attaining to resurrection. The greater part, however, teach a resurrection for all, and a "second death," which is annihilation, for the wicked. …

3. *Annihilationism Proper*

Already, however, in speaking of extinction we are passing beyond the limits of "conditionalism" pure and simple and entering the region of annihilationism proper. Whether we think of this extinction as the result of the punishment or as the gradual dying out of the personality under the enfeebling effects of sin, we are no longer looking at the soul as naturally mortal and requiring a new gift of grace to keep it in existence, but as naturally immortal and suffering destruction at the hands of an inimical power. And this becomes even more apparent when the assumed mortalism of the soul is grounded not in its nature but in its sinfulness; so that the theory deals not with souls as such, but with sinful souls, and it is a question of salvation by a gift of grace to everlasting life or of being left to the disintegrating effects of sin. The point of distinction between theories of this class and "conditionalism" is that these theories with more or less consistency or heartiness recognize what is called the "natural immortality of the soul," and are not tempted therefore to think of the soul as by

nature passing out of being at death (or at any time), and yet teach that the actual punishment inflicted upon or suffered by the wicked results in extinction of being.

4. Universalism. Universalists contend that all men are lost by sin, but that the death of Christ avails for all men and that all are saved regardless of the element of personal faith. An attempt to meet this error has been made by the Limited Redemptionists, who declare that Christ died only for the elect or those who are to be saved. The more obvious correction of the error, however, is the truth that salvation is applied to no one apart from his personal acceptance of it. In any case, the Word of God cannot be ignored when it so clearly teaches that a vast multitude will be eternally lost.

The fundamental tenet of Universalism is the one divine attribute of love. Their belief is stated in their original three articles of faith, namely, "Article I.—We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain revelation of the character of God and of the duty, interest and final destination of mankind. Article II.—We believe that there is one God, whose Nature is Love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of Grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness. Article III.—We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected, and that believers ought to be careful to maintain order and practise good works; for these things are good and profitable unto men" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th ed., XXII, 861). At their general convention in Boston in 1899 the following five-point creed was adopted: "1. The Universal Fatherhood of God; 2. The Spiritual Authority and leadership of His Son, Jesus Christ; 3. The Trustworthiness of the Bible as containing a revelation from God; 4. The certainty of just retribution for sin; 5. The final harmony of all souls with God" (*Ibid*.).

A distinction is to be observed between Universalists and Universalism, as the former designates a modern sect and the latter the belief of certain individuals; and there have been many from Origen's day to now who believe that all will eventually be saved.

5. Restitutionism or Reconciliationism. This theory, like Universalism, implies that all men are lost through sin, but that sometime, somewhere, all men will be reconciled to God—even the fallen angels and Satan. No Scripture is more depended upon to uphold this teaching than Philippians 2:10–11: "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of

things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." The passage teaches that the *authority* of Christ will be acknowledged by all beings, but it in no way indicates that all men will be saved who acknowledge that authority. In like manner, Colossians 1:20 is offered as proof. The phrase, "reconcile all things," significantly refers to the wider classification of *things* and, in so far as it may involve created beings—fallen angels and unregenerate men—they are, as in Philippians 2:10–11, returned to the divine authority. This restoration of divine authority by Christ is presented in 1 Corinthians 15:25–28. The rebellion and anarchy of the universe will be put down both by the judgment of the nations (cf. Ps. 2:8–9; Matt. 25:31–46) and by the millennial reign of Christ (1 Cor. 15:25–28). The passage in Acts 3:21, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," must be limited to the things spoken by the prophets, which things have to do with Israel's future. However, were these Scriptures which assert a restored divine authority to be interpreted as insuring the salvation of all beings in heaven and earth, the immense portion of the Word of God which so positively declares the eternal character of man's lost estate would be contradicted.

A fair statement of the doctrine of restitutionism is made by Van Oosterzee in his *Christian Dogmatics* (II, 807–9), a portion of which is here quoted:

> In the far remote distance we contemplate the new Jerusalem, peopled with redeemed citizens, and hear the word of Him that sits upon the throne: "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5). But may we therefore look for a restoration of all things, in the sense that even the kingdom of darkness is resolved into the blissful Kingdom of God? Little as this concluding question can be put aside, it can equally little surprise us that it has, in almost every age, been answered by one or another in the affirmative sense. From Origen to not a few distinguished Christians of our age, we see the doctrine of the Apokatastasis confessed with inner conviction and warmth, and within his own heart many a one hears a voice which pleads in favour of the expectation of the eventual general blessedness of all. The idea of an absolutely endless perdition has about it for our natural feeling something indescribably harsh, and appears, indeed, absolutely irreconcilable with all which we believe of God's redeeming love. If we believe, on the one hand, that God really wills the salvation of *all*, and on the other that His grace is perfectly able to triumph over the resistance of sin, it becomes almost inconceivable to us that a cheerless Dualism should be the end of the world's history. In the domain also of the Theology of the Kingdom the thoughtful mind strives after unity, which appears to be attainable only when eventually God's wide-extending creation contains

no other than blissful creatures. It cannot, moreover, be denied that the Scriptures of the New Testament, definitely those of Paul and John (Rom. 5:18; 11:32; 1 Cor. 15:21, 22, 28; Phil. 2:10, 11; Rev. 5:13, 14), contain at least some solitary hints by which a silent expectation on this point is awakened and cherished. One may even ask whether it is not the only termination in connection with which the Divine plan of the World and of Salvation is wholly realised; and, on all these grounds, one would almost feel justified in expunging, from above the door of the place of woe, the terrible inscription, "All hope abandon, ye who enter here"; and substituting for it the jubilant chorus of sensuous joy, "Allen Sündern soll vergeben, and die Hölle nicht mehr sein." That the latter view of the world is at least the most attractive and aesthetic, can scarcely admit of contradiction. Whether, however, it may be considered the most moral, and therefore must be the last word of Christian Theology, is another question. It is in itself, when we turn to the other side, a fact in our estimation of no small significance, that the Christian Church of all ages has decidedly rejected the doctrine of the Apokatastasis, even when it was presented to her in the most charming colours. It was as though the Church instinctively felt that thereby too little is, in principle, made of the holy and inflexible righteousness of God, of the deepest solemnity of the Gospel proclamation, yea, of the whole Scriptural mode of regarding the connection between the present and the future life; and in reality there is—its dangerous character not even being taken into the account—something in the apparent easiness of this solution of the worldproblem which awakens an involuntary suspicion. It is by no means open to us here to attach the highest authority either to our reason or to our feeling. Upon the point of becoming arbiters in our own cause as regards this matter, we run the risk of becoming just as little impartial as, without the Word of God, we are sufficiently enlightened in our judgment. As against the single indications in that Word which appear to be in favour of the Apokatastasis, there stand, as has been already earlier observed, others, and those more numerous, which lead to an opposite conclusion; while even the first-named, on a nearer examination, and viewed in their connection with the whole of saving doctrine, lose, at least in part, the force which has been ascribed to them. So long as Scripture has a right to a voice in the decision, utterances like Matt. 25:10, 41, 46; Mark 9:44–48; Luke 16:26; Rev. 14:11, and others, cast a heavy weight into the scale; while the principles of Hermeneutics teach that obscure and ambiguous places must be explained by the light of such clear and unambiguous places, and not the converse. Even though we had only the words of Jesus concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:32, and parallel places), the eternity of punishment would be thereby already, in principle, decided; unless it be, without reason, asserted that this sin never was committed, and also never will be committed. But even regarded as to the nature of the case, it is scarcely possible to think of conversion—and without this it is evident that no salvation is conceivable—in connection with an opponent such as is depicted in 2 Thess. 2 or Rev. 13; and thus also for him an exception must be made to the desired rule, unless one should choose to suppose an *annihilation*, in the proper sense of the term, of this hostile power. Such an annihilation of the incurably Evil would, we readily confess, appear most acceptable to *us*, if we should give to our own thoughts the highest authority in this province. For it is very difficult to conceive of an endless existence in connection with one who is entirely separated from God, the source of life, on which account accordingly Scripture has described this condition as "the second death" (Rev. 20:14). On the other hand, however, we feel that such an annihilation would be no slight alleviation of sufferings, from which precisely this prospect is most positively cut off (Rev. 6:16; 14:11). Thus we here come to a point at which the question of principle is determined, which must give the last deciding weight to the scale of our considerations; and then we can and must—even though the issue should be against our own selves—only bow

> before the written word of Him who cannot lie, and give Him the full honour of the obedience of faith. From this standpoint, in our estimation the only trustworthy one, we may not, with regard to this matter, after having mentioned all that is for and against—following in the footsteps of an able predecessor (Martensen)—close the subject of Dogmatics with a query, since the for and the against are, at least according to the Word of Scripture, *not* equal. We even regard it as dangerous to wish to be wiser, more just, or more merciful than the Infinite Himself, who has an eternity before Him for His justification. The conception of an everlasting gulf is difficult; but that of an absolutely universal salvation, which causes the history of the Kingdom of God to end in a sort of natural process, is in itself not less dangerous, at least for him who really believes in the mystery of freedom conferred by the Creator upon the creature. This freedom involves in itself the terrible possibility of an endless resistance, which equally endlessly punishes itself; and he who is in truth *entirely* penetrated with a sense of the allsurpassing glory of the Revelation of Salvation in Christ, and of the absolute culpability of its obdurate rejection, will at least consider the matter again and again before speaking of the idea of an endless retribution as being absolutely irreconcilable with that of an eternally holy Love. "The thought of an everlasting perdition is to such an extent a necessary one, since there can be in eternity no enforced sanctification of the personal being, and in eternity no blessed unholiness" (Nitzsch). If it still remains for us a problem how God could bring into existence a creature which would be for ever miserable, this is only another form of the question already treated of how under the government of an Almighty and Holy God sin and death, with all the inevitable consequences thereof, could come into the world and reign. The one question just as little as the other admits of perfect solution; but our science is only a science of faith, fully conscious, not only of the basis on which it rests, but also of the limits which are imposed upon it. Even though it could not repress the *inmost* desire, the latent hope that one day at last, on the land of everlasting retribution, a star of hope might arise; yet it would not be able to confer upon any one the right, in opposition to Scripture, to proclaim such hope as certain, yea, to make of it the starting-point and foundation of a whole theological system, which may be destined in the event to be blown over by the breath of a terrible reality. We distrust every mode of regarding the doctrine of Salvation, which in its foundation and tendency fails to do justice to the seriousness of the conception of an everlasting *Too Late*, and of the holiness of a grace which cannot indeed be exhausted, but can just as little be mocked. Christian Dogmatics has to do with no other thoughts of God than those revealed by Himself; and, with regard to every obscurity which yet remains, to console itself with the hope of the Seer, "There shall be no night there" (Rev. 22:5).

With all others of this belief, the restitutionist builds on human sentiment and reason more than upon the Word of God.

6. Rome's Purgatory. The Church of Rome has conceived and advances the idea that Christ's death is a satisfaction for sins committed before baptism, but that those baptized, should they sin, must atone for those sins in a purgatory before they can be admitted into the presence of God. This theory encourages both prayers for the dead and large contributions to the church for the offering up of those prayers. The doctrine

that Christ is the propitiation for the believer's sins (1 John 2:2) and thereby the believer is forgiven and cleansed on the ground of confession to God of sin (cf. 1 John 1:9) is denied by Rome.

7. NIRVANA. This term, the meaning of which is to be extinguished as a lamp is blown out, reflects the belief of Brahman and Buddhist alike, which is that the immaterial part of man is absorbed into the divine and that this may begin in this life by the renouncement of all personal desires.

As a conclusion to this discussion of theories respecting the future estate, it may be seen that the true Biblical doctrine has been sought, found, and defended by conservative theologians of past generations. They teach that, respecting the general classification of the lost and the saved, the lost are sealed in their doom should they die without Christ, and that the saved are safe under divine provisions from the moment they believe.

V. The New Earth

That there is to be a new earth was anticipated by the Spirit when He wrote through Isaiah: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind" (Isa. 65:17); "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain" (66:22); and is restated in 2 Peter 3:7–8: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" and Revelation 21:1–3: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." In verse 4 following the last-named passage it is declared that God shall wipe away all tears, there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are

passed away. Sorrow, crying, and pain have never belonged to heaven; therefore, the reference is to earth and to a new earth. The same passage declares that God will make His tabernacle with men. This is not new concerning heaven because He has always had His habitation in heaven. The new earth will be as suitable for His abiding presence as heaven ever has been.

There must be an everlasting new earth because God has given Israel the promise of an everlasting possession of the land (Deut. 30:1–10).

It is further declared by Isaiah that the new earth and the new heaven shall so surpass the present, that these will never be called to mind again (Isa. 65:17).

VI. The Doctrine of Hell

Uninstructed minds revolt at the doctrine of eternal perdition and the more sympathetic they are by nature the more they revolt; however, the doctrine does not originate with human reason nor is it influenced by human sympathy. The theologian here, as always, is appointed to discover and defend that which God has revealed. That asserted in the Bible is consonant with the higher divine reason. The root difficulty of all human speculation is the fact that man knows the meaning of neither sin nor of holiness, and these two factors are about all that is involved in this discussion. The answer of infinite holiness to sin is perdition and retribution. An insoluble mystery is involved. Upon this, much has already been written. So long as the distinction obtains between that which is infinite and that which is finite, Deuteronomy 29:29 will apply: “The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.” In no way does man reveal his littleness more effectively than when he exhibits surprise over the fact that there are realities in the universe which he cannot understand. The permission of sin in the universe by a sovereign, holy God who hates sin to an infinite degree, the damage it does to uncounted multitudes of beings—angels and men—whom He loves with a Creator’s love, and the fact that sin must demand of God the greatest sacrifice He could make, all this only tends to enlarge the mystery involved. The problem—if it ever has been such in the mind of God—was wholly solved

before the creation of anything, and man would do well to trust implicitly. It was a rare characteristic in Job that, though he could not understand God's ways, he did not "charge God foolishly" (Job 1:22). After having voiced the uttermost cry of His humanity—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—Christ added the words, "But thou art holy" (Ps. 22:1–3). To know with any measure of completeness the mystery of evil in the universe of God, one must understand (1) precisely what evil meant to God in the dateless past before aught was created. Was evil then, though only a potentiality, a stupendous reality which required its full manifestation that it might be judged and dismissed forever? Will the doom of multitudes of men and angels prove an essential feature in the final solution of the problem? Likewise, one must know (2) that the present outworking of this problem is the best solution that infinity can devise—that the present solution is wrought of God and is wholly free from pernicious incidents or accidents. In the same manner, he must know (3) that the end will justify the means. God will have done right and be justified and glorified forever. That no finite being may approach such knowledge is patent indeed. When the creature knows the evil character of sin as God knows it and the perfection of holiness which sin outrages, then may he sit in judgment on the question of whether eternal retribution of men and angels is consonant with the character of God. It is thus clear that no creature is in a position to deny the righteousness of eternal perdition or to remonstrate against the Creator because of what He does.

In attempting to write a comprehensive statement of the most solemn doctrine of the Bible, the term *retribution* is chosen in place of the more familiar word *punishment* since the latter implies discipline and amendment, which idea is wholly absent from the body of truth which discloses the final divine dealing with those who are eternally lost. It is recognized that, in its earlier and broader meaning, the term *retribute* was used for any reward, good or evil. The word is used in this treatment of the doctrine of hell only as reference is made to the eternal perdition of the lost. Just so far as language can serve to express truth, the effort is being made to declare what the Scriptures assert, namely, that for those who pass out of this life—which life is probationary in character—there is no basis for the hope that any divine grace will be extended to them in a future existence. Such a case should not be considered as being without a precedent. Uncounted legions

of angels have sinned and for them there is not the slightest intimation to be found in the Bible which extends to them a ray of hope. By divine decree these angels are already consigned to the lake of fire, not under a possible proviso that this doom will be averted if in the meantime they repent; but they are arbitrarily, unrevokably consigned to retribution and that without remedy. Since God has said, without condition, that the fallen angels will be cast into the lake of fire, He would be found untrue should the destiny of the fallen angels be otherwise. Likewise, there is the case of the Gentiles from Adam to Moses who, for the most part, are well described in Romans 1:18–32 as those who wilfully rejected God and who, three times in this one context, are said to be abandoned by God to their sinful ways. Their lost estate is described in Ephesians 2:12, which declares "that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." No more decisive terms could be employed than those which describe men as being *without Christ, without promise, without God,* and *without hope*. It will be observed that, while the passage had an application to the estate of the Gentiles to whom Paul was writing and at the time they were saved, it is also an exact description of Gentiles in past ages. The Jews stood in virtue of covenants and divine promises, with remedial animal sacrifices available to them. It is clear that during the period from Adam to Moses the human family in some instances retained an approach to God by sacrifices, but in this respect they were, as a whole, unwilling to retain God in their thoughts and this led to the judgment of the flood and the abandoning of them to their own iniquity. This, again, is the record of Romans, chapter 1.

The result of any unprejudiced investigation into God's revealed truth respecting fallen angels and God-rejecting Gentiles of past ages will be a conviction that the marvel of it all is not that sinners are lost, but that they are ever saved; and in this connection it should be observed that the death of Christ for the world does not serve as a partial remedy and the ground of a remote hope that all lost souls will be saved: that death becomes, rather, the basis of a greater condemnation upon those who reject the Savior. Their inherent unrighteousness is augmented by the immeasurable sin of rejecting the remedy infinite love has provided. Nothing but infinite grace made possible through an infinite sacrifice can avail to save the lost; yet human

opinion is ever intruding into spheres wherein it knows nothing, insisting that the lost, if lost at all, might be saved in any one of a variety of ways. Strong emphasis is needed on the truth that eternal retribution is not only a doctrine fully asserted in the Bible, but that it draws no corroboration from other sources. It invites no opinion from human reason, and, in all its particulars, is as clearly set forth in the Scriptures as it is possible for language to serve in the expression of ideas. Nothing is gained when men deny that which God has plainly declared. It would be the better part for them to conform their minds and adjust their actions to the revelation God has given them.

As heaven is a *place* and not a mere state of mind, in like manner those reprobated go to a *place*. This truth is indicated by the words *hades* (Matt. 11:23; 16:18; Luke 10:15; 16:23; Rev. 1:18; 20:13–14) and *gehenna* (Matt. 5:22, 29–30; 10:28; James 3:6)—a place of "torment" (Luke 16:28). That it is a condition of unspeakable misery is indicated by the figurative terms used to describe its sufferings—"everlasting fire" (Matt. 25:41); "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:44); "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8); "bottomless pit" (Rev. 9:2); "outer darkness," a place of "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 8:12); "fire unquenchable" (Luke 3:17); "furnace of fire" (Matt. 13:42); "blackness of darkness" (Jude 1:13), and "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night" (Rev. 14:11). In these instances a figure of speech is not a license to modify the thought which the figure expresses; it is rather to be recognized that a figure of speech, in these passages, is a feeble attempt to declare in language that which is beyond the power of words to describe. It is true that a figure of speech is not a complete demonstration of truth (*theologia symbolica non est demonstrativa*); but the idea of eternal retribution could be conveyed to the human mind in no other way. It is well to observe, also, that nearly every one of these expressions fell from the lips of Christ. He alone has disclosed almost all that is revealed of this place of retribution. It is as though no human author could be depended upon to speak forth *all* of this terrible truth.

The second reaction of the sincere human mind—after acknowledging the indisputable truth that retribution is an actual place of suffering—is to entertain the hope that this distress of the lost is not eternal, or everlasting.

It is natural for the mind to cling to such a hope and a few men have gone to great lengths in their attempts so to expound the Scriptures that the idea of everlasting retribution will be excluded. Inadequate, if not insincere, translations are published which no Greek scholar can countenance, with the one purpose in view of expunging from the Word of God the eternal character of these awful sufferings. The fact that many are untaught will account for the ready reception given to such interpretations of the Scriptures. Only the uninformed will listen to the voice of a man who has no scholarship and ignore the fact that the greatest Greek scholars of all generations—who have given to the Church the true translation and interpretation of the original Greek text—have not modified the eternal feature of retribution. To be ignorant of the Greek text is not reprehensible, but to disregard the voice of all the worthy translators is reprehensible. It is reported that in England, on the morning when the Revised Version of the Scriptures was put on sale, a man inquired in a bookshop for "that new Bible that has no hell in it"; but he was disappointed, for the Revisers—and possibly no better scholars could be found—had not removed either the idea of retribution or its eternal character from the version they had prepared. The controversy centers over two Greek words—αἰών and αἰώνιος. No extended wordstudy can be introduced here. Enough will be said if it is pointed out that these words do in some instances convey the idea of time and its limitations; but in the majority of instances, where duration is involved, they convey the idea of eternity. Αἰών is used of Christ (note 1 Tim. 1:17; Rev. 1:18). Αἰώνιος is likewise used of the Persons of the Godhead (Heb. 9:14), and is the term employed to describe the eternal life which the believer has received (see all the texts on this theme) and the endless blessedness of the redeemed. If the word is restricted with reference to time when referring to the future estate of the lost, it must be so restricted concerning the future estate of the saved. One passage alone—"and these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal"—demonstrates the truth that the word αἰώνιος means unending condition for one class as much as for the other. This truth that the sufferings are endless is attested by the words of Christ—"the fire is not quenched." The estate of the lost is said to be that of resting under the wrath of God which *abideth* upon them (John 3:36). So it is written of those who worship the beast, "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever

and ever" (Rev. 14:11). It is true that wrath may be turned away in this life by believing upon Christ; but no such promise will be found as something addressed to the lost after they die. Their estate is described as the *second death*, and from it no relief is ever proffered. Those who build a hope that the way of salvation will be available after death do so without a syllable of authority from the Bible and in direct contradiction of that which God has written.

However, the most misleading error respecting retribution is that which falls back in blind dependence upon the one attribute of God, namely, His love, and ignores the attributes of holiness, righteousness, and justice, and the supreme control these attributes exercise over the love of God. If a term may be coined at this point, those who thus restrict their vision of God's love may be styled *Mercyists*. Thus the Mercyists may be classified as those of all creeds and no creeds who believe that eternal retribution is impossible since God is love. Such, indeed, do not understand the gospel by which sinners are saved. It is supposed that God is generous and that He forgives sin as an act of clemency or leniency, that He being a Sovereign can forgive whom He will and when He will. This fallacy underlies nearly all opposing thought contrary to the doctrine of eternal retribution. It is assumed that, since God is love, His affection for His creatures will prompt Him to rescue them from suffering. If the Bible declares that He will not rescue those reprobated and that their estate is eternal, then the Bible is rejected and God Himself is classed as One who cannot be defended. Many are the attempts made by those who understand nothing of the real character of God to save Him from the undesirable reputation He must acquire if He does not in compassion rescue all beings from eternal retribution. Such is the doctrinal confusion which arises when one truth is stressed without regard for other truths which qualify it. God is holiness and righteousness as well as love. It is the holiness of His Person and the righteousness of His government which preclude Him from any mere generosity which would make light of sin. In fact, sin is sufficiently sinful to require eternal retribution as the divine penalty for it. There is no field for argument at this point. The Word of God must stand and man must be reminded that of the two issues involved—sin and holiness—he knows nothing about their depth of meaning. Being *absolute,* divine holiness cannot be varied or altered in the least degree. This truth is the key to the entire problem which the idea of

retribution engenders. If God could have forgiven one sin of one person as an act of mere kindness, He would have compromised His own holiness which demands judgment for sin. Having thus compromised Himself with sin, He would need Himself to be saved because of the unrighteous thing He had done. He would, by such supposed kindness, have established a principle by which He could forgive all human sin as an act of divine clemency, and thus the death of Christ is rendered unnecessary. This truth must not be overlooked if the doctrine of eternal retribution is to be understood at all. Let it be restated that, if God could save one soul from one sin by mere generosity, He could save all souls from sin by generosity and the death of Christ thus becomes the greatest possible divine blunder. It is the fact of unyielding divine holiness which demands either the retribution of the sinner or the death of Christ in his room and stead. God is love, and that love is demonstrated by the gift of the Son that men might be saved; but love and mercy did not circumvent the demands of holiness to save the sinner: they paid its every demand. The conclusion of the matter is that God, because of His holiness, cannot save the lost unless His holy demands are met for the sinner, as they are met in the death of Christ; and to be unsaved, or outside the grace of God as it is in Christ, is to be destined to eternal retribution. God can do no more than to provide a perfect salvation, which is provided at infinite cost. When love will pay such a price that a sinner may be saved and holiness remain untarnished, it ill becomes finite men to tamper with these immutable realities. Those who resent the idea of eternal retribution are, in fact, resenting divine holiness. However, the message of God’s grace to sinful men is not merely a proclamation of eternal condemnation; it is rather that the chief of sinners may be saved through the Savior that infinite love has provided.

VII. The Doctrine of Heaven

In approaching the general subject, heaven, it is well to observe that the Bible employs the term in various ways. (1) *The kingdom of heaven* is a title peculiar to Matthew’s Gospel and, as has been demonstrated, refers to the rule of God in the earth; and while it is seen in various aspects relative to its preparation and anticipation, it refers specifically to the Messianic kingdom which was offered, rejected, and postponed at Christ’s first advent and will

yet be established over the whole earth at His second advent. (2) *The heavenly places* is a designation peculiar to the Ephesian letter and refers to the present sphere of association which the believer enjoys with Christ. (3) *Heaven* is a term which in general denotes the abode of the Godhead, the angels, and the redeemed who are and ever will be with the Lord. (4) Three distinct heavens are to be identified. The first is that of the atmosphere about the earth, in which are the birds of heaven and the clouds of heaven; the second is the starry spaces, which heaven is the abode of the angels; and the third is the celestial realms where glory reigns beyond comprehension. Even this last heaven, like the earth and all that pertains to it, will be replaced by a new heaven of surpassing glory (cf. Isa. 65:17).

No vestige of dependable information regarding heaven is to be had which is not derived from the Word of God; thus, incidentally, the influence of the Bible upon civilized people is demonstrated, for the idea of heaven and a belief in it are all but universal. Over against this is the fact that there is a very general doubt with regard to hell; yet one is no less sustained by the Scriptures than the other. The solution of this situation is that one is attractive and the other is not. Thus, also, the failure of the vast portion of the race to be amenable to the Bible is proved; but human wishes or opinions have never determined the existence of either heaven or hell.

The revelation regarding heaven may be divided or classified as follows:

1. The Informed Witnesses. The agelong challenge of unbelief has been that no truthful knowledge of heaven is available since no one has returned from that bourn to give a trustworthy testimony regarding it; yet there are three witnesses each of whom is able to speak with firsthand knowledge respecting heaven. These witnesses are:

a. Christ. He who came out from heaven and who had ever resided in heaven could speak not only from an inexhaustible omniscience, but He, being very God, could not mislead or be subject to error. Christ more than any other spoke of the future state of both the lost and the saved. It may be concluded that the place from which He came was more real to Him—if any realities were not His own as the Creator of them—than the earth to which He came. He asserted that He was going to prepare a *place* and not a mere state of existence. To the Son of God heaven is a place and as real as any place could ever be.

b. Paul. In 2 Corinthians 12:1–9 the Apostle relates an experience which occurred in his own life “above fourteen years ago.” The fact that he refers to himself, though the third personal form is used in the opening, is established by his later application of the experience to himself. Uncertainty is expressed about whether he was “in the body or out of the body”; but no uncertainty is entertained about whether it was his own experience or whether in that experience he was caught up into paradise, which is the third heaven, or not. That to him was given the realization of an actual entrance into the third heaven, or paradise, is clearly asserted. Likewise, the experience of the stoning at Lystra—to which he probably makes reference—brings out evidence that the Apostle died as any martyr dies, that he went into heaven, and that he returned again to his body and to the service committed unto him. The stoning at Lystra was by angry Jews who entertained no other purpose than to put their victim to death. The deed was done in a manner wholly satisfying to those Jews and they, having dragged the lifeless body out of the city, went on their way confident that he was dead. That he was dead is certain since execution by stoning—a common thing among the Jews and, under certain conditions, ordained of God—probably left no unbroken bone in the body and no vital organ unmutilated. Such is the convincing evidence that the Apostle had died and, as any other believer, had passed into the presence of his Lord. There he was evidently received, but also requested to return to his body and to his earthly ministry. What a sacrifice such a return could have meant under those circumstances no mind can comprehend. For his departed soul and spirit to return to his body involved a stupendous miracle of healing; for the narrative asserts that “he rose up and came into the city: and the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe” (Acts 14:20). Strangely, the Apostle is prohibited from relating what he saw and heard in heaven; and to insure his adherence to this interdict, he is given a thorn in the flesh with no hope of its removal, though sufficient grace is granted whereby he may endure it. It is after this experience of an entrance into heaven that he writes, “Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord” (2 Cor. 5:6–8); “For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire

to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better" (Phil. 1:23). These are the words of an experienced witness.

c. John. To the Apostle John was given the divine appointment of an entrance into heaven, and of seeing and hearing all that the Church will see and hear when she is translated into heaven. This unveiling to John includes all the events of the tribulation, the marriage of the Lamb, the judgments of God, and the extended Day of the Lord with the eternal state. The vision is given to John with the definite command that he write down these revelations for the encouragement of the saints. Thus John, also, became an experienced witness respecting heaven; and it could hardly be said truthfully that, in the light of the testimony of Christ, of Paul, and of John, no one has returned to declare the truth respecting heaven.

The fact that a prohibition was imposed on the Apostle Paul lest he disclose what he had seen and heard and a command was given to the Apostle John to publish his revelation may be accounted for on the ground that the experience accorded Paul was that of a believer who passes out of this sphere by death, and that the experience of the Apostle John is that of the whole Church at the rapture and beyond. The latter may well be published for the encouragement of the saints, but the former may well be kept a secret lest the temptation to leave this world of trials by self-inflicted death be too strong for endurance.

2. The Future Estate of the Redeemed. It is clearly asserted that heaven is "far better" than the earth (Phil. 1:23). It is in heaven that the child of God will be conformed to the image of Christ (Rom. 8:29; Phil. 3:20–21; 1 John 3:1–3), he will know then even as God knows now, and believers will be together with the Lord (1 Thess. 4:16–17). In fact, God is now creating a new order of beings out of human material—both Jews and Gentiles. Those who comprise that New Creation will retain but little resemblance to that which they were. Their citizenship will have been changed, their bodies will have been transformed, their whole being will have been conformed to Christ, they who are now joined to Christ will then be forever with Christ in glory. Being now in Christ, they are partaking of what He is, and being married to Christ they will share with Him in all things as a bride enters into the position and estate of her bridegroom.

3. Heaven the Suitable Abode of God and His People. Heaven is also the appropriate home of Christ, of the Spirit, of the Church of the first-born, and of the "spirits of just men made perfect" (cf. Heb. 12:22–24).

4. Some Essential Features of Heaven. Certain features are disclosed respecting heaven and these may best be stated in the words of Scripture.

a. An Abundant Life. "For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. 4:8).

b. Rest. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them" (Rev. 14:13).

c. Knowledge. "Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away" (1 Cor. 13:8–10).

d. Holiness. "And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life" (Rev. 21:27).

e. Service. "And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him" (Rev. 22:3).

f. Worship. "And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God" (Rev. 19:1).

g. Glory. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. 4:17); "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4).

The truth should ever be in mind that heaven and hell are not attained by mere accident. They are presented in Scripture—with a view to human responsibility—as depending upon the human determination. This truth is asserted in such passages as, "Come. And whosoever will, let him take the

water of life freely" and "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." That so great a variation in destiny is possible for human beings is set forth in conformity with man's viewpoint and represents the greatest of all human responsibilities.

5. The Third Heaven. The Scriptures indicate that there are three heavens. There is no reference to the first or second heaven as being such, but there is a reference to the third heaven (2 Cor. 12:2), and there cannot be a third heaven without a first or second.

The first heaven is evidently the atmosphere that surrounds the earth, for reference is made to "the birds of the heaven" (Matt. 8:20; 13:32, R.V.) and to "the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 24:30; 26:64).

The second heaven is evidently the stellar spaces, for Scripture refers to "the stars of heaven" (Gen. 26:4; Rev. 6:13).

By the creation of a man and a woman with the instructions that they should multiply and replenish the earth, God has populated the earth, which is connected with the first heaven. By the creative act in which the angels were brought into being, God has populated the second heaven. It would seem that the stars of heaven are their abode. In leaving the third heaven, which was His abode, Christ became lower than the angels (Ps. 8:5) and, returning from this sphere into heaven, He passed through the sphere of principalities and powers (Eph. 1:21). Thus it would seem that the angels are occupying an abode between earth and the third heaven.

The location of the third heaven has never been revealed, but it is the home of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and has never been inhabited by any created being until the present age. When a believer dies, he goes at once to be with Christ (2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23) and therefore takes up his abode in that sphere. Thus all believers will be brought into that place of glory at the coming of the Lord, and the third heaven is being populated at the present time. Salvation consists in fitting individuals for that heavenly sphere. The Apostle writes in Colossians 1:12: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," and all believers have become legitimate sons of God: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29).

Conclusion

With certain restrictions in the details, the general field of truth which is rightfully embraced in Eschatology has been covered. Proceeding upon the conviction that all in the Bible which was prediction at the time it was written belongs to this thesis, an attempt has been made to arrange and systematize the extended body of truth. It still remains veritable that, whereas unaided human minds may comprehend history, only those who are personally taught of God may give intelligent response to the prophetic revelation (cf. John 16:13); and this principle obtains throughout the range of all spiritual truth and its understanding (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14).

With this conclusion of Volume IV the seven major divisions of Systematic Theology are completed. Usual reference has been made to the Person and work of Christ and to the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. However, these two Persons of the Godhead, since they fill so large a place in the plan and purpose of God and are so much beyond all estimation the source and resource, the alpha and omega of the Christian's life, position, service, and destiny, should by the student be considered each in His separate and individual Person and work—a treatment which may hope to gather up in systematic and connected form that vast body of Scripture which discloses in its plenitude the incomprehensible reality of the Son and the Spirit. Accordingly, Volume V will be devoted to Christology and Volume VI to Pneumatology. Though the field of truth usually included in a system of theology has been set forth, there remains upwards of sixty vital doctrines which are not either directly or indirectly drawn into a theological treatise and these with other major doctrines—one hundred and eighty in all —will be contemplated in the remaining volume.

Volume Five
Christology

Table of Contents

Christology

Chapter I. The Preincarnate Christ The Son of God I. The Deity of Christ

1. The Divine Names a. Designations of Eternal Relationship b. The Primary Designations of Deity 2. The Evidential Attributes

3. The Evidential Mighty Works

4. The Triune Relationship

II. Christ And Creation III. The Before-Time Covenant

IV. The Old Testament Messiah

V. The Angel Of Jehovah

VI. Indirect Biblical Implications

VII. Direct Biblical Assertions

Conclusion

Chapter II. Introduction to the Doctrine Of Christ Incarnate I. The Doctrine as a Whole

II. The Old Testament Anticipations 1. The Types 2. The Prophecies

Chapter III. The Birth And Childhood of Christ Incarnate I. The Birth

II. The Childhood

Chapter IV. The Baptism of Christ Incarnate I. The Baptizer

II. The Need

III. The Mode

1. The Philological Evidence 2. The Exegetical Evidence

IV. Christ's Baptism And Christian Baptism V. Other Baptisms

1. The Baptism by the Holy Spirit 2. The Cup Baptism

Chapter V. The Temptation of Christ Incarnate I. Three Fundamental Factors
1. The Meaning of πειράζω
2. God May Be Tested
3. Christ Was Tempted

II. Christ's Relation to the Holy Spirit III. Christ's Testing By Satan

Chapter VI. The Transfiguration of Christ Incarnate I. The Importance

II. The Reason

1. The Immediate Need 2. The Agelong Need

III. The Reality IV. A Representation of the Kingdom V. The Divine Attestation

Chapter VII. The Teachings of Christ Incarnate I. The Major Discourses
1. The Sermon on the Mount a. Setting
b. Distinctive Character
c. Delay in Its Application
2. The Olivet Discourse
3. The Upper Room Discourse
a. A New Relationship to God
b. Cleansing unto Unbroken Fellowship c. Abiding in Christ for Fruit Bearing d. A New Relationship to the Holy Spirit e. A New Relationship between Believers f. A New Ground of Prayer
g. The Promised Return

Conclusion

II. Parables

1. Messianic 2. General

III. Special Teachings IV. Conversations

Chapter VIII. The Miracles of Christ Incarnate Conclusion

Chapter IX. The Sufferings and Death of Christ Incarnate I. In Types

II. In Prophecy

1. The Major Historical Prediction 2. The Major Doctrinal Prediction
3. Minor Predictions
4. Christ's Predictions

III. In The Synoptics IV. In John's Writings

1. The Gospel 2. The Epistles
3. The Revelation

V. In Paul's Writings 1. Romans 2. First and Second Corinthians
3. Galatians
4. The Prison Epistles
5. The Thessalonian Epistles
6. The Pastoral Epistles

VI. In Peter's Writings VII. In The Letter to the Hebrews

Chapter X. The Resurrection of Christ Incarnate I. The Old Testament Doctrine
1. The Types 2. The Prophecies

II. The New Testament Doctrine 1. Christ's Predictions 2. Subject to Valid Proof
3. Actual Resurrection
4. A New Order of Being
5. Seven Reasons
a. Because of Who He Is
b. To Fulfill the Davidic Covenant
c. To Become the Source of Resurrection Life d. To Be the Source of Resurrection Power e. To Be Head over All Things to the Church f. On Account of Justification
g. To Be the First-Fruits
6. The Present Standard of Divine Power 7. The Lord's Day a Commemoration
a. The Sabbath from Adam to Moses
b. The Sabbath from Moses to Christ c. The Church Age
d. The Sabbath in the Coming Age
e. The New Creation
f. The Lord's Day
(1). A New Day Prophesied and Appointed (2). Observance Indicated by Various Events (3). The Day of Circumcision
(4). The Day of Grace
(5). The Day Blessed of God
(6). The Day Committed Only to the Individual (7). No Command to Keep the Day

Conclusion

Chapter XI. The Ascension and Session of Christ Incarnate I. The Ascension

1. The Ascension on the Resurrection Morn a. Christ Entered the Heavenly Sanctuary b. Christ the First-Fruits
2. The Final Ascension on the Clouds of Heaven II. The Session 1. The Exercise of Universal Authority 2. Head over All Things to the Church 3. The Bestower of Gifts
4. The Intercessor
5. The Advocate
6. The Builder
7. Christ Expecting

Chapter XII. The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate Chapter XIII. The Messianic Kingdom of Christ Incarnate I. Assured by Jehovah's Covenants

1. The Covenant with Abraham a. An Everlasting Nation
   b. An Everlasting Possession of the Land 2. The Covenant with David

II. Its Various Forms 1. The Judges 2. The Davidic Reign and Covenant

3. The Kingdom Predicted
   a. To Be Theocratic
   b. To Be Heavenly in Character
   c. To Be in Jerusalem and World-Wide d. To Be Established by the Returning King e. To Be Spiritual
4. The Kingdom Offered
5. The Kingdom Rejected and Postponed 6. The Present Form
7. The Kingdom of Heaven Realized and Manifested Chapter XIV. The Eternal Kingdom of Christ Incarnate I. The Release of Satan

II. The Revolt on Earth

III. The Passing of Heaven and Earth IV. The Great White Throne Judgment V. The Creation of a New Heaven and a New Earth VI. The Descent of the Bridal City

VII. The Surrender of the Mediatorial Aspect Christology

Chapter I

The Preincarnate Christ the Son of God

Introduction

Christology (Χριστός, λόγος), to which this entire volume is devoted, is the doctrine respecting the Lord Jesus Christ. In attempting to write on His adorable Person and His incomprehensible achievements— which achievements when completed will have perfected redemption, exercised to infinite satisfaction the divine attribute of grace, manifested the invisible God to His creatures, and subdued a rebellious universe in which sin has been permitted to demonstrate its exceeding sinfulness—the limitations of a finite mind which is weakened by a faulty perception are all too apparent. Samuel Medley expressed this sense of restriction when he sang:

"O could I speak the matchless worth,
O could I sound the glories forth
    Which in my Saviour shine,
I'd soar, and touch the heavenly strings,
And vie with Gabriel while he sings
    In notes almost Divine."

Thus, again, the same inability is felt and expressed by Charles Wesley:

"O for a thousand tongues to sing,
    My great Redeemer's praise;
The glories of my God and king,
    The triumphs of His grace."

Of this incomparable One it is said that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God"; yet such an One, who thus occupied the highest place of Deity in company with the Father and the Spirit, "was made flesh, and dwelt among us." He who is from everlasting to everlasting was born of a woman and died on a cross. He who according to the mind of the Spirit is Wonderful, was spit upon by men. He who, by the same mind, is Counsellor is rejected of men. He who is The mighty God is crucified in abject weakness. He who is The everlasting Father, is a Son who learned

obedience by the things which He suffered. He who is The Prince of Peace must Himself tread the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, for the “day of vengeance” must yet be in His heart and He must yet break the nations with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces as a potter’s vessel. He who said, “I am among you as he that serveth,” also said, “Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.” He who is the chaste, wooing Lover of the Canticles is the King of glory who is mighty in battle. He who created all things occupied an infant’s cradle. He who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners was made to be sin in behalf of others. He who was the Bread of Life was Himself hungry. He who was the giver of the supernatural Water of Life was Himself thirsty. He who was God’s Gift of Life to a lost world was Himself dead. He who was dead is alive forevermore.

The range of the life and influence of the Lord Jesus Christ, as disclosed in the Sacred Text, is such as to comprehend things infinite and finite, of God and of man, of the Creator and the creature, of things in heaven and things on the earth, of eternity and of time, of life and of death, of supernal, celestial glory and of mundane sufferings and sacrifice. No greater spread of realities can be conceived than is done when predicating of one Person that He is both very God and very man. It may be inquired how God could be born in a human fashion and die, how God could grow in wisdom and stature, how God could be tempted, how God could be made subject to law, how God could be in need of prayer, how power could be given unto Him which was not His before, or how He could be exalted beyond what He was before. Thus, too, it may be inquired how a visible, identified man on the earth could heal all manner of diseases by His own authority, how He could still the waves with a word of command, how He could discern the thoughts of all men, how He could finally and authoritatively forgive sin, how He could be in complete dominion over angelic spheres, how He could be associated with the Father and the Spirit in majestic ascriptions of heavenly glory, how He could be linked with the titles, the attributes, and the worship belonging to Deity. The answer is found in the revealed truth that this One, as no other could ever be, is both God and man, yet one adorable Person. None need be surprised that this Being is different and, for want of a parallel in the history of the universe, is incomprehensible to finite minds. Were He only man, even the greatest of men, His fellow men might

apprehend Him, but He is, first of all, the God of all eternity; and because of that aspect of His incomparable Person, the finite mind may never plumb the immeasurable depths or scale the limitless heights of His Being.

An uncounted number of devout men and even those who lack a due recognition of divine authority have vied with each other in the effort to define or circumscribe the Person of Christ. Christology purposes to set forth this unrivaled Person; but a true Christology, unlike the straitened treatment imposed in Theology Proper, should extend to the life, to the activities of Christ, and above all else to the redemption He has wrought, and to His eternal power and glory.

No apology is offered for the reconsideration in one connected thesis of truths which have already been contemplated as they, in their appropriate order, have appeared in the course of a full-rounded system of doctrine. There is benefit, sufficient to justify the effort, in gathering into one continuous dissertation the essential features of divine revelation respecting the Person and work of the Second Person of the Godhead—as there is equal advantage in a comprehensive contemplation of the Person and work of the Third Person of the Godhead. Were these vast themes to be broadened to incorporate the history of these doctrines, the subject matter would greatly transcend the plan of this work. Historical features here, as everywhere throughout this work, are eliminated in the main with the expectation that these will be accounted for in another discipline in the student's course of study, namely, the *History of Christian Doctrine.*

The larger and usual division of Christology is twofold—Christ's Person and His work. The work of Christ, being generally restricted to the redemption He has achieved, does not include other essential features—His life on earth, His teachings, His manifestation of divine attributes, His offices as Prophet, Priest, and King, or His relationship to angelic spheres. It is with this larger consideration of Christology in view that a sevenfold division of this extended theme will be pursued: (1) the preincarnate Christ (chap. I), (2) Christ incarnate (chaps. II–VIII), (3) the sufferings and death of Christ incarnate (chap. IX), (4) the resurrection of Christ incarnate (chap. X), (5) the ascension and session of Christ incarnate (chap. XI), (6) the second advent and kingdom of Christ incarnate (chaps. XII–XIII), and (7) the eternal kingdom of Christ incarnate (chap. XIV).

A true and worthy estimation of the Person of Christ is the foundation of a befitting Christology. The cursory computation or valuation of Christ which extends to no greater lengths than to say He began with His human birth, lived thirty-three years on earth, died by crucifixion, was raised, and ascended into heaven, is, in the light of the human story which the Gospels set forth, a natural deduction. Such an inference is nonetheless incommensurate and is therefore misleading. The harmful effect of such a restricted comprehension of Christ is felt not alone in a field of truth which extends merely to temporal and mundane issues; it involves man's proper recognition of his God and Creator. In such realms, no estimation with regard to the effect can be placed on the enormity of the error. The difference is great indeed whether a highly endowed and divinely favored man began to exist when Christ was born of a woman, or whether a Person of the eternal Godhead became incarnate in human form. The natural disposition of the human mind to think of Christ as a man to whom unusual divine elements were added enters, perhaps unwittingly, into very much modern religious thought. That Christ is God in the most absolute sense and that through the incarnation a member of the adorable Godhead has entered the human family by becoming a part of it, is a far different proposition. The question of who Jesus Christ is becomes the fundamental issue in Christology. If He be very God, as He is, then His birth, His life on earth, His teachings, His death, His resurrection, His session in heaven, and His return assume proportions which are as limitless as infinity. On the other hand, if Christology be occupied merely with a man, be he ever so exalted and favored of God, these features respecting him are no more than details of that human exaltation. It is therefore essential, before any worthy investigation into the great realities which enter into the divine undertaking in and through the Lord Jesus Christ can be pursued, that the mind and heart of the student be made conscious to a degree which dominates all his thinking that *Christ is God.* The absolute, dogmatic declaration that Christ is God is the basic premise in all logic respecting the Person and work of Christ. Without a complete recognition of His Deity, every feature of Christology must be at fault to a baleful degree. As is the case in a great number and variety of themes, the only source from which information may be drawn respecting the Person of Christ is the Sacred Text. In that Text God has spoken regarding the Deity and eternal existence of Christ—this,

too, not in a limited way, but at every point where the subject rightfully appears in the Word of God; and not so much as one passage, when properly expounded, implies the contrary. Those who have questioned the truth that Christ is God have done so either through a limited understanding of that which is written, or through wanton rejection of what is doubtless the clearest of all revelations. To the theologian whose task is to discover, arrange, and defend the truth which God has spoken, the assignment relative to the absolute Deity of Christ is simple indeed. The joining of the doctrine of Christ's humanity to the doctrine of His Deity does create a problem which demands the most exact and careful consideration; but the doctrine respecting Christ's Deity when standing alone is without complications.

The general divisions of the divine revelation regarding Christ's pre-existence may be comprehended under a sevenfold arrangement of truth: (1) Christ is God, hence His pre-existence; (2) Christ is the Creator, hence His pre-existence; (3) Christ is a party to the before-time covenant, hence His pre-existence; (4) the Old Testament anticipation of Messiah which Christ answered is that of Jehovah God, hence He pre-existed; (5) the Old Testament angel of Jehovah is Christ, hence He pre-existed; (6) indirect Biblical assertions declare Christ to have pre-existed; and (7) direct Biblical assertions declare Christ to have pre-existed.

I. The Deity of Christ

The line of evidence which demonstrates the pre-existence of Christ on the ground of the truth—as stated above—that He is God, is wholly uncomplicated. Being God, He has existed from all eternity and will be the same yesterday, today, and forever. To the spiritually minded believer the procedure which undertakes to prove the Deity of Christ is redundant; yet to the unbeliever a restatement of this overwhelming evidence will always be advantageous, if perchance there is sufficient candor to receive it. Such a declaration of Christ's Deity is called for in any attempt to develop a worthy Christology. The line of argument to be followed should be clear, namely, that, as the Deity of Christ is verified, both His pre-existence and His eternal existence are assured. In this the Arian assumption, which contends

that Christ pre-existed but was a creation of God and therefore not equal with God, is refuted. Of God, the *Westminster Confession of Faith* declares:

> There is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of his own immutable and most righteous will, for his own glory; most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and withal most just and terrible in his judgments, hating all sin, and who will by no means clear the guilty. God hath all life, glory, goodness, blessedness, in and of himself; and is alone in and unto himself all-sufficient, not standing in need of any creatures which he hath made, nor deriving any glory from them, but only manifesting his own glory in, by, unto, and upon them: he is the alone fountain of all being, of whom, through whom, and to whom, are all things; and hath most sovereign dominion over them, to do by them, for them, and upon them, whatsoever himself pleaseth. In his sight all things are open and manifest; his knowledge is infinite, infallible, and independent upon the creature, so as nothing is to him contingent or uncertain. He is most holy in all his counsels, in all his works, and in all his commands. To him is due from angels and men, and every other creature, whatsoever worship, service, or obedience, he is pleased to require of them.…

It is probable that no more comprehensive declaration respecting God has been framed than this; yet it is precisely this infinity of Being which the Scriptures predicate of Christ. There is nothing which is said to be true of God which is not said to be true of Christ and to the same degree of infinite perfection. It is true that He took upon Himself the human form and that in so doing important problems arise regarding the theanthropic Person which He became. These problems have been considered under Theology Proper and will yet be resumed later when contemplating the incarnation and earth-life of the Savior. The fundamental issue is that Christ is God. This has also been proved earlier and is not to be demonstrated again. The student is enjoined not to pass over these proofs without having attained to a profound conviction of the Deity of Christ. If he wavers respecting this foundational truth, he should recanvass every argument and attempt no forward step until this credence is definitely acquired, for apart from this conviction no true progress will be made. If, on the other hand, such a conviction is not gained, the student is fundamentally wrong and can, under such abnormal unbelief and want of amenableness to the Scriptures, serve no worthy purpose as an exponent of the Sacred Text. The Lord has Himself declared that “all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father” (John 5:23). The Son is dishonored when assigned a lower place than that of the Father. Such

dishonor to the Son is displeasing to the Father, and a ministry is vain indeed which, though sincere, advances under the displeasure of God. The Deity of the Father is all but universally admitted, so also the Deity of the Spirit; but the Deity of the Son is challenged. Such a doubt would not have arisen had the Son not become incarnate. It is His entrance into the human sphere that has provided a field for unbelief. Thus it is required the more that the exact testimony of the Word of God should be given in its full authority. As though the divine Author anticipated the temptation to unbelief which would exist through misunderstanding of the theanthropic Person, the strongest evidence is supplied concerning the Deity of Christ. The Scriptures are as clear and conclusive in their expressions respecting the Deity of Christ as they are respecting His humanity. His humanity is revealed by the natural method of ascribing to Him human titles, human attributes, human actions, and human relationships. Similarly, His Deity is disclosed in the same manner by ascribing to Christ divine titles, divine attributes, divine actions, and divine relationships.

1. The Divine Names. The names found in the Bible—especially those applied to divine Persons—are far more than empty titles. They define as well as indicate the Person to whom they belong. The name *Jesus* is His human designation, but it also embodies the whole redemptive purpose of His incarnation (cf. Matt. 1:21). Similar titles such as "The Son of man," The son of Mary, "The son of Abraham," "The son of David," assert His human lineage and relationships. In like manner the designations "Word," or Logos, "God," "Lord," "The mighty God," "The everlasting Father," "Immanuel," "Son of God," connote His Deity. Among these divine names, some are final in their implications.

a. Designations of Eternal Relationship: *Logos* (Λόγος). As language expresses thought, so Christ is the Expression, the Revealer, the Manifester of God. The term *Logos*—used only by the Apostle John as a name of the Second Person—indicates the eternal character of Christ. As Logos He was in the beginning, He was with God, and He was God (John 1:1). He likewise became flesh (John 1:14) and thus is —according to divine functions—the manifestation of God to man (cf. John 1:18). In His manifestation, all that may be disclosed relative to the Person of God was not only resident in Christ—"In him dwelleth all the fulness [πλήρωμα] of the Godhead bodily"

(Col. 2:9)—but all the competency of God—knowledge-surpassing, indeed—was resident in Him. No stronger declaration of the Deity of Christ can be made than is indicated by the cognomen *Logos*. Without the use of this specific title the Apostle Paul also has written both in Colossians and in Hebrews of the same pre-existence of Christ; and concerning the origin of this title and the fact that the Apostle John employs it without explanation—suggesting a general understanding of its meaning—collateral reading may be pursued (cf. Dean Alford, M. R. Vincent, and in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, s. v.,* Alexander).

Bishop Lightfoot, in his commentary on Colossians, chapter 1, verse 15 ff., has declared the meaning of *Logos* and its use in the Sacred Text. He writes:

> As the idea of the *Logos* underlies the whole of this passage, though the term itself does not appear, a few words explanatory of this term will be necessary by way of preface. The word λόγος then, denoting both "reason" and "speech," was a philosophical term adopted by Alexandrian Judaism before St. Paul wrote, to express the *manifestation* of the Unseen God, the Absolute Being, in the creation and government of the World. It included all modes by which God makes Himself known to man. As His *reason*, it denoted His purpose or design; as His *speech*, it implied His revelation. Whether this λόγος was conceived merely as the divine energy personified, or whether the conception took a more concrete form, I need not stop now to enquire; but I hope to give a fuller account of the matter in a later volume. It is sufficient for the understanding of what follows to say that Christian teachers, when they adopted this term, exalted and fixed its meaning by attaching to it two precise and definite ideas: (1) "The Word is a Divine Person," ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος; and (2) "The Word became incarnate in Jesus Christ," ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. It is obvious that these two propositions must have altered materially the significance of all the subordinate terms connected with the idea of the λόγος; and that therefore their use in Alexandrian writers, such as Philo, cannot be taken to *define*, though it may be brought to *illustrate*, their meaning in St. Paul and St. John. With these cautions the Alexandrian phraseology, as a providential preparation for the teaching of the Gospel, will afford important aid in the understanding of the Apostolic writings.—8th ed., pp. 141–42

Only Begotten (μονογενής)—*John 1:14, 18.* This, one of the highest of titles ever employed, bears an indication of the eternal relationship existing between the Father and the Son. Here R. Govett in his *Exposition of the Gospel of St. John* declares:

> This glory was of "the *Only-begotten* from the Father." These words, then, refute the ideas of some of "the men of intelligence," that there were many like emanations proceeding from God. No! *He* is the *Only* begotten. He is related to the Father, as an only son is to an earthly father. He is "begotten, not made," partaker in full of His Father's Godhead. "But if so, do you not introduce another difficulty? If He be the begotten Son of God, proceeding

from the Father, do you not imply, that He is not eternal, but had a beginning, after the Father?" At this point two errors may seek to enter, "Jesus Christ is *God;* therefore not a *Son* of God." Then arises Tritheism, or the doctrine of three Gods. Or, "Jesus Christ is *Son*—therefore He is not *God*." Then Arianism comes in. We testify on the contrary, then, with Scripture, that Jesus Christ is the Eternal Son of God, and is God. "Eternal decrees" contains as great a difficulty as "Eternal Son." Eternity introduces difficulties beyond our plumb-line. Jesus is "the Only-begotten" in relation to the many figurative "sons of God." Angels are sons of God by *creation;* but in the sense in which Christ is so, they are not sons at all. He stands alone. In another sense those begotten anew of the Spirit become *adopted* Sons of God. But they *begin* to be so, after having become men. Christ was Son from all eternity. Still further, to set the matter clearly, the Spirit of God adds—"Only-begotten *from the Father*, " as distinct from Him eternally, and sent forth from the Father. Jesus uses this phrase in reference to Himself (3:16–18). The word is then to be taken in the loftiest sense of which it is capable; for the giving of Jesus Christ is alleged to be the very greatest gift which is possible. The higher the person of Christ, the greater the glory of God in the gift of His Son. —I, 23–24

Image (εἰκών)—*Colossians 1:15. Image* connotes more than mere likeness; it implies that there is a prototype and that the image is its revealed reality. On this term Dean Alford may be quoted:

…the image of the invisible God (the adjunct invisible is of the utmost weight to the understanding of the expression. The same fact being the foundation of the whole as in Phil. 2:6 ff., that the Son *subsisted in the form of God*, that side of the fact is brought out *here*, which points to His being the *visible* manifestation of that in God which is *invisible:* the *word* of the eternal silence, the *shining forth* of the *glory* which no creature can bear, the *expressed mark* of that *Person* which is incommunicably God's; in one word, the *declarer* of the Father, whom none hath seen. So that while the epithet invisible includes in it not only the *invisibility*, but the incommunicability of God, the term image also must not be restricted to Christ corporeally visible in the Incarnation, but understood of Him as the manifestation of God in His whole Person and work—pre-existent and incarnate. It is obvious, that in this expression, the Apostle approaches very near to the Alexandrian doctrine of the *Logos* or *Word:* how near, may be seen by an extract from Philo: "As they who cannot look upon the sun, behold the sunshine opposite to him as himself, and the changing phases of the moon as being himself: so men apprehend *the image of God, His Angel the Word, as being Himself*." St. Paul is, in fact, as St. John afterwards did, adopting the language of that lore as far as it represented divine truth, and rescuing it from being used in the service of error.—*New Testament for English Readers*, New ed., II, 446

Exact Image (χαρακτήρ)—*Hebrews 1:3, Gk.* M. R. Vincent states, "Here the essential being of God is conceived as setting its distinctive stamp upon Christ, coming into definite and characteristic expression in his person, so that the Son bears the exact impress of the divine nature and character" (*Word Studies in the New Testament*, IV, 383).

First-Begotten (πρωτότοκος). This title—sometimes translated *First-Born*—indicates that Christ is First-Born, the elder in relation to all creation; not the first created thing, but the antecedent to all things as well as the cause of them (cf. Col. 1:16). Of this title Dr. John F. Walvoord writes, "This term is used twice in the New Testament without referring to Christ (Heb. 11:28; 12:23), and seven times as His title. An examination of these references will reveal a threefold use: (a) Before all creation (Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15). As the 'firstborn of every creature' (Col. 1:15), the title is obviously used of Christ as existing before all creation, hence, eternally self-existent. (b) Firstborn of Mary (Matt. 1:25; Luke 2:7; Heb. 1:6). Here the reference is plainly to the fact that Christ was the first child born to Mary, a usage in contrast to that speaking of His eternal sonship. The term is used, then, of His preincarnate Person, and also of His incarnate Person. (c) Firstborn by Resurrection (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). The meaning here is that Christ is the first to be raised from the dead in resurrection life, hence, 'the firstborn from the dead" (Col. 1:18). In relation to the eternity of Christ, this title is another proof that Christ is the self-existent, uncreated God spoken of in Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15; and that in view of His eternal Person, He also has the honor of being the first to be raised from the dead in resurrection life" (*Outline of Christology,* unpublished ms., pp. 5–6).

A consideration of these designations cannot but impress the devout mind with the truth that the Lord Jesus Christ existed as God from all eternity, and that He will so exist throughout eternity to come.

b. The Primary Designations of Deity: *God.* Though in a few instances the name *God* is used with an inferior application, it is almost universally a reference to Deity. When applied to Christ, as many times it is, it declares Him to be of the Godhead and therefore to have existed from all eternity. The use of this designation for Christ begins in the Old Testament and continues throughout the New. Abundant evidence may be cited which makes Isaiah 40:3 turn out to be an anticipation of Christ's first-advent ministry as heralded by John. The passage reads, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." In this Scripture the Holy Spirit asserts that the Messiah, or Christ, is both Jehovah and Elohim. In the same manner the same prophet by inspiration writes of Christ: "For unto us a child is born,

unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (9:6–7). Christ alone is the member of the Godhead of whom it could be said that He would be born and that He would sit on David's throne. So, also, Isaiah declares the coming One to be *Immanuel* and identifies Him as One who would be born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14). Matthew interprets the name *Immanuel* as being "God with us" (Matt. 1:23). The significance of this title is more than that God is present with His people; it is that, by the incarnation, God has become one of the human family. Luke reports the angel as saying of Christ that John would turn many to the Lord their God (Luke 1:16); and this is to turn them to Messiah. Thus, also, over against all the revelation relative to Christ's humanity which the New Testament sets forth is the disclosure in the same Testament of the truth of His absolute Deity, made by the repeated application to Him of the name *God.* As seen above, the Apostle John, when introducing Christ as the subject of his Gospel, states that the Logos is God, and at once adds that it is this same Logos (who is God) who created all things. When Thomas beheld the Savior's wounds he said, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28). Such an utterance, were it untrue, would be idolatry and reprehensible sin; yet Christ did not reprove Thomas, but rather states that, by so much, Thomas has come to believe that which is true of Him. As certainly as it is Christ who is to come again, so certainly He bears the title of Great God and our Savior (Titus 2:13). It was God who shed His blood to purchase the Church (cf. Acts 20:28). When Psalm 45:6 is quoted in Hebrews—clearly referring to Christ—the message states, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." It is thus in the most express terms that Christ is said to be *God*, and reason asserts that, if He be God, He existed from all eternity. He is the "True God," the "God Blessed for ever," and "God who is over all."

Jehovah. Lastly, it is to be observed that the highest of all appellations of Deity, that of *Jehovah*, is freely and constantly applied to Christ. Of the exalted character of that name it is written, "I am Jehovah, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise unto graven

images" (Isa. 42:8, R.V.). The name *Jehovah* is proper to but One; it can never be rightfully applied to another. Other titles of Deity, such as *Elohim*, imply a correspondence with others. "That men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth" (Ps. 83:18). It is Jehovah who speaks in Zechariah 12:10, yet only Christ could be identified as the One who was pierced. Thus the prophet writes, "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn." John seems to be considering this Scripture when he said, "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him" (Rev. 1:7). To have both Deity and humanity in view as in Jeremiah 23:5–6, is certain evidence that it is of Christ that the prophet writes when he says, "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." It is Christ who is made unto the believer *righteousness* (1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21). In Psalm 68:18, Jehovah again appears. The passage reads, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them." And it is this very Scripture which when quoted by the Apostle in Ephesians 4:8–10 refers definitely to Christ. Psalm 102, which names Jehovah at least eight times, is quoted in connection with Christ in Hebrews 1:10 ff. thus, "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands …" So, also, in Isaiah 8:13–14 He is said to be the Stone of stumbling, "Sanctify the LORD of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." Of this prophecy of Christ Peter writes, "Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of

stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed" (1 Pet. 2:7–8). Upon the important passage—Isaiah 6:1–13 in its relation to John 12:41, Dr. William Cooke writes:

> In John 12:41, the evangelist, speaking of Christ, says, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." The things which Esaias spake are stated in the preceding verse, and we find this prophecy revealed in Isaiah 6. The evangelist states that the prophet saw Christ's glory at the time of the revelation; and there we find the sublime manifestation referred to, and the seraphs veiling their faces before his awful majesty. But he whom the evangelist speaks of as CHRIST, in his humbled and incarnate state, the prophet identifies in his pre-existent glory as "JEHOVAH, " and the seraphs adore him as "*Jehovah of hosts.*" The passage is too important and sublime to be omitted. "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also *the Lord* sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphs: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another and said, Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." The evidence that Christ is here called Jehovah of hosts is too bright to be resisted, and the authority too sacred to be impugned. Now, let the reader remember the declaration we previously adduced from the word of God, which proclaims that "He whose name *alone* is Jehovah is the Most High over all the earth," and then compare this assertion with the fact before us, that the name "Jehovah," and its various combinations, as "Jehovah God," "Jehovah our righteousness," and "Jehovah of hosts," are applied to Christ, and he will have before him a complete demonstration of the proper Deity of Christ. The New Testament being written in Greek, the name Jehovah, which is Hebrew, does not occur in it; the word is not used by evangelists or apostles in reference to either Father, Son, or Spirit. Indeed, that name had ceased to be pronounced, except by the high priest in the temple. In the Septuagint version the word Κύριος, LORD, is used instead of Jehovah, and so it is by the New Testament writers. When they quote from the Old Testament such passages as contain the name Jehovah, they use the word Κύριος, LORD, in its stead, whether that name be applied to the Father, Son, or Spirit; and, indeed, in their own compositions this word is constantly applied to the Deity, whichever person may be intended. This word, in its radical meaning, signifies existence, like the word Jehovah; and though custom has not restricted it to God alone, yet when applied to him it must be understood to represent the meaning intended by the name Jehovah. This will not be disputed in reference to the Father; but as we have abundantly shown that the word Jehovah, with all its sacred combinations, is applied to Christ, it will necessarily follow that the word Κύριος, LORD, is also applicable to him in its highest sense—as the substitute for Jehovah, in the same sense in which it is applied to the Father, and is thus applied to him in a multitude of instances. The numerous passages quoted from the Old Testament, and applied by the apostles to Christ, so fully establish this, as to show that the names "Jehovah" and "Lord" are convertible terms as applied to Christ, and the word "Lord" is applied to the Redeemer about a thousand times in the New Testament. Sometimes, both in the Old and New Testament, a *periphrasis* is used to express the same idea as Jehovah—that is, several words are employed as explanatory of its meaning. A Few examples will make this quite clear. "Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called: I am he; I am the first, I also am the last." Again, "I Jehovah, the first, and with the last, I am he." Once more, "Thus saith

Jehovah, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, Jehovah of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God" (Isa. 48:12; 41:4; 44:6). From these passages it is clear that the terms "THE FIRST AND THE LAST" are not only titles of Deity, but are explanatory of the name Jehovah—are expressive of Him who is eternal in his existence and unchangeable in his nature. Now, these Divine titles are ascribed to our Lord and Saviour: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the First and the Last. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the FIRST and the LAST: I am he that liveth, and was dead." "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 22:13, 16; 1:17, 18; 1:8). The two former passages most clearly refer to Jesus; and that the third does, is highly probable, both from the context and the identity of the phraseology. Since, then, the title, "The First and the Last," is the periphrasis for Jehovah in the Old Testament, and this is applied to Jesus in the New, it furnishes an additional declaration of his proper Deity. In the texts we have just adduced, several other terms are introduced expressive of the same meaning. He is called Alpha and Omega. Alpha is the first and Omega the last letter in the Greek alphabet, and the import is, that he is the origin and object of all things. He is called the "One WHO IS, WHO WAS, and WHO IS TO COME; " and this is but another periphrasis for Jehovah—another mode of expressing his eternal and unchangeable nature. It appears that he is also here called the ALMIGHTY, which word explains itself as an appellative suited to him alone who in the highest sense is God. The word (παντοκράτωρ) *Almighty* is frequently used, and it always means, as Schleusner says, "The Omnipotent Being, who has all things in his own power, and on whose will and pleasure all created beings are dependent;" and (*est nomen soli Deo proprium*) "is a name proper only unto God." The following passage illustrates and confirms this view: "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy" (Rev. 15:3, 4).—*Christian Theology*, pp. 97–99

Much may be said of the titles *Jehovah of the Temple* and *Jehovah of the Sabbath* as applied to Christ. To the Jew the temple was greater than all else excepting the One who was pleased to dwell there. Malachi declared that Jehovah would come to His temple (3:1), and Christ fulfilled that prediction. Of the temple Christ said, "Ye have made my house a den of thieves", and "My house shall be called the house of prayer." The temple could not be Christ's house unless it be true that Christ is Jehovah. In like manner, the Sabbath was Jehovah's day. He ordained it and He was to be honored by it; but Christ styled Himself as "Lord also of the Sabbath." The Sabbath was Jehovah's day also in the sense that it came to be His own through the sequence of six creative days. Thus when Christ announced Himself to be Lord also of the Sabbath He, by so much, assumed the place of the Creator of all things.

Yet more may be said of the name which Christ bears. Salvation is through His name (cf. Acts 4:12); and all gatherings of the people of God

are unto His name, who therefore is God.

It is thus demonstrated that every divine name is ascribed as freely to Christ as to the Father, and if these titles do not assert the Deity of the Son then, in candor, they do not assert the Deity of the Father. Since it is declared by these names that Christ is God, then it follows that He has existed as God before His incarnation.

2. The Evidential Attributes. Equally conclusive that Christ is God is the evidence which is drawn from His attributes. Only a portion of this material need be indicated.

Eternity. A distinction should be maintained between that which is merely extended and indefinite with respect to time and that which is eternal in the absolute sense. Millions of ages may have been marked off, but no multiplication of ages can ever make an eternity. Of Christ it is said that His goings forth are "from of old, from everlasting" (Mic. 5:2). In the English text, the words "In the beginning" serve to open both the book of Genesis and the Gospel by John. The Genesis beginning, however, is comparatively modern history as compared to that mentioned by John. Genesis relates to the origin of material things, while John is straining language to its last degree of expression to declare that which is eternal. In a beginning which antedates all creative acts the Logos *was.* He did not then begin to be, but was Himself as old and as all-sufficient then as now. This Logos that *was* has been identified as the Lord Jesus Christ. He it is whom John is introducing as the Subject of his Gospel. Thus, also, by the application of the Jehovah name "I am" (John 8:58), Christ claimed in respect of Himself that He is Jehovah, and no stronger assertion could be made by Him regarding His eternity than to assume that designation. That He is Jehovah is a truth to which no creature might bear conclusive evidence. He must witness thus of Himself, and this might be, as it was, confirmed by the Father and the Spirit. Christ's own witness to Himself is sustained by His unimpeachable character. In this He was neither self-deceived nor ignorant. Similarly, and by the authority of the Holy Spirit's inspiration, Christ is said by Isaiah to be The everlasting Father, which declaration is better rendered *The Father of Eternity.* The Apostle declares that "he is before all things, and by him all things consist" (Col. 1:17). He who existed before aught was created is of necessity Himself uncreated and

eternal. John states that Christ is "The first and the last." This is one of the strongest declarations of Jehovah respecting Himself (cf. Isa. 41:4; 44:6; 48:12). Ages past and ages future are included in this proclamation. How, indeed, could the Savior be the source of life eternal to all who believe and He Himself not be eternal? True, with reference to the beginning of His humanity, He is related to time, though His humanity will know no end.

Immutability. The unchangeableness of Deity is ascribed to Christ. When Jehovah announces, "I am the LORD, I change not" (Mal. 3:6), He is stating that which belongs to the Godhead alone. All else is subject to change. It is significant, therefore, that of Christ it is written, "They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. … Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever" (Heb 1:11–12; 13:8).

Omnipotence. The Almighty is an appellation which can belong only to Deity; yet of Christ it is said that He is "able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil 3:21), and at the end of the thousand-year conquest of all angelic enemies "all things shall be subdued unto him" (1 Cor. 15:28). No particular reference to the power displayed in His mighty works while here on the earth is needed when it is remembered that He is repeatedly said to be the Creator of all things.

Omniscience. Again, another attribute which belongs only to Deity is in view, and in many instances both directly and indirectly this limitless competency is predicated of the Lord Jesus Christ. That omniscience is a characteristic of Deity is disclosed in many Old Testament passages. "For thou, even thou only, knowestt the hearts of all the children of men" (1 Kings 8:39); "I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways" (Jer. 17:10; cf. 11:20; 20:12). Of Christ it is said that He knew the mind and the thoughts of all men. He needed not that any man should tell Him what was in man. He "knoweth the thoughts of man." It is not a contradiction of this great truth when Christ said of Himself, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13:32). It would be wholly within the range of that theanthropic Person to know perfectly on the divine side and yet not to know on the human side. How He could know and not know is beyond human understanding, but not impossible with

God; however, it is probable that the Savior is employing a form of speech which is common to the Word of God. As the Apostle said to the Corinthians, “I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified” (1 Cor. 2:2), so Christ may have been speaking. In this statement to the Corinthians the Apostle is saying that he determined to limit his message to the one theme. Certainly he did not become ignorant for the time being of all else that he had known. It is easily believed that it was not and is not the purpose of God to reveal the day and the hour of Christ’s return. Speaking from the glory, Christ said, “And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works” (Rev. 2:23). How conclusive relative to Christ’s omniscience is John 10:15; and also Matthew 11:27, “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.”

Omnipresence. Of Jehovah it is written, “But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded?” (1 Kings 8:27); “Am I a God at hand, saith the LORD, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the LORD. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the LORD” (Jer. 23:23–24). In the same manner Christ presents Himself as One to be present wherever two or three are gathered in His name, and to be with every witness even to the consummation of the age. He likewise promised that He with His Father would come and make His abode with all who love Him (John 14:23).

As definitely might it be pointed out that the divine attributes of infinite *love, holiness, justice,* and *truth* are predicated of Christ as they are of the Father. Each divine attribute belonging to Christ is an indisputable evidence that Christ is God and therefore one who existed from all eternity.

3. THE EVIDENTIAL MIGHTY WORKS. This aspect of proof respecting Christ’s Deity and pre-existence need not include His miracles while here on earth, which theme will be viewed in later pages. Vast undertakings, such as man cannot even comprehend, are assigned to Christ. Some of these are:

Creation. Though according to the Bible the work of creation is assigned to each of the Persons of the Godhead in turn, it does not lessen the scope of

that work in the case of any one of them. Some have contended that John 1:3 asserts that the Father created through the Son as Agent, and that the Son was not, therefore, the original cause of creation. On this important distinction Dr. William Cooke has written thus:

> In order to neutralize the force of this argument for the Saviour's Deity [that He created the universe], it has been alleged that our translation in John 1:3, "All things were made *by* him," is too strong for the original, and that the Greek preposition δι' more properly denotes the instrument *through* whom a thing is done, than the *agent by* whom it is done; that, therefore, though Christ may be the *instrumental* cause, he cannot be the *efficient* cause; and in support of this view we are referred to the passage, "By whom also he made the worlds" (Heb. 1:2). But this criticism will not stand the test of examination; for, in the first place, διά, with a genitive, is evidently used for the efficient cause in numerous passages. Thus it is applied to the Father, whose efficient agency will not be disputed; hence, we read, "God is faithful, by whom (δι' οὗ) ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son" (1 Cor. 1:9. See also Rom. 11:36; Heb. 2:10, where διά expresses the direct agency of the Father). If, then, the word denotes efficiency when applied to the Father, we must admit it denotes the same when applied to the Son, unless we are prepared to violate the common principles of language, to sustain a falling system. But it should be remarked that διά is not the only preposition employed in reference to the operation of the Saviour's power. The preposition ἐν is used, and this, too, is expressive of immediate and efficient agency, as in Col. 1:16, 17. As to the passage, "By whom also he made the worlds," while this implies the agency of the Father, it does not exclude the agency of the Son, but denotes their united agency, for the work of creation is ascribed efficiently to the three persons in the glorious Trinity; and perhaps the passage implies that the agency of the Son was as in some ineffable manner especially displayed in this work.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 107–8

Passing over the truth that creation is everywhere only a divine undertaking, it is pertinent to note that there are four direct statements in the New Testament which aver that Christ created all things. These passages read, (1) "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3). In a positive sense, all things were created by Him, and, in a negative sense, apart from Him not anything was made. (2) "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not" (John 1:10). A strange relationship is here asserted: He was in the world which He had made. (3) "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him" (Col. 1:16). Christ is said to be not only the Creator but the Object of all creation. All was created by Him and for Him. (4) "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands" (Heb. 1:10). This Scripture

serves to seal all that has gone before, and in the light of these Scriptures none will with candor deny that Christ is the Creator of all things. If He creates, He is God; if He is God, He existed as God eternally.

Preservation. Whoever constructed this vast universe also upholds it and preserves it. All this is assigned to Christ. In Hebrews 1:3 it is said that He, Christ, "upholdeth all things by the word of his power." Similarly, in Colossians 1:17 the Apostle states, "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Thus the limitless system of worlds is said to be held together by none other than the Savior of mankind, even He who was nurtured in a human mother's arms.

Forgiveness of Sin. None on earth has either authority or right to forgive sin. None could forgive save the One against whom all have sinned. When Christ forgave sin, as He certainly did, He was not exercising a human prerogative. It is Jehovah that "blotteth out thy transgressions," and Christ, it is said, was the exalted Prince and Savior who gives repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins (Acts 5:31). The Apostle writes, "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye" (Col. 3:13). Since none but God can forgive sins, it is conclusively demonstrated that Christ, since He forgave sins, is God, and, being God, is from everlasting.

The Resurrection of the Dead. Christ assigned to Himself the exalted divine title of *The Resurrection, and the Life*. It is God who raiseth the dead and therefore Christ announced Himself to be God. It is written, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:25–29); "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. 15:21).

All Judgment. In view of the truth that to sit in judgment is the highest function of any government, it is indicative that all judgment is said to be committed to the Son. In such an exercise of authority and power the Judge must know the secrets of all hearts and the history of every creature. He

must Himself be the righteous One upholding all standards of His righteous government. In Psalm 9:7–8 it is written of Jehovah, "But the LORD shall endure for ever: he hath prepared his throne for judgment. And he shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness." Yet it is asserted that the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son (John 5:22), and it is also said, "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead" (Acts 17:31). In conformity to this great disclosure, it is seen that the judgment of the nations is performed by the King on David's throne (cf. Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; Matt. 25:31–46; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; Rev. 19:15), that He judges Israel (cf. Matt. 24:37–25:13), that He judges the believer's works (cf. 2 Cor. 5:10), and that He will yet judge all angelic powers (cf. 1 Cor. 15:25–26). Since He is God and all judgment is committed unto Him, it is He who sits upon the great white throne in judgment of the wicked dead (cf. Rev. 20:12–15). As His consort, His Bride will also sit in judgment with Him.

The mighty works, like His names and His attributes, point to the truth that Christ is God, and, being God, is eternal.

4. THE TRIUNE RELATIONSHIP. As a further and final evidence to be advanced in proof of the Deity of Christ, it may be observed that in every disclosure respecting the triune relationship the Son occupies a place of essential equality with the Father and the Spirit. To the Son are ascribed the same worship, the same honor, and the same glory. There is no ground for any supposition that the Father or the Spirit are more to be revered than the Son. Whatever is true of the Father and the Spirit in this relationship is, in every instance, as true of the Son. The Scriptures maintain this testimony in spite of the unmeasured condescension of the Son in the incarnation, and in spite of the truth that He remains incarnate in human form throughout eternity to come. The humanity of Christ, as has been seen, though perfect, has the limitations of that which is human; but in no instance does His humanity restrict His Deity. He remains what He is, namely, not God *mutilated* by the flesh, but God *manifest* in the flesh. The fact that Christ is to be worshiped and this on the authority of the inspired Sacred Text is indicative of that which He is in the Godhead relationship. He accepted the

worship of men, and He, as much as the Father or the Spirit, is to be adored. He asked the rich young ruler who addressed Him as "Good master," "Why callest thou me good?" The entire meaning of this question depends on where the emphasis is placed. Evidently Christ did not say, "Why callest thou me *good?*" but He did say, "*Why* callest thou me good?" By so much He drew out, so far as could be done, the esteem in which this ruler held the Lord. There is no basis here for the Unitarian claim that Christ did not believe in His own Deity. Those who think mostly in the terms of Christ's humanity naturally shrink from what to them seems to be the worship of a man. The correction of this impression can come only as the attention is drawn to the truth, which is as perfectly established, that He is God.

To those who believe the testimony of the Bible regarding the triune mode of the divine existence, there can be no doubt that Christ is the Second Person in that Trinity; nor can doubt be entertained reasonably whether the Second Person is in every feature equal to the First or the Third.

In concluding this division bearing on the Deity of Christ, it may be restated that the fourfold proof—His names, His attributes, His mighty works, and His rightful place in the Trinity—has established the truth that *Christ* is *God*, and, since He is God, He has existed from all eternity.

II. Christ and Creation

So far-reaching in its evidential value respecting the Deity of Christ is the truth that Christ is the Creator that it must reappear in this discussion. Already it has been listed among His mighty works. At this point the theme is introduced as a major proof of Christ's pre-existence. While four major passages bearing upon Christ as Creator have been cited above, only one of these is to be developed further under this division of this thesis.

In itself, the act of creating is an incomparable undertaking. In His creation of material things, God called them into existence out of nothing. Such a declaration is far removed from the notion that nothing has produced something. It is obvious that out of nothing nothing of itself could arise. The Biblical declaration is rather that out of infinite resources of God everything has come into existence. He is the Source of all that is. The self-determining will of God has caused the material universe, as stated in

Romans 11:36, “For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever.” In this Scripture the creation of all things is predicated of God; but, in Colossians 1:16–17, it is asserted in the same general terms that all things were created by Christ and for Him, that He is before all things and by Him all things consist. This is a reasonable pronouncement only to the extent that Christ is God. The power to create—whether it be production of a universe, of a new creation, or of a new heaven and a new earth—belongs alone to God, and is predicated alike of each of the three Persons of the Godhead. It is certain that if Christ is God He is able to create all things. However, the statement with which this division of this theme is concerned is that, since Christ is said to have created all things, He is by a right reasoning none other than God.

The one passage now to be considered is Colossians 1:15–19. Having declared the redemption which is provided through the blood of Christ and the remission of sins on the ground of that blood (cf. Col. 1:14), the Apostle enters upon an extended and revealing description of the Son who thus redeems. This whole context should be compared with Hebrews 1:2–12 and is distinctive in that it sets forth the Deity of the Son with no direct reference to His humanity. This exalted proclamation of Christ’s Deity, as in Hebrews, chapter 1, is followed by a portion of Scripture which announces His humanity. These verses of Colossians 1:15–19 will be considered separately.

Verse 15. “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.”

But recently in an earlier discussion the two eternal titles employed in this verse have been considered. To this may be added that to assert, as the Apostle does at this point, that Christ is the εἰκών or image of God is equivalent to John’s statement regarding the λόγος—that He is not only the manifestation of God, but that He is God. No greater assertion respecting Christ could be made than the statement here advanced, that He is the exact image of God. Thus, again, in Hebrews 1:3 it is declared that Christ is the effulgence of the Father’s glory and that all divine fullness—πλήρωμα—is in Him.

Verse 16. “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him.”

In this verse the reason is given for assigning to Christ the title found in verse 15, namely, “Firstborn of every creature.” As this designation places Christ, in point of time, before all creation, He must have existed before all things. This passage, as Bishop Lightfoot points out, does not teach that Christ was Himself created before all other creations; it rather asserts “the absolute pre-existence of the Son” (*Op. cit.*, p. 144). Concerning a revelation such as this which assigns to Christ the causation of all things—far removed from the idea that He is Himself one of those created things—and includes things celestial and things terrestrial, and things visible and things invisible, it is to be expected that scholars of all generations would have written at length. The precise exegesis of this verse should be followed; however, for the purpose desired in the present treatise, it will suffice to assert, as above, that the text predicates of Christ the origination of all things. The suggestion that Christ was merely an agent through whom God wrought in creation is refused by all who are not prejudiced respecting the absolute pre-existence and creatorship of Christ. Upon the well-established rule that repetition of a truth in the Sacred Text is for emphasis, it is exceedingly significant that the phrase “all things were created by him” occurs twice in this one verse. The enumeration of things that were created by Christ reaches into celestial spheres. There are things visible in heaven as well as invisible and there are things invisible—as the souls of men—as well as visible on the earth. In fact, though mundane things are mentioned by no more than a reference to things that are in the earth, here the contemplation is largely of things which are in heaven. A proper proportion is probably preserved at this point regarding the relative importance of these two spheres. There is no slighting of mundane things. It is only that heavenly things are far more extensive. Thus is accentuated the surpassing creative work of the Son of God. Were this the only reference in the Bible to Christ’s work in creation, it would, naturally, stand alone on its own declaration; but, as before stated, this same revelation occurs in other Scriptures, notably, John 1:3, 10; 1 Corinthians 8:6; Ephesians 3:9; Hebrews 1:10. The enumeration of heavenly things is restricted to celestial beings. The passage in Hebrews 1:10 assigns to Christ the laying of the foundation of the earth. Otherwise, that which stands first in the divine estimation is not material things, but living creatures; and the living creatures of heaven appear to exceed far in importance the living creatures

of earth. In this connection, it will be observed that in the matter of the judgments of Christ upon all living creatures the time assigned to the two spheres—earth and heaven—is very unequal. The judgment of the people of the earth—Jew and Gentile —is at most a matter of a day or days, while the judgment of angelic empires, according to 1 Corinthians 15:24–26, may require the whole millennial period.

The Apostle has twice recorded the various ranks or divisions of celestial beings. In Ephesians 1:21 he discloses that when Christ ascended into heaven He was exalted to the right hand of the Father "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion." This fourfold enumeration is not quite identical with that of Colossians 1:16, all of which suggests that the listing in either case is partial, that the items are named only to answer a general purpose. The same Apostle names the angelic groups when declaring the subduing reign of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–26). There he speaks of rule, of authority, of power, and implies that these are "enemies" who must be put under Christ's feet. Among these enemies is death—a factor which in itself is impersonal and in no way to be classed with responsible creatures. Thus, broad indeed is the contemplation of the enemies of the kingdom of God.

The all-important averment of Colossians 1:16 is gathered up in the second declaration, namely, "All things were created by him." The act was His and with a view to glorifying Him. Christ is the *end* of creation. It was *for* Him. In this connection, two passages in Revelation present added truth, "And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer" (10:5–6); "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created" (4:11).

Verse 17. "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

This portion of the context adds the important revelation that it is by the direct and unceasing application of Christ's power that all things consist, or more literally, *hold together.* Again there is a parallel to this truth in Hebrews where in 1:3 it is said, "And upholding all things by the word of

his power." The disclosure is thus made that He who created all things unceasingly sustains them.

Verse 18. "And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence."

Not only is Christ Head over creation, but He is Head over the New Creation—the Church. With respect to the Church, Christ is its beginning and the First-Born from the dead. 1 Corinthians 15:20, 23 proclaims Christ to be the First-Fruits of them that slept. Revelation 3:14 styles Him "the beginning of the creation of God." This is doubtless a reference to the New Creation in which He is a part. Because of all this, to Him be the pre-eminence! To Him who created all things, who sustains His creation, who is Head of all creations the pre-eminence belongs.

Verse 19. "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell."

It is according to the design and purpose of the Father that the pre-eminence should be given unto the Son. In the Son all the πλήρωμα dwells (cf. Col. 2:9). Thus the Father's purpose is realized and thus the Father is glorified in the Son.

The declaration that Christ pre-existed is sustained to the last degree by the revelation that He created all things.

III. The Before-Time Covenant

Expositors have not agreed on the exact nature of the covenant which is mentioned in Titus 1:2, which reads, "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began" (cf. 2 Tim. 1:1, 9). By some it is believed that reference is here made to an agreement between the Persons of the Godhead which embraced and provided for the whole plan of redemption, that it assigned to each His part in the undertaking. To others the text indicates no more than the foreknowledge of God concerning the promise which the gospel would proclaim. Of the latter view Dean Alford writes, "The solution of the difficulty, that no promise was actually made till the race of man existed, must be found by regarding, as in the place in 2 Tim. [1:9], the construction as a mixed one,—compounded of the actual promise made in time, and the divine purpose from which that promise sprung, fixed in eternity. Thus, as there God is said to have given us grace

in Christ from eternal ages, meaning that the gift took place as the result of a divine purpose fixed from eternity, so here He is said to have promised eternal life before eternal times, meaning that the promise took place as the result of a purpose fixed from eternity" (*Op. cit.*, II, 580). On the general theme of a before-time covenant, Dr. A. A. Hodge presents seven points, "1st. As shown at the opening of this chapter [XXII] such a Covenant is virtually implied in the existence of an eternal Plan of salvation mutually formed by and to be executed by three Persons. 2d. That Christ represented his elect in that Covenant is necessarily implied in the doctrine of sovereign personal election to grace and salvation. Christ says of his sheep, 'Thine they were, and thou gavest them me,' and 'Those whom thou gavest me I have kept,' etc. (John 17:6, 12). 3d. The Scriptures declare the existence of the promise and conditions of such a Covenant, and present them in connection (Isa. 53:10, 11). 4th. The Scriptures expressly affirm the existence of such a Covenant (Isa. 52:6; Ps. 89:3). 5th. Christ makes constant reference to a previous commission he had received of his Father (John 10:18; Luke 22:29). 6th. Christ claims a reward which had been conditioned upon the fulfillment of that commission (John 17:4). 7th. Christ constantly asserts that his people and his expected glory are given to him as a reward by his Father (John 17: 6, 9, 24; Phil. 2:6–11)" (*Outlines of Theology*, p. 371).

It is certain that the triune Godhead existed from all eternity, that all things were predetermined, and that an agreement existed between the Persons of the Godhead concerning the part to be executed by each. If the triune Godhead existed from all eternity, the Second Person existed and Christ, being that Person, existed from all eternity.

IV. The Old Testament Messiah

What is too often overlooked is the fact that the Messiah anticipated in the Old Testament is repeatedly declared to be Jehovah. It is also to be observed that, within the mystery of the Trinity, Jehovah and the Messiah are two separate Persons. In Psalm 2:2, R.V., it is said of the kings and rulers of the earth that they will yet "set themselves against Jehovah, and against his anointed." (Here *Anointed* is better translated 'Messiah.') Though the finite mind hesitates for want of ability to understand that which

is declared, there are many passages of unquestioned interpretation in which the Messiah is said to be Jehovah. In fact, this is true in the great majority of Messianic predictions. Some of these may well be indicated.

Deuteronomy 30:3. "That then the LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee."

In this passage, which is the first mention within the Sacred Text of the second advent, it is Jehovah Elohim who proclaims that He will return; but He cannot return if He has not been here before. It is alone true of Christ that He has been here and departed, that He will return, that when He returns, as asserted in this passage, He will regather Israel, and that He will reign on the earth. No optional interpretation is available. It is Christ alone who answers this description and He is here identified as Jehovah Elohim.

Jeremiah 33:14–17. "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she [basically, he] shall be called, The LORD our righteousness. For thus saith the LORD; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel."

From this prophecy it may be seen that the Branch, or Son, of David will complete the promise that David shall never lack for one to sit upon his throne. The line of rightful kings continued from David to Christ, but no other king need ever arise, nor will one arise. Of Christ it is declared that His is an everlasting kingdom (cf. Dan. 7:14), and He shall reign forever and ever (Rev. 11:15). In his announcement to Mary of the birth of Messiah, the angel said her Son would be the Son of the Highest, that He would sit on David's throne, and that He would reign forever. This Son, having no human Father, is the Son of God (Luke 1:31–35). It is thus conclusively demonstrated that Christ is Jehovah.

Isaiah 9:6–7. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end,

upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this."

Incomparable titles are here ascribed to that unique Person who is never duplicated in heaven or on earth, who combines both humanity as a child born and Deity as a Son given. He is here said to be Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The Father of eternity, and The Prince of Peace; yet this is that One—Jehovah—who, as declared above, shall sit on David's throne. All that can be ascribed to Jehovah Elohim is ascribed directly to Christ, and therefore Christ is Jehovah.

Zechariah 9:9. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass."

In the fulfillment of the prediction, as recorded in Matthew 21:1–14 and John 12:12–15, Christ is proclaimed to be the Son of David who comes in the name of the Lord (Jehovah); and as He entered the temple He cast out the moneychangers, saying that they had made "my house" a den of thieves when it is properly styled "the house of prayer." Malachi anticipated that Jehovah would thus come to His temple. It was Jehovah's temple and Christ asserts that He is Jehovah when He called the temple "my house." So Zechariah 9:9 is a Messianic prediction which makes Messiah to be Jehovah, and Christ fulfilled this prophecy. The conclusion is that Christ is Jehovah.

Zechariah 1:4, 9, 16. "Be ye not as your fathers, unto whom the former prophets have cried, saying, Thus saith the LORD of hosts; Turn ye now from your evil ways, and from your evil doings: but they did not hear, nor hearken unto me, saith the LORD. … Then said I, O my lord, what are these? And the angel that talked with me said unto me, I will shew thee what these be. … Therefore thus saith the LORD; I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies: my house shall be built in it, saith the LORD of hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem."

The predictions of the Bible know of but one King, of one throne, and one Son of David to reign forever on David's throne. That Christ is that King and therefore the Messiah need not be demonstrated again; but Zechariah distinctly declares the Messiah-King is none other than Jehovah. He shall be worshiped because He is Jehovah.

Isaiah 40:1–3. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the LORD'S hand double for all her sins. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

John the Baptist fulfills the prediction of one who in preparation for the advent of Messiah is a voice crying in the wilderness. He himself said that he was that voice (John 1:22–23; cf. Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4–6). It matters not that on account of the rejection of the King the complete fulfillment of this expectation is delayed until His second advent. John was the voice preparing the way for Messiah and Isaiah's prophecy asserts that the voice was to prepare the way for Jehovah.

Jeremiah 23:5–6. "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

The King who shall reign and prosper is Messiah, the Son of David. He it is who shall execute judgment and justice in the *earth.* He it is who will save both Judah and Israel (cf. Isa. 63:1; Rom 11:26–27). He it is who shall be designated *Jehovah our Righteousness*—not as a meaningless title, but because He is Jehovah.

Though but a limited selection of passages has been introduced, it will be seen that Messiah is always declared to be Jehovah, and since He is Jehovah He has existed from all eternity.

V. The Angel of Jehovah

One of the most compelling and indisputable proofs that Christ preexisted is found in the truth that He is the Angel of Jehovah whose various appearances are recorded in the Old Testament. On this doctrine Dr. John F. Walvoord has written an analysis which may well be included in this text:

> *Definition.* A theophany is a manifestation of God in visible and bodily form before the incarnation. Usually the term *theophany* is limited to appearances of God in the form of man

or angels, other phenomena such as the Shekinah glory not being considered a theophany. The theophanies are chiefly appearances of the Angel of Jehovah, who is clearly distinct from angelic beings.

The Angel of Jehovah Identified as Jehovah. A study of the references to the Angel of Jehovah in the Old Testament will reveal that He is frequently identified as Jehovah Himself. When the Angel of Jehovah spoke to Hagar (Gen. 16:7–13), He is identified as Jehovah (vs. 13). The account of the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22:11–18) affords the same identification of the Angel of Jehovah and Jehovah Himself. Other passages confirm this interpretation (Gen. 31:11–13; 48:15, 16; cf. 45:5; Ex. 3:1 ff.; cf. Acts 7:30–35; Ex. 13:21; 14:19; Judg. 6:11–23; 13:9–20).

The Angel of Jehovah as a Distinct Person from Jehovah. While many passages identify the Angel of Jehovah as Jehovah, other passages almost equal in number distinguish the Angel of Jehovah as a distinct Person. In Gen. 24:7, for instance, Jehovah is pictured as sending "his angel." The servant of Abraham testifies to the reality of this in Gen. 24:40. Moses speaks of Jehovah sending an angel to lead them (Num. 20:16). A clear instance is found in Zech. 1:12–13 where the Angel of the Lord speaks to Jehovah, "Then the angel of the LORD answered and said, O LORD of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? And the LORD answered the angel that talked with me with good words and comfortable words." Other passages make a similar distinction (Ex. 23:20; 32:34; 1 Chron. 21:15–18; Isa. 63:9; Dan. 3:25–28). There are some passages which affirm the deity of the Angel of Jehovah, but do not specifically identify Him as Jehovah or as a person distinct from Jehovah (Judg. 2:1–5; 2 Kings 19:35).

The Angel of Jehovah is the Second Person of the Trinity. While to the natural mind the seeming disparity in terminology and usage of the term *Angel of Jehovah* is irreconcilable, the difficulty is easily dissolved when it is realized that Christ is the Angel of Jehovah. As such, Christ is Jehovah, and at the same time, as a Person He is distinct from the Trinity, being the Second Person. Thus when the Angel of Jehovah is identified as Jehovah, it is a declaration of His deity. When the Angel of Jehovah is distinguished from Jehovah, it is the distinction of the Persons of the Godhead, in all probability the Father in distinction to the Son. This solution is in keeping with the doctrine of the Trinity as unfolded in the entire Scriptures. Granting that the Angel of Jehovah is God, it is a minor problem, relatively, to prove that He is the Second Person, not the Father nor the Holy Spirit.

The proof that Christ is the Angel of Jehovah is supported by four lines of evidence: (a) *The Second Person is the Visible God of the New Testament.* When we turn to the New Testament, the Second Person is found to be the incarnate God, possessing a human body and being visible to all. While the Father's voice is heard from heaven, and the Holy Spirit is seen descending in the form of a dove, Christ, the Second Person, is the full manifestation of God in visible form. It would be logical that the same Person of the Godhead who is visible in the New Testament should also be the chosen One to appear in the form of the Angel of Jehovah in the Old Testament. (b) *The Angel of Jehovah of the Old Testament No Longer Appears after the Incarnation of Christ.* The Angel of Jehovah is exceedingly active throughout the Old Testament period, appearing to many people in widely separated periods. In the New Testament, while there are references to angels as such, not a single instance is found where the Angel of Jehovah appears. It is a natural inference that He now appears as the incarnate Christ. (c) *Both the Angel of Jehovah and Christ Are Sent by the Father.* The Old Testament reveals the Angel of Jehovah as sent by Jehovah to reveal truth, to lead Israel, and to defend and judge them. In the New Testament, Christ is sent by God to reveal God in the flesh, to

reveal truth, and to become the Savior. In the nature of the Trinity, it is the Father who sends the Son and the Spirit, the First Person never being sent Himself. The similar character of ministry of the Angel of Jehovah and Christ would serve to identify them. (d) *The Angel of Jehovah Could Not Be Either the Father Or the Holy Spirit.* By process of elimination, it can be demonstrated that the Angel of Jehovah must be the Second Person. According to John 1:18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." This verse in effect states that only Christ was visible to man, no one being able to see God the Father or the Holy Spirit in their glory. As the Angel of Jehovah is the Sent One, He could not be the Father, the First Person. As the Angel of Jehovah is God in bodily form, He could not be the Holy Spirit, as the attribute of immateriality is always possessed by the Holy Spirit, and His ministry is never characterized by physical attributes. There is not a single valid reason to deny that the Angel of Jehovah is the Second Person, every known fact pointing to His identification as the Christ of the New Testament.

Appearances of Christ Other Than As the Angel of Jehovah. A number of illustrations are afforded in the Old Testament of appearances of Christ in form other than the Angel of Jehovah. In Gen. 18:1–33, Jehovah appears as a man, accompanied by two other men who are probably angels. Jacob's experience of wrestling with God also involves in all probability the appearance of Christ to him in the form of a man (Gen. 32:24–32). The appearance to the elders of Israel of the God of Israel is probably to be identified as an appearance of Christ (Ex. 24:9–11). The cloud of the Lord, the glory of the Lord (Ex. 40:38), and the "cloudy pillar" (Ex. 33:9–23) are also forms of appearance of Christ in the Old Testament. It is probable that every visible manifestation of God in bodily form is to be identified with the Lord Jesus Christ (Josh. 5:13–15; Ezek. 1:1–28; Dan. 10:1–21).

The Theophanies a Proof of the Pre-existence of Christ. The theophanies of the Old Testament, being the manifestation of Christ, the Second Person, in visible form constitute an argument for pre-existence in history, as contrasted to the direct statement of the New Testament. The abundant witness to the vital ministry of Christ in the Old Testament period and His evident relationship to so many scenes of revelation in the Old Testament are a convincing proof of His pre-existence. An examination of the character of His ministry as the Angel of Jehovah and His manifestation in other forms will not only reveal His pre-existence but will also demand recognition of His deity. As the Angel of Jehovah, He is God, and the revelation of Him in the Old Testament while sometimes devoid of His inherent glory even as He is found during His life on earth after incarnation is nevertheless clearly a display of the attributes of God.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 6–8

VI. Indirect Biblical Implications

There are many phrases used in the New Testament which imply Christ's pre-existence. He said of Himself that He was sent into the world (John 17:18); it is written that He became flesh (John 1:14); that He partook of flesh and blood (Heb. 2:14); that He was found in fashion as a man (Phil. 2:8); that He said, "I am from above" (John 8:23); and, "I am not of the world" (John 17:14); He claimed to have descended out of heaven (John

3:13). Other Scriptures worthy of note in this connection are: John 1:15, 18, 30; 3:16–17, 31; 6:33, 42, 50–51, 57–58; 7:29; 8:23, 42; 9:39.

VII. Direct Biblical Assertions

This the final evidence of Christ's pre-existence is that which is direct and positive. The Word of God asserts His pre-existence in terms which cannot be questioned by a devout person. Though before noted in a previous volume, some of these passages are listed here.

John 1:1–4, 14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. … And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."

Not only is Christ here presented as Creator of all things, but, as far as language can express thought, He is declared to have existed from all eternity. In that beginning which preceded all creation, when the universe—such as it may have been—was inhabited only by the triune God, the *Logos* has existed, that is to say from all eternity. In a depth of meaning which is beyond human understanding, the *Logos* was both with God as a fellow to be distinguished separately and He was God. He is none other than the one God.

John 6:33, 38, 41, 50–51, 58, 62. In these seven texts, which need not be quoted, the sevenfold declaration is made by Christ that He came down from heaven (cf. John 3:13, 31). The more extended revelation of John 6:62 is conclusive: "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" Only the most obdurate unbelief will reject an unveiling of heavenly truth as unanswerable as is set forth in this sevenfold assertion by Christ Himself. The Socinian invention that Christ sometime after His birth was received up into heaven that He might be instructed in heavenly things and that from there He came forth, is perhaps as good an explanation as could be made—if it had a vestige of truth on which it could be based. The devout mind revolts at such impiety and must inquire why any effort is made to save a Christ so humanized that His existence ceases to be of any

moment. He came down from heaven where He, as God, had ever had His abode. Every Scripture fully sustains this claim.

John 8:58–59. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by."

Dean Alford's comment on this passage is included here, "As Lücke remarks, all unbiassed explanation of these words must recognize in them a declaration of the essential pre-existence of Christ. All such interpretations as '*before Abraham became Abraham,*' i.e. father of many nations (Socinus and others), and as '*I was predetermined, promised by God*' (Grotius and the Socinian interpreters), are little better than *dishonest quibbles.* The distinction between was made (*or was born*) and am is important. The present, I am, expresses *essential existence*, see Col. 1:17, and was often used by our Lord to assert His divine Being. In this verse *the Godhead of Christ is involved;* and this the Jews *clearly, understood, by their conduct to Him.*…Probably there were stones (for building) lying about in the outer court of the temple, where these words seem to have been spoken. The reason of the Jews' doing this [v. 59] is given by them on a similar occasion, ch. 10:33, *for that thou, being a man, makest thyself God"* (*Op. cit.*, I, 547).

John 17:5. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

The peculiar circumstances in which the Savior is addressing the Father before He returns to heaven—circumstances wholly apart from any intercourse with men and characterized by that high degree of truth which must obtain when two Persons of the Godhead converse— make this reference on the part of Christ to His pre-existence in heaven of solemn import—such indeed as only those who lack all capacity for respect toward God might question. In his *Exposition of the Gospel of St. John*, R. Govett remarks on this passage:

> As the result of such glorification of the Father, He asks for His own glorification. And for an especial form of it—the restoration to Him of the divine glory which He possessed before He became man. He here testifies His preexistence, and His abiding with the Father, and in His divine glory, before creation began. Jesus, then, is the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father. He is not one who began to be at creation. As Paul says, He was in "the form of God," and stooped and emptied Himself of glory in His becoming man. Now the bitterest part of that humiliation—the death on the cross—is at the door; but, beyond that, He anticipates so

perfect a passage across the darkness, that the Father will be obliged to exalt Him above all creatures as His Son. This appears also in Hebrews 1. Jesus, by His eternal generation, was *the Son;* above all angels, in a sense that cannot justly be assigned to them. But Paul goes on to testify, that by His perfection of service during His incarnation, He has re-won the place of superiority to angels. He has again been saluted as "the Son," on the Father's raising Him from the dead (Heb. 1:5). That place no angel has ever by his obedience earned. The unfallen angels by their obedience just fulfil the work demanded of them, but no more. They are not meritorious servants of the Most High, who can claim a reward, and *such* a reward, as their desert. Neither God nor His Son began to be. The world did begin. There were ages uncounted before it was created. On the other hand, the Father speaking to the Son, after His work on earth, owns His Godhead; and assigns to Him the kingdom as the result of His perfect love and righteousness, and hatred of iniquity (Heb. 1:8, 9). There are, then, three aspects of the matter presented in this verse. (1) Jesus, as the Son, had glory with the Father before all creation. (2) He stripped Himself of that glory to become the servant. He has so lived on earth, as that the Father has been glorified, and He can claim glory in the day to come, when the Most High shall assign to each the reward of his works. Nay, the glory is to begin at once. "Now." "Glorify Me *with* (that is, 'beside') *Thyself.*" Jesus' glory is to begin at once in the presence of the Father on His ascension; and the same divine glory which He enjoyed before His human birth, is to be restored to Him. Who of mere men could say such things with truth? Who could put forth such pretensions without blasphemy? and the Father's eternal displeasure? "But may not 'the glory which I had with Thee before the world was' mean only, that Christ had that glory in the counsels of the Father, before the Christ had any existence?" So speak some, whose aim is just the opposite to that of the Father; to diminish as much as may be, the honour given in Scripture to the Son. Whenever you find this, be on your guard! No! First, if Jesus be a mere man, how did He know what was the glory destined Him, before creation existed? Secondly, this was nothing peculiar to Himself. God had destined a special glory for Abraham, David, and others as well. Thirdly, the natural sense of the words imports—that Jesus not only existed ere creation, but dwelt in glory in the presence of the Father. Fourthly, this is sustained by many other passages, specially of John's Gospel and Epistles. "The Word was God. *The same was in the beginning with God.*" His was glory before creation; for He created all, and the cause must be before the effect; while the glory of the Creator must be infinitely above that of the creature. Again, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man *ascend up where He was before?*" "Before Abraham was *born, I am,* " "Who being in the form of God, emptied Himself" (Phil. 2). "He that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." "He that progresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of the Christ, hath not God" (2 John 1:9). Observe how the "we" in this prayer sets Jesus on a level with the Father (ver. 11, 21, 22). The Object of worship and Giver of life is the Son.—II, 284–86

Philippians 2:6. "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

An extended comment on this text and its setting by Dr. John Hutchison (*Lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 90–93) will serve to emphasize the testimony of this passage:

The passage is one of no ordinary difficulty. The controversies of the ages have gathered around it. Years would probably not suffice to master its whole literature. Almost every word

in these verses has been a battlefield of contention. A sense of confusion therefore may well settle down upon the mind in trying to study this theme; and yet the more we do study it, the sense of its grandeur grows the more overmastering. It is the theme of all Scripture. Its teaching is the meeting-point of all humble, believing hearts. Yet the exposition of it cannot but be feeble, when what is to be expounded "makes breath poor and speech unable,"—transcends, in a word, all mortal thought. We must content ourselves with the simple endeavour to bring out the meaning of the words into clearer light. In the choice of the terms employed, we see how the apostle wrote, as it were, with the point of a diamond. As Farrar (*Messages of the Books*, p. 299) well puts it, "The chief truths of the profoundest Christology could not have been expressed more grandly, and at the same time more tersely, than in this swift outline of Christ's passage downwards, step by step, from the infinite heights into the uttermost abyss of self-humiliation, and then His re-ascent upwards into the super-exaltation of unimaginable dominion." Or we might use the words of Daillé, the worthy French Reformed theologian of the seventeenth century: "The meaning is so noble and so well-established that nothing more powerful could be imagined; the apostle battering down in these few words all that hell has ever invented against this sacred and inviolable foundation of our faith." Or, going back much farther in the literature of the Church, it is worthy of notice how, in the two very striking sermons of Chrysostom, this passage in its several clauses is used as a weapon by which all the varied heresies of his time are broken to shivers. We have, however, to remember throughout our exposition that the apostle is in no sense purposely formulating the doctrine of our Lord's divinity and humanity, and atoning work and mediatorial glory and dominion. All this, indeed, is done; yet the one direct and immediate aim is simply to enforce and illustrate the preceding words, "Not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others." It is simply as the supreme enforcement of this Christian duty that the awfully profound and mysterious truths herein taught about Christ Jesus are to be contemplated. "Who," that is, He whom we now adore alike as the eternal Son of the eternal Father, and as Jesus Christ, the Son of man. But the necessities of the context make the reference to Him as in the bosom of the Father before His incarnation. "Being in the form of God"—the word "being" is emphatic. It means "subsisting," "being to begin with" (Webster and Wilkinson), or, as in the margin of the Revised Version, "being originally." It lays stress upon the reality of His existence, not necessarily, however, upon eternal pre-existence, though this indeed is involved in the clause taken as a whole. He is described then as thus existing "in the *form* of God." The word is striking in such a connection as this. It certainly does not mean "fashion" or "mere semblance," on the one hand, nor does it mean exactly "nature, essence," on the other. It rather shades off into both meanings. It represents actual specific character—that which manifests the essential nature. Of course this word, as applied to our Lord, implies His possession of the divine attributes, for, as Chrysostom says, "It is not possible to be of one essence, and to have the form of another;" and besides, it is placed in apposition to "the form of a servant," and as this latter means assuredly true condition, so must the former. Our passage, then, is in reality identical with the unapproachably grand yet simple opening words of the prologue to the Fourth Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." The choice of the word "form" is yet further significant. It directs our thoughts specially, not to the divine nature itself, but rather to the infinite majesty and glory pertaining to it. This is put by none so well as by Daillé: "To be in the form of God signifies not only to be King, to possess majesty and power, but also to have the insignia of royalty, its courtly train and equipage.… Thus formerly among the Romans we might call the form of a consul, the equipage and

> pomp with which the laws and customs of that people invested those who exercised the office; the purple, the ivory chair, the twelve lictors with their fasces and rods, and such-like. When, then, the apostle here says that the Lord, before taking our nature upon Him, was in the form of God, he does not merely intend that He was God in Himself, and that He had the true nature of the divinity; but, further still, that He possessed the glory, and enjoyed all the dignity, majesty, and grandeur due to so high a name. This is precisely what our Lord means in St. John by the glory which He says He had with the Father before the world was." It was this alone that in His humiliation He renounced. He could not empty Himself of His essential perfections, for, indeed, one of these perfections is unchangeableness itself.

In concluding the discussion of this exalted declaration set forth in this verse, the paraphrase by Bishop Lightfoot of verses 5 to 11 is here quoted: "Reflect in your own minds the mind of Christ Jesus. Be humble, as He also was humble. Though existing before the worlds in the Eternal Godhead, yet He did not cling with avidity to the prerogatives of His divine majesty, did not ambitiously display His equality with God; but divested Himself of the glories of heaven, and took upon Him the nature of a servant, assuming the likeness of men. Nor was this all. Having thus appeared among men in the fashion of a man, He humbled Himself yet more, and carried out His obedience even to dying. Nor did He die by a common death: He was crucified, as the lowest malefactor is crucified. But as was His humility, so also was His exaltation. God raised Him to a preeminent height, and gave Him a title and a dignity far above all dignities and titles else. For to the name and majesty of Jesus all created things in heaven and earth and hell shall pay homage on bended knee; and every tongue with praise and thanksgiving shall declare that Jesus Christ is Lord, and in and for Him shall glorify God the Father" (*Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 110).

Conclusion

The arguments which prove the pre-existence of Christ are conclusive and there is every reason to ascribe to the Lord Jesus Christ all that belongs to Deity. To fail to do this is to rob Him of that worship and honor which is rightfully His.

Chapter II

Introduction to the Doctrine of Christ Incarnate

I. The Doctrine as a Whole

In pursuing an orderly consideration of Christology, the next theme—extended indeed—is that of the incarnation, which theme includes the Old Testament anticipations, the birth of Christ, and the life and ministry of Christ on the earth. Though the incarnation doctrine reaches on to all that Christ will ever be and do in eternity to come, it is not traced here beyond the life and ministry, the death and all that follows being reserved for later divisions of this thesis. The importance in the divine estimation of this second division of Christology is betokened by the fact that a little less than half of the New Testment—the four Gospels—is devoted to His life and ministry, to say nothing of the Old Testament anticipations of that life and ministry. The Scriptures, as has been seen, do not underestimate the importance of Christ's preexistence or of other features of Christological doctrine—His death, His resurrection, His session, or His coming again; but the three and a half years of His ministry on the earth as the incarnate Son of God is treated in what might seem to be a disproportionate degree. Such a divine emphasis should be recognized and reflected in a true Christology. The historical Christ is set forth in the Synoptics, as by John also, but while Matthew and Luke declare the human birth of the Savior and so account for His humanity, John in his Gospel brings one of the Godhead Three into the human sphere and therefore must develop the major body of truth respecting the incarnation. In reference to John's account of Christ's advent into the world, Dr. B. B. Warfield writes thus somewhat at length in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (IV, 2343–44): John tells us that it was this Word, eternal in His subsistence, God's eternal fellow, the eternal God's self, that, as "come in the flesh," was Jesus Christ (1 Jn. 4:2). "And the Word became flesh" (Jn. 1:14), he says. The terms he employs here are not terms of substance, but of personality. The meaning is not that the substance of God was transmuted into that substance which we call "flesh." "The Word" is a personal name of the eternal God; "flesh" is an appropriate designation of humanity in its entirety, with the implications of dependence and weakness. The meaning, then, is simply that He who had just been

described as the eternal God became, by a voluntary act in time, a man. The exact nature of the act by which He "became" man lies outside the statement; it was matter of common knowledge between the writer and the reader. The language employed intimates merely that it was a definite act, and that it involved a change in the life-history of the eternal God, here designated "the Word." The whole emphasis falls on the nature of this change in His life-history. He became *flesh.* That is to say, He entered upon a mode of existence in which the experiences that belong to human beings would also be His. The dependence, the weakness, which constitute the very idea of flesh, in contrast with God, would now enter into His personal experience. And it is precisely because these are the connotations of the term "flesh" that John chooses that term here, instead of the more simply denotative term "man." What he means is merely that the eternal God became man. But he elects to say this in the language which throws best up to view what it is to become man. The contrast between the Word as the eternal God and the human nature which He assumed as flesh, is the hinge of the statement. Had the evangelist said (as he does in 1 Jn. 4:2) that the Word "came in flesh," it would have been the continuity through the change which would have been most emphasized. When he says rather that the Word became flesh, while the continuity of the personal subject is, of course, intimated, it is the reality and the completeness of the humanity assumed which is made most prominent.… That in becoming flesh the Word did not cease to be what He was before entering upon this new sphere of experiences, the evangelist does not leave, however, to mere suggestion. The glory of the Word was so far from quenched, in his view, by His becoming flesh, that he gives us at once to understand that it was rather as "trailing clouds of glory" that He came. "And the Word became flesh," he says, and immediately adds: "and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth" (1:14). The language is colored by reminiscences from the Tabernacle, in which the Glory of God, the Shekinah, dwelt. The flesh of Our Lord became, on its assumption by the Word, the Temple of God on earth (cf. Jn. 2:19), and the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord. John tells us expressly that this glory was visible, that it was precisely what was appropriate to the Son of God as such. "And we beheld his glory," he says; not divined it, or inferred it, but perceived it. It was open to sight, and the actual object of observation. Jesus Christ was obviously more than man; He was obviously God. His actually observed glory, John tells us further, was a "glory as of the only begotten from the Father." It was unique; nothing like it was ever seen in another. And its uniqueness consisted precisely in its consonance with what the unique Son of God, sent forth from the Father, would naturally have; men recognized and could not but recognize in Jesus Christ the unique Son of God. When this unique Son of God is further described as "full of grace and truth," the elements of His manifested glory are not to be supposed to be exhausted by this description (cf. 2:11). Certain items of it only are singled out for particular mention. The visible glory of the incarnated Word was such a glory as the unique Son of God, sent forth from the Father, who was full of grace and truth, would naturally manifest. That nothing should be lacking to the declaration of the continuity of all that belongs to the Word as such into this new sphere of existence, and its full manifestation through the veil of His flesh, John adds at the close of his exposition the remarkable sentence: "As for God, no one has even yet seen him; God only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father—he hath declared him" (1:18, margin). It is the incarnate Word which is here called "only begotten God." The absence of the article with this designation is doubtless due to its parallelism with the word "God" which stands at the head of the corresponding clause. The effect of its absence is to throw up into emphasis the quality rather than the mere individuality of the person so designated. The adjective "only begotten" conveys the idea, not of derivation and subordination, but of uniqueness and consubstantiality: Jesus is all that God is, and He alone is this. Of this "only begotten God" it is now declared that He "is"—not "was," the state is not one which has been left behind at the incarnation, but one which continues uninterrupted and unmodified—"into"—not merely "in"—"the bosom of the Father"—that is to say, He continues in the most intimate and

complete communion with the Father. Though now incarnate, He is still “with God” in the full sense of the external relation intimated in 1:1. This being true, He has much more than seen God, and is fully able to “interpret” God to men. Though no one has ever yet seen God, yet he who has seen Jesus Christ, “God only begotten,” has seen the Father (cf. 14:9; 12:45). In this remarkable sentence there is asserted in the most direct manner the full Deity of the incarnate Word, and the continuity of His life as such in His incarnate life; thus He is fitted to be the absolute revelation of God to man. This condensed statement of the whole doctrine of the incarnation is only the prologue to a historical treatise. The historical treatise which it introduces, naturally, is written from the point of view of its prologue. Its object is to present Jesus Christ in His historical manifestation, as obviously the Son of God in flesh. “These are written,” the Gospel testifies, “that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (20:31); that Jesus who came as a man (1:30) was thoroughly known in His human origin (7:27), confessed Himself man (8:40), and died as a man dies (19:5), was, nevertheless, not only the Messiah, the Sent of God, the fulfiller of all the Divine promises of redemption, but also the very Son of God, that God only begotten, who, abiding in the bosom of the Father, is His sole adequate interpreter. From the beginning of the Gospel onward, this purpose is pursued: Jesus is pictured as ever, while truly man, yet manifesting Himself as equally truly God, until the veil which covered the eyes of His followers was wholly lifted, and He is greeted as both Lord and God (20:28). But though it is the prime purpose of this Gospel to exhibit the Divinity of the man Jesus, no obscuration of His manhood is involved. It is the Deity of the man Jesus which is insisted on, but the true manhood of Jesus is as prominent in the representation as in any other portion of the New Testament. Nor is any effacement of the humiliation of His earthly life involved. For the Son of man to come from heaven was a descent (3:13), and the mission which He came to fulfil was a mission of contest and conflict, of suffering and death. He brought His glory with Him (1:14), but the glory that was His on earth (17:22) was not all the glory which He had had with the Father before the world was, and to which, after His work was done, He should return (17:5). Here too the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another. In any event, John has no difficulty in presenting the life of Our Lord on earth as the life of God in flesh, and in insisting at once on the glory that belongs to Him as God and on the humiliation which is brought to Him by the flesh. It is distinctly a duplex life which he ascribes to Christ, and he attributes to Him without embarrassment all the powers and modes of activity appropriate on the one hand to Deity and on the other to sinless (John 8:46; cf. 14:30; 1 John 3:5) human nature. In a true sense his portrait of Our Lord is a dramatization of the God-man which he presents to our contemplation in his prologue.

No human mind can ever grasp the significance of the occurrence and consequence of the incarnation. That a Person of the Godhead should become one of the human family—the sphere of His own creation— with a view to remaining in that form, though glorified, and throughout eternity must continue an insoluble mystery to the creatures of this world. What light is shed upon the problem is contained in the divine revelation which unfolds the advantage of redemption both to God and to man. Through the mediation of the theanthropic Person the heart of God is satisfied in the exercise of grace and the sons of men become the sons of God and heirs of God forever.

The analysis of the truth concerning the incarnate Christ which is advanced here will be pursued under these general divisions, namely: (1) the Old Testament expectation respecting the incarnate Christ, (2) the birth and childhood of the incarnate Christ, (3) the baptism of the incarnate Christ, (4) the temptation of the incarnate Christ, (5) the transfiguration of the incarnate Christ, (6) the teaching of the incarnate Christ, and (7) the miracles wrought by the incarnate Christ.

II. The Old Testament Anticipations

While, as has been seen, the preincarnate Christ appears in the Old Testament as the Angel of Jehovah, He, with regard to His earth-life, is also anticipated in both type and prophecy. To the student of Scripture in the former dispensation, there was released sufficient foreshadowings of the incarnate Christ whereby a comprehensive understanding might have been gained respecting His parentage, His birth, His life, His death, His resurrection, and His second advent. It was then, as now, largely a matter of believing in their natural interpretation the things that are written. A somewhat complete Christology may be constructed from the Old Testament Scriptures. This fact serves as an effective contradiction to the persistent contention that the Old Testament is lacking in vital truth. With the unlimited material provided in both Testaments which is so interdependent and interwoven, there is little to be gained by the segregation of that found in the Old Testament; yet the student will be enriched by a study of the Christology of the Old Testament. The two foreshadowings it has may well be considered separately.

1. The Types. Dr. John F. Walvoord in his unpublished notes on Christology has drawn off under the head of the major types of Christ a listing (which appears, but without comment, in the index of the Scofield Reference Bible) of forty-one well-defined types of Christ. This list is inserted into this text and should be studied with care.

> 1. *Aaron:* as Priest (Ex. 28:1; Lev. 8:12). 2. *Abel:* Christ as Shepherd (Gen. 4:2). 3. *Acacia Wood:* the humanity of Christ and His origin as a “root out of dry ground” (Ex. 26:15; Isa. 53:2). 4. *Adam:* Christ, Head of the New Creation as Adam is of the Old Creation (Gen. 5:1; Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:22). 5. *Altar of Brass:* Type of cross upon which Christ was offered (Ex. 27:1). 6. *Altar of Incense:* Type of Christ our Intercessor, through whom our prayers and

praises ascend to God (Ex. 30:1; John 17:1–26; Heb. 7:25; 13:15; Rev. 8:3, 4). 7. *Ark of the Covenant* (Ex. 25:10): Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 101, note 1. 8. *Ark of Noah:* Type of Christ as salvation from judgment (Gen. 6:14; Heb. 11:7). 9. *Beauty and Bands* (Zech. 11:7): Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 975, note 1. 10. *Benjamin* (Gen. 35:18; 43:34): a. *Ben-oni:* Son of Sorrow, to his mother. b. *Benjamin:* Son of my right hand, to his father. See Scofield Bible, p. 51, note 3; p. 62, note 1. 11. *The Two Birds* (Lev. 14:4): a. *The Slain Bird:* death of Christ. b. *The Live Bird Dipped in Blood:* resurrection of Christ. 12. *Sacrificial Blood* (Lev. 17:11): See Scofield Bible, p. 150, note 1, 2. 13. *Burnt-Offering* (Lev. 1:3): See Scofield Bible, p. 126. a. *Ox:* patient and enduring servant. b. *Sheep or lamb:* unresisting surrender to death of cross (John 1:29; Isa. 53:7). c. *Goat:* typifies Christ as sinner's Substitute. d. *Turtle-dove or pigeon:* mourning innocency and poverty of Son of man. 14. *Golden Candlestick* (Lampstand): Type of Christ our Light (Ex. 25:31; cf. John 1:4; Isa. 11:2; Heb. 1:9). 15. *Corn of the Promised Land:* Type of Christ Risen and Glorified (Josh. 5:11). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 263, note 2. 16. *David as King* (1 Chron. 17:7): David first shepherd, then king. Cf. Scofield Bible, pp. 475–76, note 2. 17. *First Three of Feasts of Jehovah* (Lev. 23:1–14): a. *Passover:* Christ our Redeemer (Ex. 12:11; 1 Cor. 5:7). b. *Unleavened Bread:* Holy Walk of Believer with Christ (1 Cor. 5:6–8; 2 Cor. 7:1; Gal. 5:7–9). c. *First-fruits:* Christ risen (1 Cor. 15:23). 18. *Gate or Door:* only one door to the tabernacle (Ex. 27:16; John 10:7). 19. *The Two Goats* (Lev. 16:5–10). a. *Goat sacrificed:* typical of Christ's death satisfying all of God's righteous demands (Rom. 3:24–26). b. *Scapegoat:* typical of Christ taking our sins from before God (Heb. 9:26; Rom. 8:33, 34). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 147, note 1. 20. *Isaac* (Gen. 21:3; 22:9; 24:1): a. *As obedient unto death* (Gen. 22:9). b. *As bridegroom of called-out bride* (Gen. 24). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 31, note 2; p. 33, note 1; p. 34, note 2. 21. *Joseph* (Gen. 37:2). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 53, note 2. 22. *Joshua* (Josh. 1:1): Name means, "Jehovah-Savior." Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 259, note 1. 23. *Kinsman-Redeemer* (Lev. 25:49; Isa. 59:20; Ruth 2:1; 3:10–18; 4:1–10). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 161, note 1; p. 765, note 1. 24. *Laver:* Type of Christ cleansing from defilement (Ex. 30:18; John 13:2–10; Eph. 5:25–27; 1 John 1:9). 25. *Light:* Type of Christ the Light of the World (Gen. 1:16; 1 John 1:5). 26. *Manna:* Type of Christ as the Bread of Life come down from heaven (Ex. 16:35; Josh. 5:11). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 91, note 1; p. 263, note 2. 27. *Meal-offering:* Christ in His perfect humanity tested by suffering (Lev. 2:1). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 127, note 3. 28. *Melchizedek:* Type of Christ as Resurrected King-Priest (Gen. 14:18; Psa. 110:4; Heb. 6:20; 7:23, 24). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 23, note 1. 29. *Moses:* Type of Christ as Deliverer and Prophet (Ex. 2:2). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 72, note 1. 30. *Nazarite:* Separated wholly to God (Num. 6:2). Cf. Scofield Bible, pp. 173–74, note 2. 31. *Peace-offering:* Christ made peace, proclaimed peace, is our peace (Lev. 3:1; Col. 1:20; Eph. 2:14, 17). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 128, note 4. 32. *Ram:* Type of Christ our Substitute (Gen. 22:9; Lev. 16:3; Heb. 10:5–10). 33. *Red Heifer:* Sacrifice of Christ as ground of believer's cleansing (Num. 19:2; 1 John 1:7, 9). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 192, note 1. 34. *Rock:* Christ smitten to make possible the outpouring of the Spirit (Ex. 17:6; Num. 20:8; Matt. 21:44; 1 Pet. 2:8; 1 Cor. 10:4). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 193, note 1. 35. *Rod of Aaron:* Type of Christ in Resurrection (Num. 17:8). 36. *Serpent of Brass:* Type of Christ made sin for us (Num. 21:9; John 3:14). 37. *Showbread:* Type of Christ as Bread of Life (Ex. 25:30). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 102, note 1. 38. *Sin-offering:* Christ seen in sinner's place (Lev. 4:3). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 129, note 1. 39. *Sweet Savor Offerings:* Christ in His perfections offering His merit for us (Lev. 1:9). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 127, note 2. 40. *Trespass-offering:* Christ atoning for injury of sin (Lev. 5:6; 7:1–7; Psa. 51:4). 41. *Veil of Tabernacle:* Type of Christ's body, through which we have access to God (Ex. 26:31; Matt. 26:26; 27:50; Heb. 10:20). Cf. Scofield Bible, p. 104, note 1.—Pp. 9–11

2. The Prophecies. Again, there is incorporated into this text the admirable listing of Old Testament prophecies respecting Christ which is also used in Dr. Walvoord's unpublished notes on Christology: *Introduction.* The word *Messiah* is a modified form of the Greek representation of the Hebrew or Aramaic *māshīaḥ*, the equivalent Greek word being *Christos.* Its root meaning is that of *the anointed one*, used in adjective form for priests in the Old Testament (Lev. 4:3, 5, 16; 6:22), and for kings as a noun (cf. Saul, 1 Sam. 24:6, 10; David, 2 Sam. 19:21; 23:1; Zedekiah, Lam. 4:20). Cf. *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, s.v.*, 'Messiah.'

> Two types of Messianic prophecies may be observed in the Old Testament particularly: (1)*General:* language only a Messiah could fulfill. Illus., 1 Sam. 2:35.
>
> (2)*Personal:* connected with the Messiah by some specific term. Illus., Isa. 7:14, *Immanuel.*
>
> Both types of Messianic prophecy are genuine and contribute vitally to the sum of the doctrine. Naturally, when prophecy is connected with the Messiah by some specific term its Messianic character is more easily established.
>
> Four important characteristics of Messianic prophecy may be observed: (1) *Prophecy purposely in obscure language.* An examination of Messianic prophecy will reveal that it is frequently given in obscure language such as only Spirit-led believers will discern as constituting genuine Messianic prediction. This feature, of course, may be noted in prophecy on most subjects. The entire content of Scripture is designed to require spiritual illumination for its understanding.
>
> (2) *Prediction frequently in figurative language.* While figurative language is not necessarily uncertain in its meaning, the predictions of the Messiah are often clothed in language which requires interpretation. For instance, Christ is spoken of as a "rod out of the stem of Jesse," and as "a branch" which "shall grow out of his roots" (Isa. 11:1).
>
> (3) *The future is often regarded as past or present.* As in all prophecy, Messianic prediction is often viewed as an account of events already past. For instance, the great prophecies of Isa. 53 are largely in past tense. The Hebrew frequently uses the perfect for prophecy. According to A. B. Davidson's Hebrew Grammar, "This usage is very common in the elevated language of the Prophets, whose faith and imagination so vividly project before them the event or scene which they predict that it appears already realized. It is part of the purpose of God, and therefore, to the clear eyes of the prophet, already as good as accomplished (*prophetic perfect*)" (pp. 156–57). The use of the perfect tense, then, in the Old Testament merely conceives of the event as certain of completion without specifying whether it is past, present, or future.
>
> (4) *Prophecy is seen horizontally, not vertically.* While the order of prophetic events is generally revealed in Scripture, prophecy does not necessarily include all the intermediate steps between the great events in view. The great mountain peaks of prophecy are revealed without consideration of the expanse of valleys between the peaks. Hence, Old Testament prophecy often leaps from the sufferings of Christ to His glory without consideration of the time which elapses between these aspects. It is not unusual for great periods of time to separate prophecies closely related (cf. Isa. 61:1–2; Luke 4:18–19).—PP. 11–12

An Old Testament Theology which aims at completeness will include its Theology Proper, its Angelology, its Anthropology, its hamartiology, its

Soteriology, its Pneumatology, and its Christology. No work like this exists and the theological world has long awaited its appearance. The value of such a work beyond the effective truth it develops will be both to demonstrate the scope of truth accorded the Old Testament saints and to enhance the esteem and veneration of the Old Testament which is due it and yet so generally withheld from it.

Chapter III

The Birth and Childhood of Christ Incarnate

Attention is again called to the distinction between the birth of Christ and the incarnation, the former being but an incident of all that enters into the latter. The incarnation—that stupendous enterprise of God —comprehends the advent of the Second Person of the Godhead into the human family and with a view to an everlasting participation therein. This advent is one of the seven greatest divine undertakings in the history of the universe—the creation of the angels, the creation of material things including life on the earth, the incarnation, the death of the incarnate One, the resurrection of the incarnate One, His return in glory, and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth. The enormity of the meaning of the incarnation could not be comprehended by human understandings. It belongs to the sphere of heaven, though the gracious redemptive purpose affords some light on that work which would otherwise be inexplainable.

I. The Birth

Granting that it was the divine purpose that the Second Person should enter the human realm and become truly man, by what method might He best attain that end? He must have His own identified human spirit, soul, and body; but these would not be secured if He merely took possession of or appropriated some existing human being. That kind of arrangement would result in no more than an indwelling. On the other hand, He would not simply appear among men as one of them without a natural human origin. In such a case His true humanity could never be established nor His rightful relation to the people of the earth. It thus became essential that a member of the Godhead when entering the human family should enter as all others do. By such a procedure no question may be raised about the genuineness of His humanity or the permanency of it. It is true that, because of His unchangeable Deity, He could not be born of a human father. Had He been born of a human father and mother there would have been nothing to identify His humanity as the rightful property of His Deity. On the other hand, had He appeared with no relation to human parentage, there would

have been no legitimate basis for the fact of His humanity. The divinely wrought arrangement by which He is generated of the Holy Spirit and born of a woman is the perfect solution of the problem. Cavil about whether the mother may impart a complete human nature and perpetuate a racial stock is silenced by the testimony of the Scriptures to the truth that He, though generated by the Holy Spirit, did possess a complete humanity—spirit, soul, and body. He is of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, and the Heir to David's throne. To this body of evidence for His complete humanity may be added the genealogies which trace His human origin back to Abraham and to Adam. This perfect human kinship was demanded if He, as Mediator, undertook the work of redemption. He must be of the Adamic stock with the clearest title and the Fulfiller of the Abrahamic covenant of promise, which covenant stipulates that through Abraham's seed all nations of the earth would be blessed. To the end that this unique Person might sit on David's throne, He must be in the direct line of David and the rightful heir to that throne. Accordingly and in the faithfulness of God, the Second Person in becoming man is born into the Adamic race and became the rightful Fulfiller of the covenants by being born of the stock of Israel, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, and of the kingly line of David.

In presenting this incomparable theanthropic Person, the Scriptures assert by another line of incontrovertible testimony that, in the incarnation, this Person retained His Deity undiminished and untarnished. With respect to the presence of Deity in this unique Person, it may be observed that since a person—divine or human—cannot be divided, increased, or decreased, there could be no lessening of the divine presence. Deity is either present or not present at all—other than as He is omnipresent. To aver that God was in Christ is to aver that all of God was in Christ, and to this sublime truth the Scriptures testify: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell" (Col. 1:19); "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (2:9). It is therefore certain that from that moment when Christ became a theanthropic Person—whether at birth or before—undiminished Deity was present in Him, not as a Person of the Godhead now indwells the believer, but present in the sense that Deity was the essential feature of that Person. As other men are threefold in their beings—body, soul, and spirit—this incomparable Person is fourfold, namely, Deity, human body, human soul, and human spirit. In so far as a Person of the Godhead may be

localized or maintain an identity of existence, the localized Second Person is where this unique theanthropic Person is. For thirty-three years He was here on the earth; since then He has been seated at the Father's right hand in glory. That incomparable Person will return to the earth and reign. As an accommodation to the human emphasis upon material things it is natural to imply that wherever His humanity is there His Deity is also. On the other hand, the true consideration would be that wherever His Deity determines to be, there His humanity must of necessity be. While thus recognizing the true and perfect humanity which the Second Person acquired through the virgin birth, it is, nevertheless, the undiminished and unalterable Deity which is the primary factor in this unique theanthropic Christ of God.

Similarly, in spite of the fact that the Second Person entered a race every member of which without exception, other than Himself, is utterly ruined by sin, yet is Deity in no way injured by that kinsmanship. Since it is universal, it is natural to suppose that the sinfulness of mankind is an integral feature of a human being. However, it will be remembered that sin entered as an intrusion into the lives of those who by creation were without the taint of sin upon them. Therefore, it should not be deemed incredible that another Adam should arise who is equally unsullied and that He, being very God, could never fall through sin. The humanity of Christ presents certain parallels as well as contrasts when compared to the unfallen humanity of Adam.

First, an important distinction is to be seen in the manner in which these two Adams entered upon their human career. The first Adam was a direct creation of God and therefore was possessed of a sin-free existence through his creation. Sinlessness is guaranteed in the first Adam on the ground of the truth that God would create no sinful being. Over against this, the Last Adam entered into this human existence by a birth; yet is protected from the virus of inherited sin by a special divine intervention. Here two factors must be valued: (1) with regard to the generation of the humanity of the theanthropic Person it should be noted that the Generator is also a member of the Godhead and that His contribution or impartation is thus from a sinless source. It was the Spirit's work to beget the humanity of Christ. (2) This is a different matter than it would be if it were a begetting of Christ's Deity. It has too often been assumed that Christ received His Deity from the divine Parent and His humanity from the human parent; but on the divine

side He was never thus generated or in any sense the product of another. He was Himself Deity, and that which He had always been was joined in everlasting identification with His humanity. The generating work of the Holy Spirit remains a mystery; not is the generating work of a human father free from that which is mysterious. He who creates all things causes a virgin to conceive and thus to bear a Son. This creative act is to the end that the humanity of Christ may be secured. It follows, therefore, that whatever part of this unique child is wrought by the Holy Spirit will be as sinless as the Creator who produced it. A difficulty arises in some minds respecting the mother who herself acknowledged her need of a Savior (cf. Luke 1:47). Though it be declared in Hebrews 4:15 that the Lord Jesus Christ was without a sin nature, the central text on this truth is found in Luke 1:35, which records the words of the angel to Mary. The passage states, "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Mary had been told previously (cf. vs. 31) that she would bring forth a son. In this statement no unnatural procedure is implied; but when she is told that the Generator would be the Holy Spirit she is also told that the child would be Himself holy and legitimately and properly the Son of God. The fallen nature of the mother is divinely precluded. This is the meaning of the assurance that the son she would bear would be holy. Care must be exercised in this contemplation lest the impression obtain that God who is not human could not generate the humanity of Christ. He who created the first Adam can generate the humanity of the Last Adam. In this the Holy Spirit is not so much a progenerator as He is a Creator. The unfallen estate, which in the case of the first Adam was guaranteed by the direct creation of the holy God, is in the case of the Last Adam guaranteed by revealed truth that it is generated by the Holy Spirit with a divine control of that which the woman might contribute.

Second, another and equally important difference between the unfallen humanity of Adam and that of Christ is that Adam stood alone with no relation to any other, while the humanity of Christ was and is indissolubly joined to Deity. It is true that unsupported humanity, such as that belonging to Adam, might sin; contrariwise in the case of the theanthropic Person, human traits which involved no moral issues —such as weariness, hunger,

thirst—could be experienced, but it is equally true that whatever the humanity of Christ did His Deity also did. Since God cannot be compromised with evil, the normal capacity of unfallen humanity to sin, as that humanity was represented in Christ, could never be exercised to the slightest degree. An unfallen human nature which is welded to God cannot sin since God cannot sin. Some theologians have been satisfied with the weaker contention that Christ, because of His wisdom and divine strength, *would* not sin, and no more assurance of Christ's impeccability is claimed by them. This position ignores the truth that God *cannot* sin. To say that God cannot sin does not deprive Him of any divine attribute or competency. Sin is that accursed thing which has ruined God's creation, but it cannot ruin God. Those who assert that Christ could have sinned must aver that either Christ is not God or that God may Himself be ruined by sin. Since every position held by the Christian is gained only by the fact that he is in the resurrected Christ, it would be a serious jeopardy to those positions if it were true that the Last Adam might fall as the first Adam fell. If Christ could have sinned on earth, He can sin in heaven. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. If He can sin now, there is no final assurance that He will not sin and thus bring every human hope based on redemption into ruin. Such conclusions are an insult against God and cannot be tolerated by those who bow in adoration before the Christ of God.

Christ might be styled the super-supernatural One, since He was not only supernatural in His original divine existence, but when Deity and sinless humanity are combined in one Person that which is utterly new both to Deity and to humanity emerges. The two natures combine in one Person. He is no longer God alone, nor is He man alone. He is not two Persons; He is one. He is the theanthropic Person—the first, the last, and the only One of His kind in heaven or on earth. Deity has not in this instance taken loosely an indeterminate or equivocal relation to humanity. In Christ, Deity and humanity are joined in one Person as the immaterial and material are joined in one human being. The two natures in Christ may be considered separately, but they cannot be separated.

Writing of the peculiar characteristics of this unique Person and the manner in which He is presented in the Scriptures, Dr. B. B. Warfield says:

The doctrine of the Two Natures of Christ is not merely the synthesis of the teaching of the New Testament, but the conception which underlies every one of the New Testament writings severally; it is not only the teaching of the New Testament as a whole but of the whole of the New Testament, part by part. Historically, this means that not only has the doctrine of the Two Natures been the invariable presupposition of the whole teaching of the church from the apostolic age down, but all the teaching of the apostolic age rests on it as its universal presupposition. When Christian literature begins, this is already the common assumption of the entire church. If we wish to translate this into the terms of positive chronology, what must be said is that before the opening of the sixth decade of the first century (for we suppose that I Thessalonians must be dated somewhere about 52 A.D.), the doctrine of the Two Natures already is firmly established in the church as the universal foundation of all Christian thinking concerning Christ. Such a mere chronological statement, however, hardly does justice to the case. What needs to be emphasized is that there is no Christian literature in existence which does not base itself, as upon an already firmly laid foundation, on the doctrine of the Two Natures. So far as Christian literature can bear testimony, there never has been any other doctrine recognized in the church. This literature itself goes back to within twenty years or so of the death of Christ; and of course—since it did not create but reflects this faith—has a restrospective value as testimony to the faith of Christians… Thus we are brought to the final issue. The two-natured Christ is the synthesis of the whole mass of biblical data concerning Christ. The doctrine of the Two Natures underlies all the New Testament writings severally, and it is commended to us by the combined authority of all those primitive followers of Christ who have left written records of their faith. It is the only doctrine of Christ which can be discerned lying back of our formal records in pre-written tradition; it is the aboriginal faith of the Christian community. It is the only alternative to a non-existent Christ; we must choose between a two-natured Christ and a simply mythical Christ. By as much as "Jesus lived," by so much is it certain that the Jesus who lived is the person who alone is witnessed to us as having lived—the Jesus who, being Himself of heavenly origin and superior to the very angels, had come to earth on a mission of mercy, to seek and save those who are lost, and who, after He had given His life a ransom for many, was to come again on the clouds of heaven to judge the world. No other Jesus than this ever lived. No doubt He lived as man, His life adorned with all the gracious characteristics of a man of God. But He cannot be stripped of His divine claims. We have already had occasion to advert to the gross contradiction which is involved in supposing that such a man as He was could have preserved that fine flavor of humility toward God which characterized His whole life-manifestation and yet have falsely imagined Himself that exalted being in whose fancied personality He lived out His life on earth. The trait which made it possible for Him to put Himself forward as the Fellow of God would have made the humility of heart and demeanor which informed all His relations with God impossible. Our modern humanitarians, of course, gloze the psychological contradiction; but they cannot withhold recognition of the contrast of traits which must be accredited to any Jesus who can really be believed—even on their postulates—to have ever existed. For example, H. Werner (*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, May, 1911, p. 389) exclaims, "He was at the same time humble and proud, acute-minded and weak-minded, clear-sighted and blind, sober-minded and fanatical, with profound knowledge of men and no self-knowledge, clear in his insight of the present, and full of fantastic dreams of the future. His life was, as Lipsius strikingly said, 'a tragedy of fanaticism.'" Standing before this puzzle of His life-manifestation, Adolf Harnack writes: "Only one who has had a kindred experience could go to the bottom here. A prophet might perhaps attempt to lift the veil; such as we must be content to assure ourselves that the Jesus who taught self-knowledge

and humility, yet gave to himself, and to himself alone, the name of the Son of God."—*Christology and Criticism*, pp. 285–86; 303–4

II. The Childhood

Being appointed to write of Christ's humanity, Luke has given the more complete account of the birth and childhood of Christ, though Matthew, who was appointed to write of the kingliness of Christ, has, in accordance with that which concerns a king, recorded His birth, His parentage, His name, and traced the divine protection over Him. As Luke traces the genealogy from Adam—the head of the human race—so Matthew traces His genealogy from Abraham through David; and the Scriptures are careful to state that both Mary and the foster father Joseph are in the Davidic line. Since Mark declares the servanthood of Christ, there is no occasion for him to include a genealogy; and since John portrays the Deity of the Savior, there is for the eternal Logos no ancestry. The two genealogies—important per se—constitute a study in themselves.

There were three appointed events in the life of a male child in Israel—*circumcision* at the time he was eight days old (Lev. 12:3), *presentation* at the time he was forty days old (Lev. 12:4–7), and *confirmation* at twelve years of age (Ex. 34:23; 23:17)—and the male children began to be numbered at twelve years of age. In the case of the male child appointed to public service there was a recognition and consecration when the appointed service began, but not until the man was at least thirty years of age (Num. 4:3). So far as the observance of the three events is concerned, the law which required them was observed perfectly. In connection with the fourth, Christ, being thirty years of age, was set apart and consecrated by His baptism. Of this more is due to be said in the following chapter.

On the human side, "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him" (Luke 2:40), and "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man" (Luke 2:52). Each phase of these declarations is revealing. They record the development of One far removed from that which is normal in childhood. That which would differentiate Him from all others is the fact that He never even to the least degree committed any sin. He came to maturity and to His public ministry without having wrought or even thought that which would

be unworthy of God. He went to the cross as the spotless Lamb of God, holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. The manner of His appearance in the temple at twelve years of age confirms the distinctive character of the Christ child. Yet in all His purity and sinlessness which so completely set Him apart from all others and unto God, He is said to have been "subject" to His legal parents. The entire thirty years must be judged by these meager disclosures, but they suffice, if thoughtfully contemplated, to reveal the incomparable babyhood, childhood, youth, and young manhood of the Christ of God. Mary indeed had many things to ponder and many sayings to keep in her heart.

Thus the theanthropic Person entered the human family. His advent—the importance of which is knowledge-surpassing—had been anticipated throughout the sacred Scriptures by all the prophets and seers. That expectation traces Him from the protevangelium of Genesis 3:15 to His return to the earth in glory. He is the blessing of all nations in the Abrahamic promise, the Shiloh of the tribe of Judah, the everlasting King on David's throne, and the virgin-born son foreseen by Isaiah. It is the burden of each of the two major passages which predict His birth that He should be born in the Davidic line and sit on David's throne forever (cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:31–33). Of the two great divine purposes—one for the earth centered in Israel and one for heaven centered in the Church—Christ is the Executor and Consummator of each. As the everlasting occupant of David's throne, the whole earth shall be filled with His glory. As the Lamb whose blood of redemption was shed and who arose from the dead, He became the First-Born among many brethren, which company He is bringing unto heaven's glory. Now He became a son in a fivefold sense—the Son of Adam, the Son of Abraham, the Son of David, the Son of Mary, and the Son of God. Likewise, Christ was the fourfold expectation of Jehovah to come. On this aspect of truth Dr. C. I. Scofield has written, "(1) 'The Branch of Jehovah' (Isa. 4:2), that is, the 'Immanuel' character of Christ (Isa. 7:14) to be fully manifested to restored and converted Israel after His return in divine glory (Mt. 25:31); (2) the 'Branch of David' (Isa. 11:1; Jer. 23:5; 33:15), that is, the Messiah, 'of the seed of David according to the flesh' (Rom. 1:3), revealed in His earthly glory as King of kings, and Lord of lords; (3) Jehovah's 'Servant, the Branch' (Zech. 3:8), Messiah's humiliation and obedience unto death according to Isa. 52:13–15; 53:1–12;

Phil. 2:5–8; (4) the ‘man whose name is the Branch’ (Zech. 6:12–13), that is, His character as Son of man, the ‘last Adam,’ the ‘second Man’ (1 Cor. 15:45–47), reigning, as Priest-King, over the earth in the dominion given to and lost by the first Adam. Matthew is the Gospel of the ‘Branch of David’; Mark of ‘Jehovah’s Servant, the Branch’; Luke of ‘the man whose name is the Branch’; John of ‘the Branch of Jehovah’” (*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 716–17).

By His advent into the world Christ became the Fulfiller of all divine purposes and all Old Testament expectation, and the answer to the need of a lost world.

Chapter IV

The Baptism of Christ Incarnate

This particular discussion of the general theme of the life and ministry of the incarnate Son of God is centered upon one event, namely, His own baptism. In Volume VII of this work the doctrine of water or ritual baptism as related to Jews and Christians will be considered. At this point the contemplation is only of the one peculiar baptism, that of the Christ. No phase of the life of Christ on earth is more misunderstood than His baptism. This misunderstanding is evidenced by the wide variety of more or less contradictory meanings and modes assigned to it. It is obvious that, though all of these assigned meanings and modes might be untrue, not more than one of them could be true. In the light of this confusion of ideas which prevail and the dogmatic way in which theories are expressed, there is need that care be exercised to the end that this subject may be approached in an unprejudiced manner. A complete investigation cannot be introduced here, nor is a desire entertained to engender more strife among those who should, above all things, be of one mind before the unbelieving world. The general questions that need to be answered are, (1) By whom was Christ baptized? (2) For what reason was He baptized? (3) By what mode was He baptized? (4) Is Christ's baptism an example to believers of this dispensation? (5) What other baptisms were experienced by Christ?

I. The Baptizer

It is no small issue to consider who is assigned the task of baptizing the theanthropic Person—one of the Godhead before whom all angels bow in unceasing adoration, the Creator of all things, for whom all things were created and by whom they consist, the everlasting Ruler of the universe, the Redeemer of a lost world, and the final Judge over the creation of God including both angels and men. Later it is revealed that He Himself baptized with the Holy Spirit and with fire. Though some may question why He should be baptized at all, He is nevertheless baptized both by water and by suffering unto death (cf. Matt. 20:20–23 with Matt. 26:42; John 18:11). To John is the high honor given of baptizing the Savior, and John is declared to be the last of the prophets of the old order (cf. Matt. 11:13), that one who was the greatest of all born of woman (cf. Matt. 11:11), and the divinely-

appointed messenger—the forerunner who was specifically sent to announce the advent of Messiah, who is Jehovah. Isaiah predicted of John, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: and the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it" (40:3–5). Malachi also announced as the word of Jehovah, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." This is followed by the anticipated message of John, the character of which is fully in accord with the recorded preaching of John—a comparison which should not be overlooked—for it relates John's ministry, in the main, to the merit system of Moses and not in any way to the grace system which came into effect through the death and resurrection of Christ. The appointment as Jehovah's messenger and forerunner is a responsibility far exceeding that committed to any other man. John was divinely delegated to "prepare the way of" Jehovah-Messiah (cf. Mark 1:2; Acts 19:4), and "that he [Christ] should be made manifest to Israel [and how] "therefore am I come baptizing" (John 1:31). Concerning this, the message of the angel to Zacharias the father of John regarding the birth and service of John, as recorded in Luke 1:13–17, is revealing, "But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." Here it would be well to note the extended description of John's interview with the priests and Levites who were sent to inquire who John might be: "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that

we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; he it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing" (John 1:19–28). This passage is important because of various disclosures which it records; but none more significant than that baptizing by prophets was fully recognized and established in the minds of the authorities as a right procedure, and also that the Messiah would baptize when He came. In this connection, it is needful to consider that the disciples of Messiah did also baptize. Of this fact it is written later on, "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them, and baptized" (3:22). However, in John 4:1–3 it is said that Christ did not Himself baptize. This passage reads, "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) he left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee." The unfavorable reaction of the Pharisees against baptizing on the part of Christ's disciples indicates again that which was generally recognized as the Jewish law respecting the practice of baptism. It is probable that John's baptism served as a sealing of his reformation preaching. The revealing of the Messiah was accomplished when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). Likewise his unique baptism of Christ served to designate the Messiah. With all his divine appointment—of which he was duly conscious, for he said, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias"—John shrank from the responsibility of baptizing Christ. Of this it is written, "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him" (Matt. 3:13–15). The hesitancy of John and the assuring response of

Christ is well pictured by Gregory Thaumaturgus (X, 1184–8), as cited by Dr. J. W. Dale in his *Johannic Baptism* (pp. 404–5):

> "How shall I touch thy undefiled head? How shall I stretch out my right hand over thee who hast stretched out the heavens as a curtain and established the earth upon the waters? How shall I stretch out my servile fingers over thy divine head? How shall I wash the spotless and the sinless? How shall I enlighten the light? How shall I offer prayer for thee who dost receive the prayers of those who know thee not? In baptizing others I baptize into thy name that they may believe upon thee coming with glory; baptizing thee of whom shall I make mention? Into whose name shall I baptize thee? Into the name of the Father? But thou hast all the Father in thyself, and thou art all in the Father. Or, into the name of the Son? But there is no other beside thee, by nature, the Son of God. Or, into the name of the Holy Ghost? But he is in everything united with thee, as of the same nature with thee, and of the same will, and of the same mind, and of the same power, and of the same honor, and with thee receives worship from all. Baptize, therefore, if thou wilt, O Lord, baptize me the Baptist. Make me, whom thou hast caused to be born, to be born again. Stretch out thy dread right hand which thou hast prepared for thyself, and crown by thy touch my head, that forerunner of thy kingdom, and crowned like a forerunner, I may preach to sinners, crying unto them: 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. …' Jesus is represented as answering: 'It is necessary that I should, now, be baptized with this baptism, and, hereafter, confer upon all men the baptism of the Trinity. Lend me thy right hand, O Baptist, for the present administration. …Take hold of my head which the Seraphim worship. Baptize me, who am about to baptize them that believe (δι' ὕδατος, καὶ πνεύματος, καὶ πυρὸς) by water, and Spirit, and fire; (ὕδατι) by water, which is able to wash away the filth of sin; (πνεύματι) *by* Spirit, which is able to make the earthy spiritual; (πυρὶ) by fire, consuming, by nature, the thorns of transgressions.' The Baptist having heard these things, stretching out his trembling right hand, baptized the Lord."

It should not be overlooked that John was the son of a priest, Zacharias of the course of Abia, and that his mother was a daughter directly of Aaron (Luke 1:5). John was therefore a priest in his own right, though no record exists that he was consecrated to the priestly office, and no record exists that he was not consecrated. He was rightfully a priest as well as the greatest of the Old Testament prophets, and this fact enters largely into the meaning of his baptizing ministry. It was by this so unusual, God-appointed, and God-provided priest and prophet that Christ was baptized.

II. The Need

Certain theories have been advanced concerning the baptism of Christ, but any theory is doomed to fail which cannot account for the central idea advanced by Christ when He said "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. 3:15). These theories may be mentioned briefly.

First, it is claimed that Christ received John's baptism which was one of repentance and unto the remission of sins. The truth that Christ was sinless to an infinite degree and therefore needed no repentance or remission of sin is not denied by those who make this claim. It is rather asserted that in some way not clearly defined and to some degree Christ was, in His baptism, identifying Himself with sinners, or was already substituting for them as the One who would later take their place in a sacrificial death. Earlier in this work it has been pointed out that the substitutionary redemptive work of Christ was restricted to the sufferings and death of the cross. On this theory and in defense of it, Dean Alford remarks:

> Why should our Lord, who was *without sin*, have come to *a baptism of repentance?* Because He was *made sin for us:* for which reason also He suffered the curse of the law. It became Him, being *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, to go through those appointed rites and purifications which belonged to that flesh. There is no more strangeness in His having been baptized by John, than in His keeping the Passovers. The one rite, as the other, belonged to *sinners*— and *among the transgressors He was numbered.* The prophetic words in Ps. 40:12, spoken in the person of our Lord, indicate, in the midst of sinlessness, the most profound apprehension of the sins of that nature which He took upon him. I cannot suppose the baptism to have been sought by our Lord merely *to honour John*, or as *knowing that it would be the occasion of a divine recognition* of his Messiahship, and thus pre-ordained by God: but *bona fide*, as bearing the infirmities and carrying the sorrows of mankind, and thus beginning here the triple baptism of water, fire, and blood, two parts of which were now accomplished, and of the third of which He himself speaks, Luke 12:50, and the beloved Apostle, 1 John 5:8 —His baptism, as it was our Lord's *closing* act of obedience under the Law, in His hitherto concealed life of legal submission, His fulfilling all righteousness, so was His *solemn inauguration and anointing for the higher official life of mediatorial satisfaction* which was now opening upon Him. See Romans 1:3, 4. We must not forget that the *working out of perfect righteousness in our flesh* by the entire and spotless keeping of God's law (Deut. 6:25), was, in the main, *accomplished during the thirty years previous to our Lord's official ministry.—New Testament for English Readers*, I, 16, on Matt. 3:13

This interpretation of the baptism of Christ, though held by the majority of those who construe water baptism to be a symbol of Christ's burial and resurrection, has never been sustained by Scripture. The weakness of Dean Alford's contention is evidenced when he likens Christ's baptism to His participation in the Passover feast, and when he declares that both baptism and the Passover belong to sinners. Respecting the Passover, it may be said that it was only a memorial which celebrated the time when God passed over and saved His people from death in Egypt. The Passover had no direct meaning respecting the sins of future generations who might celebrate that

feast. Those who in later generations partook of that feast were not relating it to their own sins or expecting God, because of that feast, to pass over their own sins. This whole contention may well be classed as one very strongly asserted but unproved theory. It should be remembered that Christ's early ministry was wholly confined to the nation Israel (cf. Matt. 10:6; 15:24; Rom. 15:8), and that the whole reality of the cross is entered and consummated only when He has been rejected by that nation. It is clear that the cross recognizes the need of the whole world as well as Israel (John 3:16; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2). This theory can incorporate the fulfilling of all righteousness only in the most indirect and unsatisfactory way. What Christ did in baptism was of necessity related to His Israelitish ministry and concerns what to Israel was the fulfilling of all righteousness. There is little basis for a theory which would connect Christ's supposed identification with sinners through baptism with the fulfilling of all righteousness.

Second, it is claimed that by His baptism Christ was set apart to His Messianic ministry. In this connection it is suggested that as the kingdom in which Messiah is to reign will be ushered in by the bringing in of everlasting righteousness (cf. Dan. 9:24), there is some reference to this in Christ's words to John about fulfilling all righteousness. This theory is especially weak in that there is no real connection between these two references to righteousness, nor is there a Biblical ground upon which the theory might rest.

Third, it is also advanced as a hypothesis that Christ in His baptism was taking His supposed part with the godly remnant who responded out of Israel to the preaching of John; but, again, there is no well- defined basis for this supposition that by so doing Christ fulfilled all righteousness.

Fourth, it is pointed out that the three events—the baptism, the transfiguration, and the future seating of Christ on David's throne (cf. Matt. 3:16–17; 17:5; Ps. 2:6–7)—are signalized by a divine voice from heaven. It is believed that the voice will speak again as a divine attestation. It is likewise noted that evidently the transfiguration voice is an attestation of Christ's prophetic ministry since in all three accounts the words are added "Hear ye him." Thus the baptism is related to the priestly office and the voice that spoke is the attestation of Christ's appointment as a Priest. It is true that the exercise of the ministry of Priest did not begin until He offered Himself without spot to God, and that the final exercise of the King-Priest

service, which is after the order of Melchizedek, will be manifested in the millennial reign. However, it is reasonable for Christ, having reached the appointed age of thirty years, to be consecrated as Priest. It is significant that when Christ came to be baptized it is declared, “Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age” (Luke 3:23). Such a detail is not added without meaning, and, when reviewing the Mosaic Law, it is discovered that the male child who would enter the priesthood was not eligible to do so until he was thirty years of age (cf. Num. 4:3), and from the added fact that there was no other public ministry to be entered which prescribed its age limits it is reasonable to conclude that the baptism of Christ had to do with His consecration to the priestly office. It will be remembered that Christ was of the tribe of Judah and that, according to the Mosaic Law, no priest could naturally arise from Judah; yet none can question that Christ is a Priest, both as typified by Aaron and after the order of Melchizedek. The Epistle to the Hebrews, chapters 5 to 10, is a setting forth of the truth that Christ is a Priest. Hebrews 7:14–17 states, “For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.” Thus it is divinely acknowledged that Christ’s priesthood was exceptional in character. Not only does He arise out of Judah, but He follows the similitude of Melchizedek, who was not of Aaron’s line, nor was he of Israel at all. Since Christ’s priesthood is so much an exception, it is reasonable to expect that the consecration will be exceptional; and it was. It was accomplished by John who not only surpassed the high priest in divine appointment, but surpassed all Old Testament prophets in authority and divine recognition. In fact, one of John’s divine commissions was thus to introduce the Messiah—Israel’s Prophet, Priest, and King. It only remains to emphasize the truth that, according to the Mosaic Law which God Himself decreed and which the people were taught to honor, every priest must be ordained and Christ, being a Priest, was allowed no exception in the matter of ordination. His compliance with the divinely established law constituted the fulfilling of all righteousness. “The righteousness of the law” is a phrase which means

nothing else other than that the law is fulfilled to the last degree (cf. Rom. 2:26; 8:4).

It may be concluded, then, that Christ, though of the tribe of Judah and not therefore to be recognized as a Priest by any high priest, is nevertheless the consummating Priest, and that He, in compliance with the law which Jehovah established, was consecrated or ordained to the priestly office, and, in doing so, He, whose earth-life was lived under the law and who perfectly observed the law, fulfilled all righteousness in the respect that He was duly set apart to the priestly office. He who was disqualified according to the rules imposed upon the high priest as to who might be ordained to priesthood, was ordained by God's appointed priest and prophet of whom Christ Himself said, "a prophet … and more than a prophet," and among those born of women no greater than John had arisen (Matt. 11:9, 11). No more vital thing could be done in preparing the way of Jehovah-Messiah (cf. Isa. 40:3; John 1:23) than that the legal dedication of the Priest above all priests should be accomplished.

III. The Mode

In this division of this subject the attempt is made to determine the mode of Christ's baptism. This is not done to induce a discussion relative to the proper mode of Christian baptism; for, as the case is conceived, there is no direct relation existing between the baptism of Christ and the baptism of a believer. A very wide difference also obtains between what is styled *John's baptism* and the baptism of the Messiah by John. Though Christ was baptized by John, it was not John's usual baptism which was one of repentance and unto the remission of sins. As a preparation for the Messiah, a baptism designed for sinners could not be required. As before intimated, all attempts to identify the Messiah with the sins of the people in His baptism are in danger of dishonoring the Lord of Glory, and without Biblical support. The penitence of a sinner is in no way the fulfilling of all righteousness. Whatever involves an absurdity must be deemed untrue. "Repentance," "fruits meet for repentance," and "remission of sins," though the basis of John's baptism, are wholly foreign to the Person of the Lord. He never sinned, therefore He neither repented nor brought forth fruits meet for repentance. Should it be asserted that Christ's baptism was only the form

and not the substance, it is well to remember that no baptism exists apart from its substance. It is clear that John's baptism was not Christian baptism else the Apostle would not have rebaptized the twelve disciples of John—the only instance in the New Testament of rebaptizing (Acts 19:4–5). It is even more clear that Christ's baptism as accomplished by John is not Christian baptism, and the oft-repeated injunction to "follow Christ in baptism" is both unfounded and misleading. Christians may follow Christ in moral or spiritual issues, but not in official acts; and Christ's baptism involved no moral principle other than that it wrought out the peculiar obligation which rested upon Him. The law which engendered this obligation could never apply to a believer in the present age. The familiar injunction, however, usually means no more than that the Christian should submit to the same mode of baptism as that by which it is assumed that Christ was baptized; but by what mode was Christ baptized? This is no new question but is one which, if past controversies disclose anything, will not be determined by any amount of evidence that may be advanced. That Christ was dipped into the river Jordan is purely an inference since there is no such declaration unequivocally set forth in the Scriptures. Had there been such a declaration, more than three-fourths of the church—embracing the vast majority of the great scholars—would hardly be of an opposite mind. An interesting incident is reported by John Goff (*How Was Jesus Baptized and Why?* pp. 1–2) concerning a brilliant lawyer who assumed that Christ was dipped in the river Jordan and who was asked whether, had there been a law in John's day prohibiting dipping as baptism, he could convict John on existing evidence. He supposed that he could do so easily, but he discovered that, when the matter was brought under the acid test of indisputable proof, the evidence was less than circumstantial. Those who in all sincerity contend that Christ was dipped in the river Jordan do so upon two general lines of supposed attestation, namely, the philological evidence, and the inspired record of the baptism of Christ or exegetical evidence.

1. The Philological Evidence. This line of reasoning asserts that the mode of Christ's baptism is determined by the meaning of the word βαπτίζω. This word is used about eighty times in the New Testament and at least twenty of these usages belong to situations in which there could be no physical intusposition or envelopment, and thus the dogmatic declaration

that this word means ‘to dip or plunge’ wherever found in the New Testament is subject to doubt. A more accurate teaching is found in the fact that βαπτίζω, like its kindred word βάπτω, has both a primary and a secondary meaning. Βάπτω is used but three times—twice with its primary meaning, ‘to dip’ (Luke 16:24; John 13:26), and once in its secondary meaning (Rev. 19:13, with the same situation described more definitely in Isa. 63:3). Where the secondary meaning is used, the physical dipping disappears and an object, such as Christ’s garment, is connected with βάπτω if it be dyed or stained by any means. Similarly, βαπτίζω appears with a primary meaning which is ‘to immerse or to submerge,’ i.e., dispatch with but one motion, all of which gives no authority for the lifting out (as true also in the case of βάπτω) from the submerged state, while the secondary meaning recognizes that the object has been brought under some power or influence, or been characterized by some baptizing agent. Those who hold that ritual baptism calls for a complete envelopment in water contend that, on the ground of the primary meaning of the word βαπτίζω, Christ was thus baptized; however, the priests of the old order were, when inducted into the priestly office, sprinkled with water and anointed with oil—the latter a symbol of the Holy Spirit. So Christ, when consecrated as a Priest, was baptized with water and anointed with the Holy Spirit. The meaning of βαπτίζω being that a thoroughly changed condition is secured by the influence of the baptizing agent, so Christ by a formal baptism with water was thoroughly changed to the extent that He was constituted a Priest according to the Mosaic requirements.

It will be remembered that the present discussion is restricted to the mode of Christ’s baptism. It remains to demonstrate, as far as may be possible, that Christ entered the priestly office in the manner prescribed by the Mosaic Law. According to that requirement, He was set apart by the administration of water and by the anointing of the Spirit when the Spirit descended upon Him in the form of a dove. As these two features answered the demands of the law, they constituted the fulfilling of all righteousness. Of the four early dates mentioned in the earth-life of Christ—circumcised on the eighth day; presented on the fortieth day; confirmed in the temple at twelve years of age; and consecrated, if entering the priesthood, at thirty years of age—each one is a definite compliance with the Mosaic Law. His consecration at thirty years was as much prescribed as was circumcision on

the eighth day, and Christ fulfilled all righteousness by being circumcised the eighth day.

If it be true that Christ's baptism was His formal induction into the office of Priest, it only remains to discover by what mode priests of the Mosaic system were consecrated; for His baptism, if it fulfilled all righteousness, could not depart from the specified requirements of the law. Though in Exodus 28:1–29:37, Leviticus 8:1–9:24, Numbers 8:5–26 the full requirement for the entrance into the priesthood is prescribed, nearly all of those portions of Scripture apply to the problem of bringing sinful men into that holy office. None of those features was very appropriate for the sinless Son of God. In fact, only the dedication by baptism and the anointing with oil (Ex. 29:4, 7) could be applicable to Christ. With regard to the ceremonial application of water—in the Old Testament by sprinkling and not by dipping—only the thought of a formal setting apart is found in Christ's baptism, and with no reference to cleansing. As the Old Testament priest was anointed with oil as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, Christ was anointed with the Spirit Himself. It should be remembered that these contrasts and similarities are between the Old Testament priest and Christ, and that there is another and far different group of contrasts and comparisons to be seen between the Old Testament priest and the New Testament believer who is a priest unto God. It is of great importance to recognize that because it involved the unique, sinless Person—Jehovah—Messiah—who is the eternal divine Priest who came, not from Aaron's line, but from the tribe of Judah—a minister not of a fallen people, but to a fallen people —the baptism of Christ must ever be classed by itself and rated as an official act which, because of its distinctiveness, could not be compliance in every respect to a law designed for sinful men who entered the priesthood, nor a pattern for New Testament believer-priests who come after Him. No baptism before or since could be for the same purpose as was the baptism of Christ. Though a fuller discussion of the meaning of βαπτίζω is reserved for later consideration of the believer's baptism, it may be restated here that there is nothing in the meaning of the word used in the New Testament respecting Christ's baptism nor in the demands of the law which He fulfilled which necessitates the belief that Christ was dipped in water. In truth, such a baptism would have been a violation of the law.

2. The Exegetical Evidence. In this particular division of the general theme of the baptism of Christ the entire baptizing ministry of John is indirectly involved; for in the midst of that ministry, with regard to its location and the features employed, Christ's baptism occurred. The facts relative to John's baptism, with which the baptism of Christ is associated, are found in the passages here listed.

Matthew 3:1–2. "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Though throughout Jewish history many may have administered baptism, but one is designated *the Baptist*, and doubtless in part because of the great number who came to him for baptism and more specifically because of his mission as the one divinely appointed to baptize Christ.

Matthew 3:11. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance" (cf. Mark 1:7–8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33).

In this passage, as in another of those cited with it where the word also occurs, the translation of ἐν by the word *with* as indication of the instrumental baptizing agent is justified. The setting up of the Holy Spirit's relation to the believer is also a baptism which Christ as the baptizing agent accomplished. A certain group would force a rendering of ἐν πνεύματι and ἐν ὕδατι—wholly similar in form—by translating the words '*into* the Spirit' and '*into* water'; but the great majority of scholars sustain the Authorized rendering, namely, '*with*' the Spirit and '*with*' water.

Matthew 3:6. "And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

Mark 1:4–5. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judæa, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."

Luke 3:3. "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

John 3:22–23. "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized."

John 10:40. “And went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized; and there he abode.”

Uniformly in these passages (two passages use another word) the word ἐν would be rightly rendered *at*, and with reference to locality Mark 1:5 is no exception to this interpretation. John was baptizing at the Jordan—a territorial locality—and not *into* Jordan.

Mark 1:9. “And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.”

This one passage—the only one—seems at first sight and because the preposition is εἰς to teach that John’s baptism was actually *into* Jordan. If the passages is rendered thus, it will either contradict or go beyond all other passages, for the other passages, as indicated above, treat Jordan as a specific geographical locality. The Jordan, or the river Jordan, is where John baptized, however, and not the water into which he baptized. This exceptional passage, therefore, calls for careful consideration. The sentence which this text sets forth, it will be seen, is subject to change in order, that is, the phrase, “and was baptized of John,” may rightly be treated as parenthetical and introduced at the end as well as in the midst of the main declaration. Thus the reading could just as well be, “Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to [unto or into] the Jordan [locality] and was baptized of John.” By such an arrangement, which is fully justified, this Scripture conforms to all other similar passages and does not introduce an idea which is nowhere else advanced in the New Testament. Matthew 3:13 is of particular interest on this point, which reads, “Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to [ἐπί] Jordan unto [πρός] John, to be baptized of him.” Naturally, for those who are persuaded that the name *Jordan* means water and not locality and that the verb *baptize* necessitates a physical intusposition, the discussion is closed and sealed; but such closing and sealing has no sure ground on which to rest. The term *Jordan*, which includes the water, the banks, and the territory adjacent, does not in New Testament usage mean simply water, nor does the presence of the verb *to baptize* have any power to require that the term *Jordan* shall mean water. It is, however, asserted that Christ was baptized by John in the locality known as Jordan. All else about proximity to the water and the precise mode of baptism employed must be determined from other sources.

Respecting the one passage in question, Dr. Dale quotes Dr. R. Wilson, Professor of Sacred Literature, Royal College, Belfast, thus: "The preposition εἰς with a word *supposed* to signify the baptizing element, forms the regimen of βαπτίζω, in one solitary occurrence. The unique exception to which we refer is found in Mark 1:9, 'He was baptized of John in Jordan.' On this construction great stress has been laid, as if it necessarily affirmed that our blessed Lord was dipped into the river of Israel.… We are not disposed, however, to surrender to our opponents the preposition εἰς in this important testimony. Supported by the authority of New Testament usage, we maintain that in numerous constructions, several of them closely parallel to the example before us, εἰς is employed where motion is not indicated by the verb with which it stands connected, and where, therefore, the rendering *into* is totally incompatible with the existing syntax. Bruder, in his *Concordance* to the Greek Testament, enumerates not fewer than *sixty-five* instances of this construction, and among them he includes the text under discussion" (*Op. cit.*, p. 380). And Dr. Dale adds that the interpretation of Mark 1:9 as a dipping in the river Jordan involves six assumptions, which he enumerates as follows: "It has been assumed by writers, on the mere ground of the juxtaposition of words, that 'Jesus was dipped into the Jordan." This assumption cannot be made without a handful of other assumptions: 1. The assumption, that εἰς, here, means 'into,' while, elsewhere, it means *unto.* 2. The assumption, that 'Jordan,' here, means *water*, while, elsewhere, it means *locality.* 3. The assumption, that the phrase εἰς ᾽Ιορδάνην is complementary to βαπτίζω, which assumption is based on a previous assumption, that the phrase denotes *water*, and which assumption rests on the antecedent assumption, that proximity makes complement. 4. The assumption, that βαπτίζω is, here, used in a primary and literal sense, while, elsewhere, it is used in a secondary and figurative sense. 5. The assumption, that βαπτίζω here means *dip*, while, elsewhere, and everywhere, it has no such meaning. 6. The assumption, that Mark in relating the same transaction which is related by Matthew, gives an entirely different representation from his fellow Evangelist, while his language is capable of the most absolute unity of interpretation" (*Ibid.*, p. 384).

IV. Christ's Baptism and Christian Baptism

To the reader who is dependent on the English translation as set forth in the Authorized Version, there is confusion engendered by the varying translations of four prepositions employed in the original text. These are:

ἐν. A word which is given a very great variety of meanings, and, as stated above, does not necessarily need to be translated by the word *in*. It is used in the New Testament 330 times when translated *at*, *on*, or *with*. John baptized *at* Jordan, and Christ baptized *with* the Holy Spirit. So, also, the Authorized Version uniformly translates ἐν ὕδατι by *with* water and not *in* water.

ἀπό. This preposition is given at least twenty meanings in the New Testament, and is translated 374 times by the word *from*. Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway "out of the water" (Matt. 3:16), which is just as well translated *up from the water.*

εἰς. A word given at least twenty-six different meanings and, in all, is translated by the word *unto* 538 times. Therefore, as in Acts 8:38, they both went "down into the water" is just as correctly rendered, *down unto the water.*

ἐκ. A word with twenty-four meanings, this preposition is translated by the word *from* 168 times. Acts 8:39 may as well read: They were come up *from* (rather than *out of*) the water. Thus any argument respecting mode of water baptism built on the prepositions is without substance. John was baptizing *at* Jordan and those baptized went down *unto* the water and came up *from* the water. The fact that translators give the prepositions meanings which imply a mode of baptism lends no support, unless it is demonstrated that a certain translation is itself equally inspired along with the Greek original.

Apart from every consideration of the mode by which Christ was baptized, it is certain that His was not Christian baptism. Assuming that Christian baptism represents crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection, there could be no meaning in Christ enacting that which later He would accomplish in substance. To declare that He was so acting is to substitute human imagination for the absence of a Biblical intimation. Similarly, assuming that Christian baptism is a sign and seal of the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the believer is equally as foreign to any feature of Christ's program. However, were the imagination to be employed where no Scripture directs, the fact that Christ received the Holy Spirit without

measure at the time He was baptized might indicate that such was the meaning of His baptism. As before declared, Christians follow Christ in moral rather than official issues, and Christ's baptism was official. It has been pointed out that His baptism was different in its meaning and purpose than the usual baptism by John; it is equally demonstrable that Christ's baptism differs from usual Christian baptism.

V. Other Baptisms

In its secondary usage—that so largely employed in the New Testament — the word βαπτίζω means that a thorough change of condition is brought about by the power of a baptizing agency. There was a baptism *into* repentance, a baptism *into* the remission of sins, and a baptism *into* Moses. There is a baptism *into* the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, a baptism *into* that estate of high privilege accorded those who receive the Holy Spirit with all His benefits, and there is a baptism *into* Christ by the Holy Spirit. In the Mosaic dispensation as in the Christian there is a baptism by means of symbolic water—not *into* water, but *into* whatever may be the objective estate related to a given baptism. It is in this far-reaching secondary meaning of βαπτίζω— never to the interpreted as a momentary dipping into some enveloping physical element—that two other baptisms were experienced by Christ. These are:

1. The Baptism by the Holy Spirit. Of this baptism it is written in John 1:32–33, "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."

If it be objected that in the passage it is not said that this was a baptism, it may be replied that no Scripture more clearly describes that which constitutes a complete and perfect baptism. Little, indeed, is it required that an incident so true to form should be styled a baptism in order that it may be recognized as such. On the theme of the baptism of Christ by the Holy Spirit—not to be confounded with any other Spirit baptism—Dr. J. W. Dale writes in *Christic and Patristic Baptism* (pp. 32–33):

> Evidence, to excess, has been furnished for the existence of baptisms where no envelopment was to be found in fact, or could rationally be conceived. The usage, under such circumstances, being based on a similarity of condition with that produced on a class of bodies susceptible of being penetrated, pervaded, and so receiving quality from some enveloping element. Therefore this descent of the Holy Ghost and his abiding upon our Lord is called a baptism, and not because of any irrational and impossible external envelopment. That the whole being of "the Christ" was henceforth under the influence of this *anointing* the Scriptures abundantly testify: 1. By declaring through the Forerunner (John 3:34) that "the Spirit is not given by measure unto him," and therefore the farther statement, "Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost." That such a gift would have a controlling influence, we are not left to infer; but it is expressly declared by John—"He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God, *for* God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." 2. This gift was as unlimited in continuance as it was in measure—"I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove and it *abode* upon him" (John 1:32). 3. Under this influence he preached—"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor,… to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:18, 21); "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power" (Acts 10:38). 4. His miracles were wrought by this power—"If I by (ἐν) the Spirit of God cast out devils then the kingdom of God has come unto you" (Matt. 12:28). 5. The offering up of himself as the Lamb of God was through the same Spirit—"Who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. 9:14).… It was conclusive evidence of the pervading and controlling influence of a baptism, that the Saviour immediately after such baptism is represented as being under the full influence of the divine Spirit—"Then was Jesus led up by (ἐν) the Spirit into the wilderness" (Luke 4:1). And when he came out of the wilderness he came invested with all the singular potency of this Divine agent—"Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit" (Luke 4:14).

2. The Cup Baptism. "But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able" (Matt. 20:22).

"But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized" (Mark 10:38–39).

"But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished" (Luke 12:50)!

It is certain that this simple rhetorical usage indicates that the cup—referring properly to the bitter draught it contains—is a baptizing agent. The Savior did not imply that He was to be baptized *in* or *into* a cup, but that the cup was to baptize Him. This is not an exceptional baptism outside the

range of usual Biblical baptisms. In truth it, like Christ's baptism by the Spirit, is fundamental in its character and discloses the very essence of all New Testament baptisms, namely, the bringing of the subject into a baptized estate by means of a baptizing agent, whether it be by the Holy Spirit, a cup, the cloud and the sea, or water. The baptizing agency is not the baptism any more than a hangman's rope is death. The rope may induce death, but the rope itself is not death. There is general agreement that Christ's reference to the cup by which He was to be baptized was a reference to His penal death, which cup He should drink from the hand of His Father. It is written: "Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (John 18:11). Likewise it is recorded that He prayed, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. … O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done" (Matt. 26:39, 42; cf. Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42). Beyond the sphere of human sympathy it was impossible for another to drink of this cup, though they might themselves experience physical death. As a memorial, a cup is drunk which contains in symbol the shed blood of Christ—blood shed when He drank His cup of penal death, the Just for the unjust. The contents of that cup served to baptize the Son of God into death.

Thus in conclusion it may be observed that Christ became the subject of three baptisms:

First, as a setting-apart to His priestly office, which office anticipated His one great priestly achievement of offering Himself without spot to God. He was baptized into that office by means of symbolic water according to the mode and manner prescribed by the Law of Moses. There is no record which states that He was baptized *into* water. The baptism placed Him in the position of a priest according to the law. Into water and into the priesthood are two quite different propositions. Water is the agent and not the receiving element. Therefore the mode of Christ's baptism is not determined by a dogmatic assertion that He was momentarily dipped in water. He was baptized by means of water into the everlasting perpetuity of His priestly office. It matters little whether it be little or much water so long as water is reserved—and in accordance with all references in the Sacred Text—as the baptizing agency and is not exalted to the place of the receiving element. This must be the Biblical conception, as the text of Scripture declares that

Christ was baptized into His priestly office at Jordan—a locality—and not momentarily dipped into Jordan. Of itself, the supposed dipping into Jordan could accomplish nothing as respects a thoroughly changed condition. However, water when applied by a duly qualified baptizer and in accordance with the prescribed law did become an integral factor in securing Christ's baptism into the priestly office. The Greek prepositions used cannot be made to assert that Christ was baptized both *into* water and *into* the priestly office.

Second, Christ was baptized by the Holy Spirit. The text does not state that He was baptized *in* or *into* the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was the baptizing agent and the baptism was into the estate in which Christ, with regard to His humanity, lived and served; for He wrought all His works by the power of the Spirit and to Him the Spirit was given without measure (John 3:34).

Third, Christ was baptized by a cup which contained penal death, and into the estate of death. He was not baptized *into* the cup, but *by* the cup He was baptized into the death which alone could serve as a perfect redemption, a perfect reconciliation, and a perfect propitiation.

Chapter V

The Temptation of Christ Incarnate

I. Three Fundamental Factors

As an Essential introduction to the study of the complicated theme respecting the temptation of Christ, three fundamental aspects of qualifying truth appear for consideration. These are (1) the meaning of the word πειράζω, which is usually translated *to tempt*, (2) the sense in which God may be tempted, and (3) the truth that the temptation of Christ was in the sphere of His humanity and not in the sphere of His Deity.

1. The Meaning of πειράζω. This word, which appears in the Sacred Text some fifty times, conveys the idea of a test or a making of trial. It has two significations: one to test with a view to proving or developing virtue, the other to solicit in the way of evil. Of the latter it may be said that such solicitation cannot come from God, but must arise either with the individual's fallen nature or Satan's instigation. James asserts a positive affirmation respecting this when he says, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed" (1:13–14). As respects the former—a testing in proof of virtue—the experience of Abraham in the offering of Isaac is an example. The command came directly from God, it recognized no evil in Abraham to be corrected, and closed with the words, "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me" (Gen. 22:12). The Christian is enjoined to make trial of himself to learn whether he be in the faith. He is to prove himself by testings based on the fact that Christ is in him (2 Cor. 13:5). In view of the truth that God solicits no man in the way of evil, the prayer "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil" (Matt. 6:13) must be interpreted as meaning that the one who prays thus desires to be spared from testing, but if, in the wisdom of God, testing must be endured, that he desires to be delivered from the evil of unyieldedness and unfaithfulness. The thorn in the Apostle's flesh became a testing which could not be removed. Of this he wrote, "Ye know

how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus" (Gal. 4:13–14). James also wrote, "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations…. Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him" (1:2, 12). Thus, likewise, the great tribulation is said by the glorified Christ to be an hour of testing which is to come upon the whole world from which the Church is to be saved (Rev. 3:10). Christians are even now in "manifold temptations" which engender heaviness of spirit (1 Pet. 1:6), and yet no temptation will be greater than they, by divine enablement, may bear. Of this it is written, "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it" (1 Cor. 10:13). Saints of old were tested (cf. Heb. 11:37).

2. God May Be Tested. At least twenty-seven incidents or references are recorded in which it is said that God has been or might be tested; but these are always to be considered in the light of the assurance that God cannot be tempted in the way of evil, nor does He so tempt any man (James 1:13–15). The divine testings extend to each Person of the blessed Trinity. Of the Father it is said with respect to the imposition of the Mosaic Law upon perfected believers, "Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" (Acts 15:10). To those who, perhaps in ignorance, teach that the Mosaic system is a rule of life for the believer already perfected in Christ, the warning which this Scripture advances should be effective. There are no elements of piety in the act of imposing the Mosaic system upon the Church; rather it is a dangerous and awful provoking of God. It is significant that, of all the wickedness in which Christians may indulge, only this one high crime against God is mentioned as the cause of His testing from believers. Thus, also, the Spirit may be tested. In this there is a similarity with the preceding, since but one incident of the Spirit's testing is recorded. This experience was brought to pass by a falsehood uttered by two early Christians, which falsehood was declared to be against the Holy

Spirit. It is written: “And Peter answered unto her, Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much? And she said, Yea, for so much. Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out. Then fell she down straightway at his feet, and yielded up the ghost: and the young men came in, and found her dead, and, carrying her forth, buried her by her husband” (Acts 5:8–10). Of the temptation of Christ the Son more Scripture is written —cf. Luke 4:1–13; Hebrews 2:18 and 4:15. The discussion of these important declarations will be considered in the following section.

3. Christ Was Tempted. When declaring, as above, that the testings which came to Christ were in the sphere of His humanity and not addressed directly to His Deity, not only is the truth asserted that He, being God, could not be solicited respecting things evil, but the whole problem, which may be extended into infinity, concerned with the relations of His two natures to one another is introduced again. There is general agreement that, had Christ sinned, the lapse would have arisen wholly from His human nature; but in all the discussion respecting His impeccability the truth is too often ignored that Christ was wholly free from a sin nature and all that the sin nature generates. Some theologians, much as heathen philosophers might do, have based their speculations on the acknowledged limitations of fallen men. It is argued that no man is free from sin and, since He was a man, Christ was solicited to evil even as other men. In his discourse on the problem of Christ’s personal relation to sin, Bishop Martensen writes (*Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 284–85):

> The fact that the Second Adam experienced all temptations—enticements to sin, threats and tortures of body and mind—is to be explained upon the ground, not of His moral freedom only, nor of the progressiveness of His nature, but of both these combined. The propositions, *potuit non peccare*, “it was possible for Him not to sin,” and *non potuit peccare*, “it was impossible for Him to sin,” so far from being distinct or contrasted, may be said to include and to presuppose each other. The first, which means that sinlessness was only a possibility for Christ, implies that He experienced temptation as an actual power; for while it came upon Him from without, it must, if it were not a mere pretence, have excited some corresponding feeling within Him; through which alone He could have been really tempted. And as the contrast between the cosmical and the sacred—the natural and the spiritual—was necessary in the Second Adam in order to a twofold influence upon the will;—as the Second Adam cannot be viewed as Monotheletic, which would be in fact to consider Him Monophysite, but Duotheletic,—the same principle must have been active in Him which

> made the fall of the first Adam possible. The possibility of evil existed in the Second Adam; but this possibility never became active, was never realized; it served only as the dark and obscure background to show forth His perfect holiness. This was guaranteed, not by the force of virtue or innocence, which the very idea of temptation makes uncertain and doubtful, pending the trial, nor again by the force of the Divine nature as distinct from the human, or the human as distinct from the Divine, but in virtue of the indissoluble union of the divine and human natures in Him; that *bond* which might indeed be strained and shaken to the greatest apparent tension and contrast of the two natures, but which never could be broken. This is expressed in the second proposition *non potuit peccare*, "it was impossible for Him to sin." Though the temptation itself and the conflict against it were not apparent merely but real and sternly earnest, the result could never have been doubtful; for the bond between the Divine and the human natures, which may be severed in the creature, was indissoluble in Him who is the Mediator between the Father and all His creatures. This bond may be broken only when the connection of the divine with the human is merely relative and representative; never when it is essential and archetypal, as in Him, in whom the counsels of the Father were comprehended before the foundation of the world.

Dr. Martensen here, along with many theological leaders, sustains a very high regard for the theanthropic Person, but his implications are that Christ suffered those temptations which belong to a fallen nature; still, Christ could not have possessed a sin nature without having partaken of the fall, since that nature does not belong to unfallen humanity. Naturally, the only examples of this form of human existence are restricted to Adam before he fell and to Christ. If Christ had been Himself a fallen Being, He could not have been the uninvolved Kinsman-Redeemer that was demanded. Perhaps some fail at this point to realize that the saving work of Christ extends as much to the sin nature of those He saves as to their individual transgressions. Had Christ been Himself a fallen man, He would have needed to be saved and could not have saved Himself or another. If, on the other hand, He was unfallen and theanthropic in His Being, He had no solicitations to evil such as arise out of a sin nature. It is intrinsic divine holiness which is predicated of Him (Luke 1:35). It has been declared on previous pages and is reasserted here that Christ was impeccable in the *non potuit peccare* sense; that is, it was *impossible* for Him to sin. That which creates doubt in many devout minds is the obvious fact that, as illustrated by Adam, an unfallen human being is capable of sinning. Tragic indeed, in this instance, is the failure to recognize that the first Adam was unsupported in the hour of his testing, but that the Last Adam though equally possessed of an unfallen human nature was—as Dr. Martensen so well affirms—because of "the indissoluble union of the divine and human natures" unable

to do what He might otherwise have done if His human nature had been left to itself, which disunion of the two natures could never occur. Even then the case, as with Adam, differs from that of any fallen man. While the fallen man is utterly prone to sin, both the unfallen Adam and the humanity of Christ had no such impetus to sin, and the unfallen Adam might have easily avoided the thing that he did. Since this bond of union which unites Christ's two natures—for He is one Person—is so complete, the humanity of Christ could not sin. Should His humanity sin, God would sin. When the absolute Deity of Christ is recognized, there is no logic which is more inexorable than this. Though unsupported unfallen humanity might sin, a theanthropic Person even if He incorporates an unfallen human nature is incapable of sinning. The contention that Christ *could*, but *would not*, sin is far removed from the contention that Christ *could not* sin. The former either denies His Deity or else dishonors God with the calumnious averment that God is Himself capable of sinning. Again, it must be declared that Christ's human traits which did not involve moral issues could be exhibited freely. The idea might be admitted with certain reservations that He was both omnipotent and impotent, omniscient and ignorant, infinite and finite, unlimited and limited; but it could never be allowed that He was both impeccable and peccable. There are no God-dishonoring elements in human weakness, human pain, human hunger, human thirst, or human limitations with respect to various capacities—even human death may be admitted as a death undergone for others, but not for Himself.

It may be seen from the foregoing that whatever testings came to Christ were not such as find their expression in and through a sin nature. Nevertheless, He was tested and tried and that without sin. As for fallen man, his temptations may arise either from the world, or from the flesh, or from the devil; but testing which is to develop or establish virtue usually comes from God. The world had no claim on the One who could say, "I am not of the world" (John 17:14, 16), and the flesh, conceived as a fallen nature, was not even latent in the Son of God. Of Satan He said, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30). As it is possible for an unconquerable city to be attacked, so an impeccable theanthropic Person may be assailed. Christ was tempted not to prove His impeccability either to Himself or to His Father; it was for the sake of those who are called upon to trust Him. As God might be tested so Christ was

tested. It is written, “But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?” (Matt. 22:18; cf. Mark 12:15; Luke 20:23; John 8:6). The major passages bearing on the temptation of Christ are:

> *Luke 4:1–13 (cf. Matt. 4:1–11; Mark 1:12–13.*) And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted of the devil. And in those days he did eat nothing: and when they were ended, he afterward hungered. And the devil said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread. And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God. And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. And Jesus answering said unto him, It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season.

In entering upon an investigation of three passages which relate to Christ’s temptations, the Lucan reference and two more, it is well to be reminded once again of the truths that these temptations were outside the range of those factors in human life which are the result of the fall, and that these temptations were addressed only to His humanity. The threefold temptation of Christ which the above Scripture sets forth indicates the fact of His testing and that that which is involved is the relationship within Himself between His two natures, His relation to the Father, and His relation to the Spirit. There is also a definite unveiling of His relation to Satan. All three Synoptics declare that, following His baptism, Christ was taken by the Holy Spirit into the wilderness and that there He was tempted, or tested, by Satan. The record asserts that during this testing Satan took Christ both to a high mountain and to a pinnacle of the temple. Why Christ should be tested thus will be considered later. The point at issue here is that Christ, wholly subject to the Holy Spirit, was purposefully brought into the sphere of Satan’s power. Why such a testing at all may be a problem quite beyond the range of human comprehension. It would be remiss indeed to fail to note here that, as in various other situations in the earth-life of Christ, issues were involved which belong to the realm of relationship which exists

between God and the angelic spirits, concerning which human beings have no knowledge other than those intimations which the Bible discloses. The account of this testing—immeasurable in its outreach— may be considered under two general divisions, namely, (1) Christ's relation to the Holy Spirit and (2) the testing of Christ's humanity by Satan.

II. Christ's Relation to the Holy Spirit

Though this specific theme will be introduced more fully under Pneumatology, it demands some consideration at this juncture. Again it should be restated that Christ's dependence upon the Holy Spirit was within the sphere of His humanity. As respects His Deity, there was no occasion for Him to be cast in dependence upon either the Father or the Spirit; and though He could as God have ministered to His own human needs as fully as did the Spirit, that arrangement would have moved Him from the position occupied by all believers, to whom His life is a pattern. Christians cannot call upon any such resource within themselves; so they are, as He was, cast utterly upon the enabling power of the Spirit. The New Testament asserts throughout—even from His conception through the generating power of the Spirit to His death through the same eternal Spirit—that Christ lived and wrought on a principle of dependence upon Another. No attentive student can fail to observe this truth (cf. Matt. 12:28; Mark 1:12; Luke 4:14, 18; John 3:34). The truth that Christ—and to the end that He might demonstrate the effectiveness of life that is lived wholly in reliance upon the Spirit —was Himself dependent upon the Spirit, should not be allowed to engender any failure to recognize the absolute Deity of the Savior. His own authority over the Spirit in other spheres of relationship and according to the eternal counsels of God is seen in Christ's own declaration: "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you" (John 16:7).

III. Christ's Testing by Satan

In this threefold testing it is declared that Christ was driven of the Spirit into the wilderness with the express objective in view that He should there be tested by Satan. No small importance gathers about this revelation which

implies that this testing did not originate with Satan, though it may be believed that all was wholly agreeable to that mighty angel. A parallel to this is found in the experience of Job (Job 1:6–2:8), in which experience Job is tested by Satan and wholly on the instigation of Jehovah (cf. Job 1:8; 2:3). The Sacred Text does not indicate that Christ acted on His own account in going into the wilderness nor does it assert that He was forced to do so against His will. He Himself was "full of the Holy Spirit" and, as any individual thus blessed, was pleased to do all the mind and will of God. Christ was, according to Luke, mature both physically and spiritually. The combat thus becomes crucial in every respect and most evidently reaches out into unrevealed spheres of relationship between Christ and the fallen angels. Speculation is of little avail on why such a testing should have been divinely ordered and executed. It certainly relates to the humanity of the Savior and its value is, so far as men are concerned, a matter of demonstrating the absolute impeccability of the Son of God. The grammatical construction sustains the thought that this testing continued unrelentingly over the entire forty days, though but three specific tests are recorded and these, evidently, occurred at the end. When Christ had fasted forty days He was hungry and that fact became the basis for the first of the three recorded testings.

Satan really originates nothing. Here, as in every instance, only the sovereign purpose of God is realized. This is not to say that Satan, like misguided man, does not imagine that he originates all that occurs in his efforts. The testing of Christ's humanity secures too much value to the believer to have originated with Satan. By three avenues of approach Satan sought to persuade the Last Adam to embrace that philosophy of independence of God which he himself seized upon soon after his creation and which he imposed with success upon the first Adam. The real issue was clear: Would the humanity of Christ yield to an appeal to act independently of God even when all the kingdoms of this *cosmos* world (cf. Matt. 4:8) are offered as a bribe—kingdoms which, in the end, would be His from the hand of His Father (cf. Ps. 2:7–9; 1 Cor. 15:24–28; Rev. 11:15; 19:16)? As a self-imposed covenant, the Son of God had said when He was about to enter the world and with respect to His humanity (evidenced by His making the address to *God* rather than to His Father): "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast

thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5–7). Thus the avowed attitude of the Son was, even before He entered the world, to do the will of God. To do that will is the highest and greatest achievement of any creature, angel or man. He who is ever the Supreme Pattern must be to infinite perfection the example of that which is man's highest responsibility.

Considering these three testings separately it may be seen, (1) that the proposal to minister to His hunger by turning stones into bread struck at the very center of that which is distinctly human. Man is dependent upon God. It is written, "Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing" (Ps. 145:16). For Christ to employ His divine power in creation to gratify His own human need would have been to forsake the sphere of human limitations, which sphere was the will of God for Him. Had He thus supernaturally attended upon His own human needs, He would not have been in all points tested as men are tested. Men are cast upon God with no creative power by which to secure relief. (2) The second test, already mentioned, that the kingdoms of this world would be given in exchange for the worship of the theanthropic Christ, did likewise propose that the pursuance of the divine will and plan should be abandoned in an opposing self-will; but this test reaches into angelic spheres where human comprehension may not fully enter. Comparatively, it is not difficult to think of the authority over the *cosmos* (which Satan holds under divine permission) being surrendered by Satan to Christ. All of that will be achieved in due time; but to contemplate the audacity, the insolence, and the insult to God which were involved in the suggestion that the Son of God worship a creature of His own hand who is the archenemy of God may be but feebly recognized in this world: its wickedness can only be measured in celestial realms. (3) The final testing, as recorded by Luke, was to the end that Christ, by useless exercise of divine power (for He had a claim upon this as the theanthropic Person) might do a thing for self-glory that was not included in the will of God for Him.

In all of these testings, Christ was victorious while remaining wholly in the realm of human resources. He was challenged by the words, "If thou be the Son of God." This became a clear test of Christ's humanity in that it proposed the use of powers belonging to His Deity. He conquered as man

may conquer—by the Word of God, which Word is to be cherished as the revelation of the divine will to which man should be submissive. To be other than submissive is, as declared by Christ, to "tempt the Lord thy God" (Matt. 4:7).

Hebrews 4:15. "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

Though a High Priest and in the respect that He is the archetypal High Priest—the true High Priest regarding whom all other high priests were but shadows—Christ is, nevertheless, able to sympathize with the children of God who are likewise tested. He was Himself in all points tested as they are —sin apart—that is, apart from the testings which arise from a fallen sin nature. Earlier in this discussion it has been demonstrated that Christ could not have had a sin nature nor could He have sinned. This passage does not merely assert that Christ, tempted in all points as man is tempted, did not sin. It also declares that He experienced no temptations which a sin nature engenders. As the Kinsman-Redeemer He could not Himself be involved in the calamity from which He is appointed to redeem. He could not be the holy, spotless Lamb of God that a true redemption demands if He were possessed with the slightest taint of sin. He serves as a sympathizing and merciful High Priest and not as One who partakes of that which causes the distress. He said of Himself, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30). This declaration, according to that which follows, is a reference to His death and the fact that He was in no sense worthy of death. Death, the penalty of human sin, had no rightful claim upon Him. When He died, it was His own voluntary act of obedience to His Father's will. The point at issue in this aspect of this theme is that Christ was, in the sphere of that which is unrelated to the fall, tested in all points, which testing included the experience of human infirmity and limitations.

Hebrews 2:17–18. "Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted."

In this passage the emphasis falls on the exceeding greatness of the mercy of Christ. It is the mercy of the God of all grace who, having Himself

been tested in man’s sphere, is able also to help those who are tested. It is one more competency of the Savior.

It is thus demonstrated that Christ was tested in this world, and it is certain that men knew nothing of that trial which His holy character endured. The writer to the Hebrews, having presented the account of the testings of Christ, concludes the theme by saying, “For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin” (Heb. 12:3–4). The implication is that Christ’s testing called for a resistance unto blood. This may lead on to the experience which was His in the garden, into which reality no other may intrude.

He was not tested with a view to ascertaining whether He would fail, but rather to prove to those of a doubtful mind that He could not fail.

Chapter VI

THE TRANSFIGURATION OF CHRIST INCARNATE AN EVENT MARVELOUSLY SPECTACULAR—YET MORE MEANINGFUL THAN SPECTACULAR—OCCURRED ON THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION. TO THEOLOGIANS WHO NEGLECT THE WHOLE MILLENNIAL AGE OR TO THOSE WHO HAVE SOUGHT TO IDENTIFY IT AS ALREADY PAST OR TO THOSE WHO CONTEND THAT THERE WILL BE NO SUCH AGE IN THE PROGRAM OF GOD, THE TRANSFIGURATION IS LARGELY MEANINGLESS. NEANDER (*HISTORY OF THE PLANTING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH*, I, 376), AS A REASON FOR REJECTING 2 PETER AS SPURIOUS, STATES: "BUT IT CERTAINLY IS NOT NATURAL TO SUPPOSE THAT ONE OF THE APOSTLES SHOULD SELECT AND BRING FORWARD FROM THE WHOLE LIFE OF CHRIST OF WHICH THEY HAD BEEN EYE-WITNESSES, THIS INSULATED FACT [2 PET. 1:16 FF.], WHICH WAS LESS ESSENTIALLY CONNECTED WITH THAT WHICH WAS THE CENTRAL POINT AND OBJECT OF HIS APPEARANCE" (CITED BY

Peters, *Theocratic Kingdom*, II, 559). Similarly, those of the Church-Kingdom or Covenant Theology are, for the moment, encouraged in their theory by the fact that in the transfiguration Old Testament saints —Moses and Elijah—are present with those disciples—Peter, James, and John—who afterward became the apostles of the Church. The assumption being that the transfiguration is a miniature of the Church in heaven, Dr. Charles Hodge, a representative of this school of theology, declares, "The transfiguration on the mount was a type and pledge of the glory of the second advent" (*Systematic Theology*, III, 796). This is but a partial recognition of that which Peter declares the transfiguration to have been, namely, a preview of the coming kingdom on earth. Unless the transfiguration is approached with the background of all that the Old

TESTAMENT REVELATION CONCERNING THE EARTHLY DAVIDIC KINGDOM PRESENTS, THERE CAN BE NO UNDERSTANDING OF THIS MAJOR EVENT IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST. THE PREMILLENARIAN ALONE IS ABLE TO GIVE THIS PECULIAR PORTRAIT ITS FULL AND WORTHY SIGNIFICATION AND EXPLANATION. AS WILL BE SEEN, THIS MANIFESTATION OF THE EARTHLY KINGDOM GLORY IS FAR REMOVED FROM BEING OF NO IMPORTANCE. THE DISCUSSION OF THIS THEME MAY WELL BE PURSUED NOW.

The word *transfigure* (μεταμορφόομαι) is used but four times in the New Testament (cf. Matt. 17:2; Mark 9:2; Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 3:18), and conveys a meaning which is peculiar and distinctive when contrasted with μετασχηματίζω, which is translated *transforming* or *transformed* (cf. 2 Cor. 11:13–14 where Satan is said to be transformed as an angel of light; so, also, the believer's body will be changed—cf. Phil. 3:21). It is evident that a thing is transformed by influences from without, while a thing is tranfigured by the outshining of a light or vitality which is resident within. Christ's essential glory was veiled while here upon the earth, but in the moment of transfiguration His intrinsic Shekinah glory was allowed to break forth. He was not merely assuming a glory or standing in the radiance of an outward glory which fell upon Him. The glory was His own, and originated in Him and emanated from Him. It is this truth which lends so much importance to the two passages wherein transfiguration is related to believers—Romans 12:2; 2 Corinthians 3:18. The believer is subject to transfiguration and not to mere transformation. The divine Presence within is as a light, and this is to have its normal outshining and will work great changes within the heart where that Nature dwells.

I. The Importance

The divine estimation respecting the importance of the transfiguration is suggested by the fact that it appears at length in each of the Synoptics: Matthew 16:27–17:13; Mark 9:1–13; Luke 9:27–36. The entire picture can be seen only as all three accounts are diligently compared. In all, thirty-eight verses of the Sacred Text are assigned to the description of this event; added to these are the three verses of 2 Peter 1:16–18, in which portion the divine interpretation is revealed. It is significant, also, that this great event is reported only by the Synoptic Gospels—which to a large extent are concerned with the kingdom aspects of Christ's ministry while here on earth—and that it is not recorded by John who, in the main, sets forth truth belonging to the present unforeseen age and to the Church. There is no admission to be made, however, that this distinction is not both valid and vital, when it is observed here that such discriminations are unknown to the Church-Kingdom school of interpreters. Disregarding chapter divisions which are often enough unrelated to the continuity of the context, it will be noted that each account of the transfiguration follows a declaration by Christ respecting His second advent. The record declares that He said that the Son of man should come "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark 8:38), or "in the glory of his Father with his angels" (Matt. 16:27), or "in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels" (Luke 9:26). To a Jewish mind, the coming in glory was inevitably related to Daniel 7:13–14. To this revelation of His return He adds, "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here ['there be some of them that stand here'—Mark; 'there be some standing here'—Luke], which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. 16:28—"till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power"—Mark 9:1; "till they see the kingdom of God"—Luke 9:27). The rapture of the Church could not fulfill the promises concerning the second advent of Christ to the earth. In the Synoptics, as in Daniel, that coming is to the earth with power and great glory. It is related, not to heaven, but to that kingdom which is to be set up on the earth at the appearing of the Son of man. Though approximately a week intervenes, all the Evangelists are careful to relate the transfiguration with the promise that some of the twelve—Peter, James, and John were later chosen—would not taste of death until they should see the

Son of man coming in His kingdom. All of the twelve eventually saw death in their generation, and fully seventy generations have followed and yet the actual coming is deferred. It is evident, therefore, that this promise regarding some of them was fulfilled in their own day and generation. It is evident also that Peter—chief of the favored three on the Mount—relates the transfiguration to this promise; that is, the transfiguration was, according to Peter, the fulfillment of the promise. The transfiguration is not the final and actual appearing of Christ in the glory of His Father and of the holy angels, but is a preview which presented it as a thing to be seen and to which "eyewitnesses" could bear testimony. It was a momentary enactment of that which shall constitute both the kingdom and its glory when it is set up on the earth. The presence of the angels and the stupendous world-transforming events which accompany the actual coming of Christ are not included in the preview; but such elements as were required to accomplish the divine purpose in the transfiguration were present.

II. The Reason

The entire transfiguration occurrence as a feature of the life of Christ calls for some explanation about why such a peculiar innovation should have been introduced into a program which otherwise, apart from miracles, was characterized by conditions which were within the range of human activities. The premillennialist alone has a worthy solution to this problem. The answer may be considered in two parts, namely, (1) the immediate need and (2) the agelong need.

1. The Immediate Need. Two important passages which contain prohibitions serve to express the immediate need of the transfiguration; these are Matthew 16:20 and 17:9, and these read after this manner: "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ. … And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." It will be remembered that the cognomen *The Christ* is the New Testament equivalent to the Old Testament *Messiah.* That is, when in the New Testament the Messianic features of Christ's ministry are in view they will be related to Him under the designation of *Christ*—not of *Jesus*, which

term speaks of His Saviorhood, and not of *Lord*, which asserts His essential Deity. Immediately preceding the giving of the charge that no man should be told that He is the Christ is the peculiar first announcement of the Church and the giving of the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter. Up to this time the disciples, along with John and Christ, have been presenting the messianic message respecting the King and His kingdom, and that as "at hand" in the Person of the King (Matt. 3:1–2; 4:17; 10:5–42). Because of the execution of John the Baptist and the evident unwillingness of the people—especially the rulers—to receive their Messiah (cf. Matt. 11:20–26; 16:13–14), the kingdom message is concluded; yet the ground of redemption—the new theme of infinite grace —is not established, nor could it be, until His blood was shed. Since the rejection of Christ had been effected and divinely recognized, there is no longer an offer to be made regarding His Messiahship until His work of redemption is accomplished. On this point Dr. C. I. Scofield may well be quoted: "The disciples had been proclaiming Jesus as the Christ, i.e., the covenanted King of a kingdom promised to the Jews, and 'at hand.' The church, on the contrary, must be built upon testimony to Him as crucified, risen from the dead, ascended, and made 'Head over all things to the church' (Eph. 1:20–23). The former testimony was ended, the new testimony was not yet ready, because the blood of the new covenant had not yet been shed, but our Lord begins to speak of His death and resurrection (Matt. 16:21). It is a turning point of immense significance" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1022). It is significant that Christ went on directly after Matthew 16:20 to say, "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day" (16:21). In the light of the postponement of the kingdom, which kingdom constituted the Jewish hope and which was to that time the only thought of His disciples (cf. Mark 9:10; Acts 1:6–7), it was essential to verify the promise of the kingdom and thus give full assurance of its final realization; and that is precisely the thing which the transfiguration accomplished. Three eyewitnesses were chosen to see the Son of man coming in the glory of His kingdom (Matt. 17:1). To Peter, James, and John—two of whom were appointed writers of the New Testament text—and later to Paul in Arabia, the important information respecting the certainty of the coming of the kingdom must be given, that

which later would be comprehended in its relation to the new order of grace. The disciples did not understand the meaning of the transfiguration at the time of it, but its assurance served them well in solving the problems which arose with the inauguration of the divine program for the outcalling of the Church (cf. Acts 15:13–18; 2 Pet. 1:16–17). By the statement that He should no longer be proclaimed in His Messianic character, the Lord not only withdrew the whole plan of kingdom proclamation which had engaged Himself, the disciples, and John up to that hour, but He was manifesting Himself as one about to be crucified. If any basis should remain upon which a kingdom hope— so vital in every Jewish covenant and promise—might rest, it called for a vivid demonstration which in the transition days that were to follow would serve as evidence that the unchangeable promises for Israel could not, and therefore would not, be broken. Apart from this demonstration, it would have been natural—well illustrated by the present misunderstandings of Church-Kingdom theologians—for the disciples to have concluded that God had broken His covenants with Israel and that their national hope was to be abandoned. Thus the transfiguration serves to preserve the Jewish anticipation as the divine purpose, even though it be postponed for an age. That the transfiguration had the ultimate effect upon the disciples intended is seen from Peter's statement (2 Pet. 1:16–18). Closely allied to the prohibition of Matthew 16:20—that the Messianic message should no longer be preached—is the prohibition of Matthew 17:9, which declares, "And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." And to this Mark adds, "And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean" (9:10). The fact that they reasoned about what His reference to His resurrection might mean gives evidence of their unpreparedness for all that was so soon to come to pass. As before intimated, the doctrinal force of the transfiguration could not be really grasped until after His death and resurrection; hence the mandate that no report regarding the transfiguration should be made until He was risen from the dead. To have published the transfiguration event before His death and resurrection would have been, since it proclaimed the kingdom, tantamount to a continuation of the kingdom message, which, as has been seen, was of necessity withdrawn.

2. The Agelong Need. Whatever may have been required to save the disciples from the conviction that God had abrogated His entire program of an earthly kingdom to fulfill which Christ was born (cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:31–33), the same need extends to all generations of the Church to the end that they too may be intelligent in their interpretation of the present age in its relation to the immutable earthly purpose of God. The conclusion reached at the first council of the Church (Acts 15:13–18) and the order of truth set forth in the Epistle to the Romans (cf. chapters 9–11 as an explanation by the Apostle of the relation of Israel's unchangeable covenants to the present order of grace which chapters 1–8 set forth) go to demonstrate how perfectly the early Church understood the truth which the transfiguration announced. It was the failure of Reformers to return to the conclusions of the early Church which has made possible various forms of unscriptural theology.

III. The Reality

There is slight need to give space to the consideration of the unbelieving theory that the transfiguration was only a vision or dream. Luke does state that the three disciples were "heavy with sleep," but he goes on to say that it was "when they were awake" that they saw that which is recorded (Luke 9:32). The Sacred Text presents the event as a historic fact. These men were in an upright position and from that they fell on their faces in the presence of the glory. It would be strange indeed for all three of these men to dream identically the same thing and for Peter to speak for the others while in a dream. Of the transfiguration John testified, "And we beheld his glory" (John 1:14), so also Peter refers to that glory as "the excellent glory" (2 Pet. 1:16–18). Peter describes the three as "eyewitnesses of his majesty." All of this speaks not of dreams, but of a reality. The Scriptures declare, "And he was transfigured before them" (Mark 9:2).

IV. A Representation of the Kingdom

It has been assumed by those who confound the kingdom with the Church that the transfiguration was an anticipation of heaven. It is true that there shall be great glory in heaven and that Christ will be the center of that glory. It was thus that John—though he had seen Him in the glory of the transfiguration and

of His appearances after His resurrection—saw Him in His heavenly glory and there, too, fell at His feet as dead (Rev. 1:17). As already indicated, the Scriptures declare that the transfiguration was a setting forth of the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom. That coming is everywhere said to be in surpassing glory (Dan. 7:13–14; Matt. 24:30; 2 Thess. 1:7–9). It is the earthly glory of the King.

As a general treatise on the transfiguration, George N. H. Peters has written conclusively and at length as follows: The transfiguration, following the announcement that "some" should, before their death, see "the Son of man Coming in His Kingdom," is *a representation of the Kingdom* in some of its aspects, viz., *in the glory of "the Christ" or King, in the presence of* (who also "appeared in glory," Luke 9:31) *the translated and dead saints, and in the witnessing of that glory by mortal men.* It was a temporary display, an outward manifestation or revealing of the majesty and glory *that belongs* to Jesus when He comes *at the Second Advent in His Kingdom* with His saints to reign over the nations. That this is the correct idea appertaining to this astonishing transaction is evident by regarding Peter's reference to it. He (2 Pet. 1:16–18) says: "*We have not followed cunningly devised fables*" (as so many now allege) "*when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His Majesty, "* etc. Notice that he calls this transfiguration scene, "*the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, "* thus identifying it fully with Matt. 16:27, 28. This is unquestionably, then, linking it with the still future Advent as a striking exhibition of the glory that shall be revealed—which is confirmed by Peter introducing this allusion to prove that Christ would thus again come, and by his uniting such a Coming with (ch. 1:11) "*the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, "* and with His Coming, the new heaven and new earth (ch. 3:4, 13) of prophetic promise. (See also the references to this Coming in first Epistle.) Let us survey these several aspects. First and supreme stands forth the transfiguration of Jesus, changed in form, so that "*His face did shine as the sun and His raiment was white as the light*" (Matthew); "*His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them*" (Mark); "*the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistening*" (Luke). Here is *the Theocratic King* arrayed in light and glory, His face shining with brightness like that of the sun and His garments dazzling in their whiteness. Thus

(comp. Rev. 1:13–16, etc.) will *the Mighty Christ appear* when He comes to re-establish the Theocracy. Next we have "*two men*" (Luke 9:30), Moses and Elias, who also appeared "*in glory.*" The Coming of Christ in His Kingdom is usually *associated* with that of the saints, His brethren, who are *co-heirs* with Him in the same glory. Hence, to give a representation of His Coming—His appearance when Coming—in His Kingdom it was *eminently suitable to have*—to fill out the picture—*the saints, glorified, also represented.* This is done; and in view of the fact that at His Second Advent these are made up of two parties, viz., *the dead* saints and *the living saints translated,* these two, Moses and Elias, are *purposely chosen as a correct exhibition* of the two parties—forming one class—who shall *then appear "in glory" with Christ.* Moses represents the body of saints who have died, but who will also be glorified with Christ; and as he was in converse with the glorified Saviour, so will they also be in nearness to Him. Moses and Elias both appearing "in glory," seems to indicate the same glorification of body. Elias represents another body, who, like himself, shall not fall "asleep," but shall be translated without experiencing the power of death. These two, the dead and the living, who shall be glorified at the Coming of Jesus, are graphically portrayed in 1 Cor. 15:51, 52, and 1 Thess. 4:15–17. These not only *see* His glory, but *partake* of the same, 1 Jno. 3:2; Phil. 3:21, etc., for of them it is said: "*When Christ*" (notice, as "Christ") "*who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory, "* Col. 3:4. But in addition to these, we have, to meet the prophetic announcements and to fill out the representation, *three persons,* Peter, James and John, *unglorified, mortal men living on the earth,* who see this glorified Christ and His glorified associates, and are so deeply impressed, so delighted with *the exceeding glory* revealed, that through the spokesman Peter, the emphatic declaration is made: "*Lord, it is good for us to be here.*" Thus, if willing to receive it, *will it be* at the Second Advent, *when* Christ, "The Christ,", comes in His glory and *with* His brethren gathered and glorified, *then* shall the spared Jewish nation and Gentiles, as prediction after prediction in glorious language portrays, *rejoice and exult* in the marvellous glory that shall be manifested. Jesus *personally* appears in His Kingly aspect; the saints *personally* are present in their glory; the disciples *personally* behold and admire the astonishing splendor and "majesty" of the scene. Jesus is here, "the Coming One" (a phrase well understood by the

Jews), as He will exhibit Himself “in His own Kingdom;” the saints form “the first-fruits,” who, as the predicted “kings and priests,” reign with Christ in His Kingdom; and the mortal men are the servants or subjects (as even the tender of the three tents indicates) who gladly receive this glory, and are willing to abide under its radiance. The conversation respecting the approaching death at Jerusalem indicates that this was a temporary assumption of glory, in order to be, if we may so express it, a counterpoise to that which virtually—to the Jews—seemed to end the fondly anticipated Christship of Jesus, giving a *most direct proof* that the covenant and prophets would *yet be fulfilled*. The voice of the Father, lovingly acknowledging (having previously in answer to prayer brought about this supernatural change in David’s Son) the Christship of Jesus and the power thus committed unto Him, *binds the whole together* into *an earnest, actual reception of glory*, which, thus represented, shall characterize David’s Son and Lord when He comes to restore the fallen throne and Kingdom, and reigns indeed and in truth *the manifested Christ.* The presence of the Father and some kind of avowal, or, confession, or acquiescence is requisite to meet the requirements of prediction concerning the Coming of the Messiah in His Kingdom (as e.g. Dan. 7; Ps. 2, etc.), and *thus perfect* the representation of *the real Theocratic* position of Jesus. Surely, when considering *how many* particulars this transfiguration meets, *how* it demonstrates in the most forcible manner “*The Christ;*” *how* it supplies additional evidence of the ultimate manner of procedure in the Redemptive scheme, *it is folly* to ascribe all this, compressed into a few brief sentences, to the natural descriptive powers of “uneducated and ignorant” men, or to make it out a trivial, unimportant affair not worthy of our special attention. Viewed, as we have done, in the light of the great, leading doctrine of the Kingdom, it stands forth, *pre-eminently*, as *a Divine confirmation of the Theocratic Kingship of Jesus, of the glory of His saints, and of the happiness of the nations* who shall witness it—a fact *so striking and corroborative* of the ultimate Redemption of saints and of the race, that Peter seizes upon it as *a grand proof* that Jesus shall come unto so great Salvation.—*Theocratic Kingdom*, II, 559–61

V. The Divine Attestation

It remains to be indicated that, though much overlooked, there is far-reaching significance in the words—reported diligently by each of the three Evangelists—"Hear ye him." Apart from the divine witness or response recorded in John 12:28, there are three divine attestations of the Christ. Space has been given earlier to the evidence that the baptism of Christ served as a setting apart of the Lord to the priestly office, and in this He was acknowledged from heaven to be well-pleasing to His Father. At the return of the King and when He is by His Father seated upon David's throne in Zion (Jerusalem—cf. Ps. 2:6), it is suggested that there will then be the same divine attestation of the King, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" (Ps. 2:7). Thus, also, in the transfiguration He is divinely recognized as Jehovah's Prophet. Such is the significance of the words *Hear ye Him.* In the very transfiguration itself the Lord was speaking prophetically of His future coming in glory. Such an injunction gathers up all He had ever said before and all that He would later say on earth (cf. Matt. 23:38–25:46) or from the glory, and as such addressed to all peoples in every generation.

In concluding this contemplation of the transfiguration, let it be observed again that there is only one primary meaning to it. It portrays the power and coming of Christ in His kingdom, it presents specifically the features and classifications of men in the kingdom, and is in no way related, according to the Sacred Text, to the Church or to the glory which is of heaven. The Church will share with Christ in the earthly kingdom glory, as represented by Moses and Elijah; but this should not be confused with the surpassing glory which belongs to the Bride in the splendor of heaven.

Chapter VII

The Teachings of Christ Incarnate

Throughout the Bible the prophet may win his title either by fore telling or by forthtelling. Christ was in both respects a Prophet. He was the one of whom Moses speake (cf. Deut. 18:15, 18–19; John 1:21), and none ever answered more completely to all that belongs to the perfect service of the prophet than did the Christ of God. He taught and ministered the Word of God accompanying it with His mighty works, and He also gave the most direct and determining predictions of any prophet who ever walked on the earth. In truth, the predictions of Christ should be studied closely by every student of Eschatology, remembering that these are the infallible words of the Son of God. It is also important to observe that the merest fraction of all that Christ said in three and a half years has been recorded in the Gospels; for that recorded may be read in as many hours as there were years of His ministry. Of this John writes, “And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written” (John 21:25). However, that which is presented in the Sacred Text has been selected by the Holy Spirit with that divine wisdom and perfection which characterizes all the works of God. These chosen records serve to tell all that it is God’s purpose to disclose to succeeding generations and are, therefore, all that is needed for a right understanding of every aspect of the truth which belongs to the sphere of the four Gospels. Matthew, guided by the Spirit, has selected such records as present Christ as the King of the Jews. Mark, thus guided, has selected such records as present Christ as Jehovah’s Servant. Luke, in turn, has been led to present Christ in His humanity, while John, by the same divine Spirit, portrays Christ in His essential Deity. It is probable that no uninspired writer having the story to tell that presented itself at the close of Christ’s ministry—including His supernatural birth, His childhood, His teachings, His mighty works, His death, and His resurrection—could have compressed his message into the limits which are claimed by the four Writers. In this there is evidence of the working of the divine hand as the Author of these marvelous and priceless documents. While much vital truth is found in those snatches of conversation which are recorded and in the brief sayings reported in the

later portions of the New Testament (cf. Acts 20:35; 1 Thess. 4:15–17; 1 John 1:5) and particularly in the post-ascension declarations reported in the Revelation—chapters 1–3 and 22—the indicative teachings of Christ are found in three major discourses—the Sermon on the Mount, the Olivet Discourse, and the Upper Room Discourse. In the contemplation of the full prophetic ministry of Christ, the plan to be pursued is to consider (1) the three major discourses separately, (2) the parables, (3) the special teachings, and (4) the conversations.

I. The Major Discourses

Before attempting an examination of these discourses separately, it may be well to observe that they present the widest possible latitude in subject matter. This fact has not only been greatly overlooked, but can be accounted for only when dispensational distinctions are recognized. If critical scholars assume it possible to claim two Isaiahs on the evidence afforded in the difference in style and subject matter which the two parts of Isaiah's writing set forth, there would be by far more conclusive proof of at least three Christs. It seems not to occur to a certain group of theologians that these discourses not only introduce principles which, from a doctrinal standpoint, are irreconcilable, but also happen to be addressed to classes which are differently related to God and to Christ. No proof of this assertion respecting the varied character of the discourses is needed other than the suggestion that they be given attentive study by placing them in comparison to, or over against, each other. If such a study has been pursued actually and to a reasonable degree of completeness, the distinctions which will be advanced in this thesis would be received as true. These discourses represent the doctrine which Christ taught, and it will be found that every major division of Systematic Theology is not only represented, but, more frequently than is generally realized, a final word is spoken by the Son of God. That so much of His teaching is couched in a narrative form and simplified to the last degree has misled some into supposing that Christ did not teach doctrine, that the presentation of doctrine was left for the later writers of the New Testament—especially Paul. Christ's utterances in doctrine were often presented in germ form and these were extended into wider fields by the later writers. However, it becomes the serious-minded

student to investigate most diligently the actual teachings of the Son of God. It is the intention of this thesis to attempt a comprehensive scrutiny of that which is involved.

1. The Sermon on the Mount. A rather extended consideration of this discourse has been previously introduced under Ecclesiology and to this the student is again directed. Howbeit, when attempting as in this instance to set forth the general theme of the teachings of Christ, the effort must be incomplete to an inadmissible degree should no attention be given at this point to this great discourse. The treatment of this discourse by writers of the past and present often reveals the extent of their comprehension of the present divine economy under grace. Apparently, the root difficulty is the failure to recognize what is rightfully a primary and what is rightfully a secondary application of this teaching. When the primary application is given to this Scripture, it is usually on the supposition that the Church is the kingdom and therefore passages related to the kingdom are addressed to her. Let it be dogmatically asserted at this point that those who hold such views either have failed to recognize the hopeless, blasting character of the law which this discourse announces and from which the Christian has been saved (Rom. 6:14; Gal. 5:1), or they have failed to comprehend the present position and perfection in Christ which is the estate of every believer. Apparently the two great systems—law and grace—become so confused that there could be no order of thinking possible. Distortions of the divine revelation are due, it would seem, to a slavish adherence to traditional interpretation and not to any unbiased personal investigation into the problems that are involved. Accompanying this inattention to the exact character of doctrine is, too often, the blind assumption that the student who does observe the patent character of this discourse and who therefore cannot give it a primary application to the Church is striking hands in agreement with the destructive critic who boldly rejects Scripture altogether. To give this discourse a primary application to the Church means that it is made to be, word for word, the rule of life prescribed for the child of God under grace. A secondary application to the Church means that lessons and principles may be drawn from it, but that, as a rule of life, it is addressed to the Jew before the cross and to the Jew in the coming kingdom, and is therefore not now in effect. At this point it cannot be too definitely

emphasized that this entire discourse presents a complete rule of conduct and is not subject to that destructive method of interpretation which accepts one portion of it while rejecting another portion of it. If the Christian believes he is saved from hell fire through the measureless grace of God, he will recognize that he has no relation to those warnings—three times uttered (Matt. 5:22, 29–30)—concerned with the danger of hell fire; but he must also observe that he has no primary relation to a system in any of its parts which could at any place or under any circumstances expose him to the danger of hell fire. If there are some portions of this discourse which are more gracious in character, these, it will be seen, are found also in the grace system, and it is not necessary for one to assume the inconsistent position which presumes to select or reject at will from that which, being a unit in itself, stands or falls together. It is precisely this impossible freedom to choose one portion and reject another which has kept a great company of men from coming to a clear understanding of the most elementary distinctions between the two systems—law and grace—as governing principles in daily life.

The Bible provides three complete and wholly independent rules for human conduct—one for the past age (there was no need of recording such rules as held good for people who lived before the Bible was written) which is known as the Mosaic Law and is crystallized in the Decalogue; one for the future age of the kingdom which is crystallized in the Sermon on the Mount; and one for the present age which appears in the Gospel by John, the Acts, and the Epistles of the New Testament. The Bible is God’s one Book for all ages, and it should be no more difficult to recognize that there are portions which belong to a future age than it is to recognize that there are portions which belong to a completed past age. A moment’s reflection would convince a candid mind that there were age-transforming events which serve as a cleavage between the conditions which obtained under the Mosaic system and those which obtain in the present age. “The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (and not by His birth, but by His death). Relationship to God could not be the same for His saints after Christ’s death, His resurrection, His ascension, the advent of the Holy Spirit, the placing of Jews along with Gentiles under sin, and the inauguration of a new system by which the chief of sinners may be justified forever through justice—who does no more to that end than to believe in

Jesus—as it was before. Nor could it be the same in a coming age after the removal of the Church to heaven, the glorious appearing of Christ to reign on the earth, the judgment and restoration of Israel, the judgment of the nations with the termination of man-made institutions, and the binding of Satan—as it has been in this age. All this is obvious, yet there are those who shrink from such distinctions under the impression that being deprived of the law's curse and of the kingdom's danger of hell fire they are losing some priceless treasure. Neither the curse nor the hell fire is desired, but there are features of these systems which are more attractive and these are claimed while the undesirable is rejected. It may well be restated that none of these attractive elements are lost, for they are incorporated into the grace system and belong to those who are once-for-all perfected in Christ Jesus.

It therefore stands as well founded that the Sermon on the Mount both by its setting in the context and by its doctrinal character—which assertions will yet more fully be demonstrated as true—belongs for its primary application to the future kingdom age. It was addressed to the people before Him and concerned the requisite preparation on their part for admission into the kingdom of heaven then being published as "at hand." It likewise declared the manner of life that would be demanded within the kingdom when once it is entered. This attempted analysis of this discourse may be advanced under three general divisions —(1) its setting, (2) its distinctive character, and (3) the delay in its application.

a. Setting. As the Old Testament closes with the predictions regarding Israel's coming Messiah-King unrealized (Mal. 4:1–6), Matthew's Gospel, as the introduction to the New Testament and the bond of connection between the Testaments, opens with the announcement of the presence of the Messiah among His people. All prophesied requirements are met by Him. He is of the tribe of Judah, of the house of David, born of a virgin in Bethlehem of Judea. His coming is in "the fulness of the time," that is, at God's appointed time. His predicted forerunner preceded Him, and the kingdom described in the Old Testament by the prophets and foreseen throughout the Scriptures as Israel's hope is announced as "at hand"—subject, however, to the choice of the people, whether or not they would receive their King. In this matter of choice there is a strong contrast set up when compared with His final advent, when the kingdom will be ushered in

with no reference to human determination, though He will have wrought in the hearts of His earthly people not only to receive Him as Joseph's brethren received Joseph in Egypt, but also to enter their land, the land of promise, and their kingdom with everlasting joy and gladness. The important fact to be noted by all who would comprehend the Synoptic Gospels, and Matthew in particular, is that the kingdom was offered to Israel at the first advent, with the latitude granted to receive or reject it. Had it been in the "determinate counsel" of God (Acts 2:23) for that nation to enter then her covenanted kingdom, they would have done so (and as they yet will do under the sovereign hand of Jehovah). The "determinate counsel" concerning the first advent was rather that He should be rejected and put to death and that the kingdom should be deferred until the unforeseen intercalary age of the Church should run its course. Those who do not discern the Israelitish kingdom purpose or who suppose that the Old Testament hope is realized in the Church are, because of insuperable problems which their theory engenders, not much given to exposition of Matthew's Gospel, nor can they be rated as safe expositors of either Testament.

The Gospel by Matthew opens with an introduction of the Christ, first, as Son of David and, second, as Son of Abraham. Though this is the reverse of what would be the natural order, it conforms to the plan of Matthew's Gospel which first presents the King as the Son of David, the consummator of the Davidic Covenant, Israel's Messiah, and later turns to the world-wide blessings which are related to the death and resurrection of Christ as the fulfiller of the Abrahamic Covenant expectation. In this Gospel Christ's birth as the fulfillment of much prophecy is recorded, He is baptized at thirty years of age, He is filled with the Spirit without measure, His humanity is tested by Satan, and He Himself takes up, with the disciples whom He has chosen, the message of His forerunner John—"Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (cf. Matt. 3:1–2; 4:17; 10:5–7). He suffers His disciples to preach this message to none but Israel. This prohibition is of vital importance, since in all His instructions respecting kingdom preaching (cf. Matt. 10) this direction stands first. It is written: "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach,

saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 10:5–7). After this, restricting His own ministry for the time being to that one nation, He said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15:24). The Apostle reveals his own clear understanding of this specific Israelitish ministry which was to be followed by the age of grace when he said, "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers: and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy" (Rom. 15:8–9). Apart from a recognition of a dispensational distinction at this point, there can be little understanding of these imperative discriminations. It is here that the student should note that, as there was for a time a restricted Israelitish purpose in the ministry of Christ, there was, at the same time, a peculiar and appropriate Israelitish message which John, Christ, and His disciples declared. This message, if given any worthy consideration, would not be confused with a world-wide proclamation of saving grace which became possible and exclusively authoritative by divine provision through the death and resurrection of Christ. It is strange, indeed, that men who have won honors as theologians of the first magnitude do not see the difference between the proclamation of an earthly kingdom addressed to one elect nation to be established on legal grounds, and the proclamation of a grace message which concerns only individuals with Jews and Gentiles, on an equal footing, under sin and offers in sovereign grace to the one who believes on Christ that he will be made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light. It is a serious doctrinal bondage so to be committed to a one-covenant theory with its supposed one divine purpose that these immeasurable dissimilarities must be obliterated in meaningless generalities.

During His three and a half years of ministry on earth Christ had in view the three major ages already mentioned—the Mosaic age which closed with His death; the future kingdom age which was the reasonable hope of the instructed Jew but which, being postponed, will begin with His second advent; and the present unforeseen age which began with His death and will end with His return. Christ lived under the Mosaic system and therefore was Himself conformed to it and upheld its requirements. He proclaimed the kingdom age as "at hand" and gave instructions on its character and the terms of admission into it. Likewise, while His rejection as King grew in force, He anticipated the present age and gave explicit teaching about its

relationships and doctrines. The accuracy of this brief analysis of the whole ministry of Christ need not be further defended here.

With reference to the setting, then, it is to be seen that the Sermon on the Mount was given in the midst and as a feature of the kingdom proclamation which first occupied the ministry of Christ on earth. It constituted the authoritative edict of the King relative to the character of the kingdom, its requirements, and the conditions of admission into it. It had to be restricted to Israel for it belonged to them alone, and it must be legal in character—though greatly advanced as such over the Mosaic system (Matt. 5:21–48)—for prediction was given by Moses respecting the legal character of that kingdom when he said, "And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the LORD, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day" (Deut. 30:8; cf. Jer. 31:31–34). The subject matter contained in the Sermon on the Mount not only sustains the contention that it is legal in character, but also asserts that it pertains to the kingdom as the surrounding context so clearly relates it. With all this in view, namely, (1) that Christ's early ministry was itself restricted to Israel and their covenanted kingdom, (2) that its character is legal and accords with the predictions in this respect, (3) that by its own subject matter it relates itself to the kingdom, and (4) that that which goes before as well as that which follows this sermon in the context is in every particular of the kingdom, it would be exceedingly difficult to relate this great rule of life to any other age than that of the Messianic reign of Christ on the earth. This discourse is no more related to the Church than the Messianic, Davidic, earthly kingdom is related to the Church, and those who apply it to the Church seem little aware of the problems which are involved. Some of these problems will be considered in connection with that which follows.

b. Distinctive Character. Though treated at length under Ecclesiology, the analysis of this discourse constitutes a theme of such surpassing importance that it should be considered here somewhat fully. It is a formal declaration —unlike so many of Christ's teachings which were broken into by conversation. Nothing is gained by the modern notion that this is a compilation of "single sayings which Jesus spoke at various occasions to different people," and that "these sayings were connected with each other to form a continuous discourse partly by Matthew, partly by the author of his

source" (Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 105). By so much the plain assertion that Christ spoke all these words on one occasion is discredited and the accumulative force of the message is assigned to Matthew rather than to Christ. It was addressed to His disciples, evidently as detailed instruction to those who were then serving as preachers of the kingdom message. The address closes with the words, "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:28–29), which indicates that the multitude were present and heard, though it was spoken to His disciples (5:1). Though these disciples were soon to be brought into the Church and into this new age, the address to them, like the offer of the kingdom to Israel, was in good faith. Well did Christ know that these men would not enter the kingdom, but that they would be saved into the Church when His rejection was complete. Well did He know, also, that the kingdom itself would be refused and delayed until His second advent. There is no small advantage in keeping in mind the fact that this was the address of a Teacher to teachers, that it was to His disciples. On the general character of the address and its application, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes:

> Having announced the kingdom of heaven as "at hand," the King, in Mt. 5.—7., declares the *principles* of the kingdom. The Sermon on the Mount has a twofold application: (1) Literally to the kingdom. In this sense it gives the divine constitution for the righteous government of the earth. Whenever the kingdom of heaven is established on earth it will be according to that constitution, which may be regarded as an explanation of the word "righteousness" as used by the prophets in describing the kingdom (e.g. Isa. 11:4, 5; 32:1; Dan. 9:24). In this sense the Sermon on the Mount is pure law, and transfers the offence from the overt act to the motive (Mt. 5:21, 22, 27, 28). Here lies the deeper reason why the Jews rejected the kingdom. They had reduced "righteousness" to mere ceremonialism, and the Old Testament idea of the kingdom to a mere affair of outward splendour and power. They were never rebuked for expecting a visible and powerful kingdom, but the words of the prophets should have prepared them to expect also that only the poor in spirit and the meek could share in it (e.g. Isa. 11:4). The seventy-second Psalm, which was universally received by them as a description of the kingdom, was full of this. For these reasons the Sermon on the Mount in its primary application gives neither the privilege nor the duty of the Church. These are found in the Epistles. Under the law of the kingdom, for example, no one may hope for forgiveness who has not first forgiven (Mt. 6:12, 14, 15). Under grace the Christian is exhorted to forgive because he is already forgiven (Eph. 4:30–32). (2) But there is a beautiful moral application to the Christian. It always remains true that the poor in spirit, rather than the proud, are blessed, and those who mourn because of their sins, and who are meek in the consciousness of them, will hunger and thirst after righteousness, and hungering will be

filled. The merciful *are* "blessed," the pure in heart do "see God." These principles fundamentally reappear in the teaching of the Epistles.—*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 999–1000

Matthew 5:3–12. This sermon opens with a proclamation of the blessedness of those who in personal merit meet certain requirements. To the poor in spirit there is promise of the kingdom of heaven—the Davidic, Messianic, earthly, millennial kingdom. The agencies of human authority will not then prevail in that kingdom. A vast change will have come over this world when the humble in spirit will be honored by the possession of the kingdom. Through Isaiah Jehovah anticipated this priceless characteristic when He said, "For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the LORD: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word" (66:2). Those that mourn shall be comforted. Doubtless this is a constant provision throughout that glorious age, but it is especially true that Israel when saved into that kingdom will be saved from that mourning which is theirs in the tribulation. The King Himself at His second advent will "comfort all that mourn." He will "appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness" (Isa. 61:2–3). This mourning is described by Christ when in relation to His return He said, "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24:30). Of the meek, Christ said that they shall "inherit the earth." This, again, is far removed from earth conditions of today. The meek and poor in spirit arise to honor and to authority over men, but such a reward does not concern the Christian who has no right or citizenship on the earth. It would be thought-provoking if Christians who repeat the Decalogue and the Beatitudes with application to themselves should be required to designate "the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee" (Ex. 20:12) or to defend their title to the earth. An instructed believer is not looking for long life; he is waiting for his Lord from heaven. He is not looking for a land or a place in the earth; his citizenship is in heaven. The Jew alone can respond to the promise of Psalm 37:3 which reads, "Trust in the LORD, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." The meek among Israel shall inherit

the earth. Hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be the experience of those in the kingdom upon whose hearts Jehovah has written His law (cf. Deut. 30:6; Jer. 31:33) and that hunger and thirst shall be satisfied. This is the promised tranquillity of the children of the King. The proclamation that the merciful shall obtain mercy introduces one of the strongest contrasts between the governing principles of law and grace, and the persistent determination to retain this portion of this discourse as applicable to the Christian has, next to Matthew 6:12, wrought more confusion among believers than almost any other misapplied Scripture. The declaration that the merciful shall obtain mercy requires no labored adjustment to make it seem to fit into the grace relationship to God. It cannot be thus fitted in. It belongs to an age when the beatitude which is clearly stated will be perfectly true. Wide, indeed, is the difference between the conception of individual meritorious mercy and the words about mercy addressed to the Christian of this age: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins" (Eph. 2:4–5). Unmerited and limitless mercy shall yet be the portion of the nation Israel in the day of their salvation (Ps. 103:8–11). It is true that the pure in heart always see God; and since peace and righteousness are the essential features of life in the kingdom, those who promote peace and those who are persecuted—before or in the kingdom— for righteousness' sake shall be rewarded. Record of that reward due is kept in heaven (cf. Mal. 3:16–17).

Matthew 5:13–16. The second section of this address represents the saints of the kingdom and those worthy to enter it as "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world." All of this is revealing since it intimates the responsibility men are to assume in that coming age. None will deny that believers of this dispensation have similar obligations, but the mere paralleling of truth does not place Christians in Israel's kingdom, nor does it place inside the Church Israel as a nation.

Matthew 5:17–48. The next section should be classed as one of the most determining portions in this great discourse. It discloses Christ's own upholding of the law then in effect, and presents the legal aspect of the kingdom requirements in their clearest light. This portion should be pondered with utmost care and its drastic features taken seriously. To those who comprehend but little of that "grace and truth" which came by Jesus Christ, who have had no other thought of themselves than that they are

under law, obligation to these requirements is not, naturally, disturbed by the assumption of this "yoke of bondage," and those of such a legal mind will easily discredit as destructive critics any who consider that through grace they are under no obligation to these and other legal requirements. Pure doctrine cannot be guaranteed by following tradition whether it be of Protestantism or of Rome, nor are mere habits of interpretation a safe guide. All of these legal utterances of Christ's were in full divine force when they were spoken, but the child of God of this age has been saved from the entire merit system. The believer is delivered from and dead to the law (Rom. 7:4, 6). The Apostle when defending the positions and privileges of grace not only asserted that the law is "done away" (2 Cor. 3:11; Gal. 3:23–25), but he declares that the Christian is not under law (Rom. 6:14). To contend that Christians are under law obligation simply because Christ enforced it upon Jews, to whom it alone belonged and that before His death, is to contradict directly the grace teaching regarding freedom from the law—as cited above. This division of this discourse opens with the assurance that He had come to fulfill both "the law and the prophets," that is, He fills all the place assigned Him in the Old Testament. E. Schuyler English in his book *Studies in the Gospel According to Matthew* (p. 50) states, "Think not that He came to destroy the law. He was made under the law (Gal. 4:4); He lived in obedience to the law (1 Pet. 2:21); He fulfilled the types of the law (Heb. 9:11–28); He bore for us the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13); and He redeemed us from the position of servants of the law to that of sons of God (Gal. 4:5)." It is evident from Deuteronomy 30:8, which reads, "And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the LORD, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day," that the kingdom rule is the Mosaic system which, as Christ indicated (Matt. 5:21–44), has now been extended to realms vastly more demanding; and the standing of men will be measured by their personal adherence to the law that then reigns. It is no small feature of the kingdom that some shall be called "great" (Matt. 5:19; 11:11). The declaration regarding human greatness is followed by the words, "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (5:20), and here it is certain only personal rectitude is in view. No reference, here or elsewhere in this sermon, is made to imputed righteousness. The kingdom saints' righteousness under Messiah's reign

will exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. Indeed, such personal quality and merit are demanded for entrance into that kingdom at all. Many Jews will be judged unworthy to enter the kingdom, and those who will be judged will include Jews of the past dispensation who are raised to this judgment (cf. Dan. 12:1–3) as well as the last generation living who will enter that judgment. A reminder at this point may be in order, which asserts again that the believer is provided in this age with righteousness which is a gift from God made possible through the sweet savor aspect of Christ's death and on the ground of the believer's position in Christ. Of the Christian it is said, "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus 3:4–5). Such wide differences should not go unheeded as, too often, they do. Still continuing the emphasis which He placed upon the law, Christ goes on to state that the kingdom law, while introducing no new subjects of regulation, does, nevertheless, extend the obligation beyond the act to the motive. The phrase "Ye have heard that it hath been said" —the Mosaic declaration—is followed by the phrase, "But I say unto you"—the kingdom demand. Thus throughout Matthew 5:21–44 the contrasts are drawn. The scribes and Pharisees attended upon the law in their age, but a greater or more perfect righteousness than theirs will be demanded of those who enter the kingdom. The former prohibition against murder with its extreme penalty is advanced to apply to those who are angry without a cause. The one who says, "Thou fool," shall be in danger of hell fire. The most exacting demand rests upon the one who does not agree with his adversary quickly. The penalty is no less than that he be cast into prison and that without relief or mercy. The judgment which should fall upon the adulterer is imposed without grace upon the one who casts a lustful glance. The offending member is to be sacrificed lest one be cast into hell fire. Divorce will be restricted to the one cause of unfaithfulness. Communications shall be free from every oath. The other cheek must be turned when smitten. The cloak must be given to the one who by law takes away the coat. A second mile is to be added. Gifts are to be made to all who ask, and none are to turn from those who would borrow. Enemies are to be loved, those that curse are to be blessed, good is to be done to those that hate, and prayer offered for those who persecute.

All this is required since it represents the character of the Father. A moment's reflection will convince the mind that such a standard as this belongs to another social order than the present one. It is designed for a day when the King reigns upon His earthly throne and when Satan is in the abyss. Of the reign of the King, Isaiah writes, "And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins" (11:2–5). The undiscerning may feel it their duty to uphold and place such requirements upon those who are forever perfected in Christ, but this would be due to the failure to understand what it means to be in Christ and perfected forever. Even those who apply these requirements in sincerity to themselves and to others utterly fall short of the fulfillment of them. The present superabounding grace of God does not merely forgive the one who breaks the law; it saves one from any obligation to a merit system and enjoins him to walk worthy of the position which is his in Christ Jesus. What, then, does the Apostle mean when he said, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. 5:1; cf. Acts 15:10; Col. 2:8)? Who but the most prejudiced Arminian can incorporate into his scheme of doctrine the threefold warning against hell fire which is found in this portion of Matthew? The believer "cometh not into judgment" (John 5:24, R.V.); "they shall never perish" (John 10:28); "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). If the warnings respecting hell fire do not fit into the grace system—and they do not—it is because the entire kingdom program of relationship and conduct is far removed from that which belongs to grace. The kingdom rule of life is an extension of the Mosaic system in the direction of a more drastic law; it is not the modification of law in the direction of grace. To say as some have done that they accept the Sermon on the Mount as the rule of their lives but omit those portions which threaten hell fire, is to disregard the revealed truth

respecting the law, namely, that the one who assumes the least portion of it is a debtor to do the whole law (cf. Gal. 5:3; James 2:10).

Matthew 6:1–18. This, the next section of this Sermon, concerns the mere outward pretense in the giving of alms, of prayer, and of fasting. It is in the midst of this portion respecting prayer that the so-called "Lord's Prayer" is introduced, which prayer at once becomes a most difficult portion of this address for many to release to the kingdom system. In fact, like Matthew 5:20 which proclaims the terms of admission into the kingdom for the Jew, the "Lord's Prayer" is the divinely prescribed petition for the coming of that kingdom on the earth. "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." It is probable that of the many who repeat these words but few have pondered their far-reaching significance. Not every mind can grasp so vast a theme; and it may not, when repeated, express a personal desire that arises within the individual's own conception of need. Especially is this true of those who have no understanding of that which is meant in the Scripture by the word *kingdom*. The kingdom will come and the Father's will be done on earth as it is in heaven, but only by virtue of the returning Messiah. The point of difficulty in the prayer, however, is not the petition in behalf of the earthly kingdom, which kingdom will come with the second advent and was "at hand" when the prayer was given to the disciples, but it is the one petition, "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." This being the only portion of the prayer which is taken up by Christ for special elucidation, it evidently, in His mind, called for such remarks as might keep it from misunderstanding. As it is—in spite of the clarifying comment which the Lord added—there is much disregard for all that He emphasized and a determination to bend this legal condition into some conformity with grace. His comment is as follows, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (6:14–15). It cannot but be recognized that this one petition—meaning what Christ insists it means —is directly opposed in principle to the grace ideal as set forth in Ephesians 4:32, which declares, "And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Such is also the restatement found in Colossians 3:13, "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ

forgave you, so also do ye." The truth that God is "rich in mercy" even when we were "dead in sins" is one truth concerning which the child of God should be jealous with a great passion of soul. On that truth his only hope depends. Sad, indeed, is the spectacle when Christians assume that the Sermon on the Mount represents the high calling of the Church and attempt to modify the character of sovereign grace to the end that it may conform to a merit system. When it is recognized that this petition and this entire prayer is not only embedded in the kingdom manifesto but is itself a plea for the kingdom to come, difficulties are removed. Added to the conclusive character of the prayer is the fact that it is not "in the name" of Christ. Prayer for the Christian is upon a new and infinitely higher basis than any could be in any other age or relationship. In His last words to His disciples, Christ opened to them the new ground of prayer which is in His name (John 14:14), and declared that hitherto prayer had not been offered in that name (John 16:24). Again the child of God may well be jealous with a great passion respecting this new and marvelous approach to God in prayer. When the Lord said "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name," He contemplated all previous prayers— including the "Lord's Prayer"—as in no way to be compared with that new ground of prayer then opened unto believers.

Matthew 6:19–24. Devotion to God is the theme discussed in this division of the discourse. Treasures may be laid up in heaven in the sense that the record of faithfulness is preserved in heaven (cf. Mal. 3:16). In this there is something similar to the grace relationship.

Matthew 6:25–34. What is deeply devotional follows, surpassing anything found in the Old Testament presentation of the Mosaic system. To those who feel that Matthew 6:19–34 presents truth so rich and helpful that it must be claimed for their own portion as Christians, it may be restated that all Scripture is profitable, and accordingly this material, though also directly taught under grace, may be employed on the basis of a secondary application. It yet remains that these truths belong to the address in which they are found. It is not right or commendable for believers to claim Israel's richest blessings, but refuse her penalties and curses.

Matthew 7:1–6. Nothing more drastically legal or based on human merit will be found than the teachings in this portion of this Sermon. Here it is written, "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye

judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (vss. 1–2). With this there is a scathing rebuke for those who assume to judge others when self-judgment has been neglected.

Matthew 7:7–11. Christ here returns again to the subject of prayer, with the assurance that prayer will be answered, that God is in infinite goodness more willing to give good gifts to them that ask Him than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children.

Matthew 7:12–14. In this section those among Israel are reminded that to enter the kingdom a surpassing righteousness is required. The time of entering and of judgment is "in that [prophesied] day." The common ethics of moral men is proclaimed in the so-called "Golden Rule," which rises no higher than what is human self-interest. This rule is a standard for "just men" of the Old Testament order. By such faithfulness, measured by one's own self-interest, entrance would be made into the "strait gate." There is a "wide gate" that leads to destruction and a strait and narrow way that leads to life. Here "life" is not presented as a present possession of the Jew, as it is now of the Christian (cf. John 3:36; 10:28; Rom. 6:23; 1 John 5:12), but it is presented as an expectation, an inheritance, that is to be bestowed (cf. Luke 10:25–28; 18:18). Life, in its kingdom aspect, is at the end of the path which leads unto it. The nation Israel, to whom these words are spoken, are to come up for a final judgment when some will enter the kingdom and some will not (cf. Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 24:37–25:30). "The strait and narrow way" is an outworking of personal merit and righteousness and is far removed from salvation, which provides a perfect and eternal justification based on an acceptance in the Beloved. The Christian has been saved by an act of faith and not by relentless persevering in a narrow path. Luke reports this same saying of Christ's —perhaps upon another occasion —when he records Christ as saying, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate" (Luke 13:24), and the word here rendered *strive* is ἀγωνίζομαι, which could well be translated *agonize*. There is no rest here in the finished work of Christ (cf. Heb. 4:9); all is personal merit as the basis of hope for entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

Matthew 7:15–20, 21–29. This portion presents two warnings and with these the discourse ends. The first is against false prophets and unveils the method by which they may be detected. The second is against mere professors who render lip service, who say "Lord, Lord," but do not the will

of the Father. Merely to call on the name of the Lord (cf. Rom. 10:13) or to have done wonderful works in that name will not suffice. The same drastic demand is again stated by Christ and in connection with the same situation in the parable of the ten virgins. Of those shut out of the marriage feast (note R.V. on Matt. 25:10) the Lord will say, "Verily I say unto you, I know you not" (25:12). The life that is given over to the keeping of those sayings of Christ—set forth in this Sermon and when the kingdom objective is before Israel, whether in the days of Christ's ministry on earth or when the King returns—is building on a rock; but this is purely a matter of individual merit. It is "he that doeth" and not "he that believeth." The people heard this address and were astonished at His doctrine, for He taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes. This authority was that of the sovereign God and King. It breathed in every portion of the address. "I say unto you" above and in the place of the Law of Moses was that which no other would assume to declare. The Originator of all things—greater than Moses and the Author of all that Moses said —had no occasion to refer to any other than Himself. What He proclaimed would transpire simply because He said so. No man ever spoke as this Man spoke.

The conclusion growing out of this analysis of this discourse is that it is the direct and official pronouncement of the King Himself of that manner of life which will be the ground for admission into the kingdom of heaven and the manner of life to be lived in the kingdom. It relates itself backward to the Mosaic Law and the prophets and not forward into the then unknown spheres of sovereign grace. When considered with this interpretation in mind, this Sermon is full of meaning and free from insuperable problems. It will be borne in mind, however, that there is no divine objective in the present age unto the setting up of that earthly kingdom. The offer of the kingdom, together with all situations and teachings related to it, was withdrawn for this age and will be renewed when the Church has been removed and the King is about to return in power and great glory.

Having presented this somewhat limited summarization of the Sermon on the Mount, it remains to investigate that which is excluded from this discourse. It is in this connection that the inattention of many is revealed. It will be discovered that the most vital elements of the believer's relation to the Persons of the Godhead—such relationships as are set forth in the Upper Room Discourse—are all wanting in this address; but the

disappointing feature is disclosed when so many embrace a system demanding supermerit requirements and seem not to recognize that the priceless things pertaining to both a perfect standing and eternal security in Christ are omitted. A dominating jealousy for those things on which Christian reality depends would at least be reasonable and natural.

There is in the Sermon on the Mount a recognition of the Father and the Messiah-Son, but no reference will be found to the Holy Spirit whose indwelling and limitless ministry is so great a factor in this age of the Church. There is no reference to the death of Christ with its redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation values. There is no regeneration and no mention of the faith principle as a way into the saving grace of God. There is a reference to faith as a life principle (Matt. 6:25–34), but this is in no way related to salvation from sin. The great truth of a New Creation procured and secured through the resurrection of Christ is wholly wanting in this address. The phrase *in Christ* with its infinite meaning relative to positions and possessions is not present, nor is even one of those positions or possessions hinted at throughout its more than one hundred verses. No enabling power whereby these great demands both in character and conduct may be realized is intimated. It represents a human responsibility. The great word *justification* could not possibly be introduced nor that imputed righteousness upon which justification is founded. How far removed is a mere man-wrought righteousness which exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt. 5:20) from the "gift of righteousness" bestowed on those who receive "abundance of grace" (Rom. 5:17)! And how great is the difference between those who hunger and thirst after righteousness (Matt. 5:6) and those who are "made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21)! Thus, also, great is the difference between those who are in danger of hell fire (Matt. 5:22, 29–30) and those who are justified on a principle of perfect divine justice who have done no more than believe in Jesus—even the ungodly (Rom. 3:26; 4:5). Thus, again, note should be made of the divergence between those who obtain mercy by being merciful (Matt. 5:7) and those who have found everlasting mercy even when dead in sins (Eph. 2:4–5), likewise between those who hope to be forgiven on the ground of their own forgiveness of others (Matt. 6:12–15) and those who for Christ's sake have been forgiven (Eph. 4:32; Col. 3:13). And, yet again, consideration must be given to a distinction between

those who follow a course—strait and narrow—with the goal in view that they may find life at the end of that path (Matt. 7:14) and those to whom eternal life has been given as a present possession (John 3:36; Rom. 6:23; 1 John 5:11–12). Finally, far removed is a situation in which some hear the Lord say, "I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:23) and an assurance that one trusting in Christ "shall never perish" (John 10:28; Rom. 8:1). With these and many other contrasts in view, agreement cannot be accorded Professor Martin Dibelius in his book *The Sermon on the Mount* wherein he says, "The Sermon on the Mount is not the only program of Christian conduct in the New Testament. The New Testament contains many other sayings of the same kind, especially the instructions for the disciples, the well-known similes and parables and the admonitions found in the Epistles. But the Sermon on the Mount overshadows all of these and thus has special symbolic value as the great proclamation of the new righteousness" (pp. 105–6). Apparently Professor Dibelius does not lack in the matter of appreciation of the high moral standards set forth in the Sermon on the Mount; he does lack, however, the understanding of that which enters into the whole divine undertaking of saving grace, nor does the Professor, as many a theologian in his class, distinguish between the earthly Jewish purpose of God which is consummated in the Davidic, Messianic kingdom of heaven and the heavenly purpose of God which is consummated in the Church and her destiny in heaven.

c. Delay in Its Application. Nothing new is introduced under this division of the discussion. It has been repeatedly demonstrated in previous pages that as certainly as the kingdom itself was postponed, so certainly all that appertains to it was postponed until the present unforeseen intercalary age has run its course. The rule of life looking to and governing in that kingdom was, with respect to its application, postponed. All that enters into the general fact of the kingdom's delay, as well as the objections raised against this doctrine, has been considered at length under Ecclesiology. Suffice it to say that the kingdom requirements presuppose the kingdom as present. The social order in the earth which the kingdom prescribes must be such as will make possible this supermanner of life. The King Himself must be present and reigning, Satan must be bound, the law of God must be written in the

heart, and all Israel must know the Lord from the least unto the greatest (Jer. 31:31–34).

2. The Olivet Discourse. The second major discourse delivered by Christ was spoken but two days before His crucifixion. This limit of time is clearly indicated by the words which follow immediately after the address, "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his disciples, Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified" (Matt. 26:1–2). This discourse, like that known as the Sermon on the Mount, is addressed to Israel. Christ's lament over Jerusalem is the divinely arranged introduction to it. That lament is recorded thus, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Matt. 23:37–39). This portion, in turn, has been preceded by drastic condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23:1–36). As in the Sermon on the Mount, this major address is given to the disciples "privately," and these twelve are here treated as Jews and as representatives of that nation. They are spoken to as though they, like all Jews before them, would share in the events described in this discourse. The address is of the nature of a farewell to the nation Israel. Its purpose is not to condemn that people nor to instruct those then living, beyond the preparation of writers who would prepare the New Testament text, but to instruct those who live in the end time—with which it deals—when these disclosures and instructions will apply. It is reasonable to believe that God who provided these teachings will bring them to the attention of those, in their day of trial, to whom they belong. Jews in the tribulation will profit exceedingly by these words, and recognize them as the words of their Messiah-King. The King speaks, but quite without the use of the first person pronoun. He rather uses the third person form and refers to Himself as "the Christ, the bridegroom, the Son of man, and the king." Few portions of the New Testament place recorded events in a more complete chronological order than this address. This fact is an essential truth which determines much in the right interpretation. That which belongs

to the age of the Church is but provisionally referred to in a section which may be classed as an introductory portion. The discourse proper, it will be seen, begins with a description of the great tribulation and provides exhortations and warnings to Israelites of that time. The discourse concludes with a recital of the judgments which fall first upon Israel and then upon the nations. These judgments are determined by the King Himself and occur when the tribulation is over and when the King has returned to the earth. As the Church is not directly seen as present in Matthew's Gospel, excepting as her presence is implied in chapter 13, and is anticipated in 16:18, so—and even more emphatically—the Church is not seen even remotely in this farewell discourse to Israel. Two days later in the Upper Room Discourse—that to be considered later— the Lord gave His farewell message to the disciples not as Jews, but as those who were clean through the Word (John 13:10; 15:3), and who were no longer to be classed as under the Mosaic Law (15:25).

The wide difference which obtains between the Olivet Discourse and the Sermon on the Mount hardly needs elucidation. Though both were spoken by the Messiah to the nation Israel, they have almost nothing in common. One presents the responsibility of the individual Jew respecting entrance into and life within the Messianic kingdom. The other directs and warns the whole nation about its sufferings in the tribulation and gives most explicit directions and predictions relative to the place that nation must occupy in the most eventful days the world will see, namely, the seventieth week as foretold by Daniel (cf. Dan. 9:25–27; Matt. 24:15). Those days of unsurpassed tribulation are determined for the future and with them the final disposition of all Gentile governments and institutions. Israel, too, must be judged and the earth be changed from the present man-governed, Satan-ruled, *cosmos* world into the kingdom of heaven, and righteousness and peace cover the earth as waters cover the sea. It is both reasonable and much to be appreciated that Christ should give before His departure these explicit instructions to His beloved nation concerning such incomparable days. To those who have no understanding of and, therefore, no interest in these great predictions, this address can mean no more than aimless and useless remarks on the part of the Savior. However, the worthy student will enter into the contemplation of these far-reaching declarations with utmost attention.

It would hardly seem necessary, in the light of all that has been presented under Eschatology, to restate the truth that in the order of events —all clearly arranged by the Holy Spirit and to be observed by careful students— the Church is removed from the earth before Daniel's seventieth week begins, and that the Church is not therefore on the earth or to be seen in any of these situations.

It is probable that no body of prediction in the entire Bible is more definite or more interrelated with all the field of Biblical prophecy than this address. Almost every separate declaration may be taken as a starting point from which much prediction may be traced in its order. It could not be otherwise, since this is the consummating foretelling on the part of the Messiah-King and near the hour of His departure from this world. As often stated before in this work, God has a twofold purpose, namely, that for the earth which is centered in His earthly people and that for heaven which is centered in His heavenly people. It is therefore to be expected that Christ, who is the Consummator of each, should deliver two farewell messages— one for each of these groups of people. This is exactly the order of truth found in the Gospels. In this connection it will be seen that there is no intermingling of the truth which comprises these two farewell discourses. That addressed to Israel —now to be considered—is wholly apart from any reference to the Church, and that addressed to the Church—to be considered in the next division of this Chapter—is wholly apart from any complication with Israel or her kingdom. The analysis of the Olivet Discourse may be undertaken after the following manner:

Matthew 23:37–39. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

From the viewpoint of its inclusiveness, there are few more extended prophetic declarations than this. It may be reduced to a few meaningful phrases— "Jerusalem," "I would have gathered thy children together," "Ye would not," "Your house is left unto you desolate," "Ye shall not see me …, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The address is to Jerusalem's children, which, in this instance, is a

representation of the nation Israel. As before indicated, the entire discourse from Matthew 24:4 on (but for this opening portion— 23:37–39), though immediately spoken to His disciples who are still classed as Jews and represented a people who will pass through the experiences described in this address, is directed toward the entire nation and especially to those who will endure the trials depicted therein.The phrase, “I would have gathered thy children together,” not only discloses that He speaks to Israel, but refers to the fulfillment of much prophecy respecting the final regathering of Israel into their own land. In the accomplishment of His kingdom purpose, Christ is to regather Israel. This was indicated in His kingdom messages delivered during His first advent. The purpose will be executed perfectly at His second advent. Later on in this same address, He declares—and in relation to His second advent—“And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other” (24:31). Of this same event, Jeremiah said, “Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that they shall no more say, The LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land” (Jer. 23:7–8). That Israel “would not” is Christ’s own identification of their rejection of the King and His kingdom. And this declaration places the responsibility upon the nation. Later, and in harmony with this announcement respecting His rejection, they said, “His blood be on us, and on our children” (Matt. 27:25). “Your house” is a reference to the house of Israel which became centered in the kingly line of David. In Acts 15:16 this entity is termed “the tabernacle of David.” The passage reads, “After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up.” The term “desolate” is one of several words used to describe Israel’s situation in the world throughout this age (cf. “scattered and peeled”—Isa. 18:2, 7; James 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:1; “cast away,” in the sense of abandoned for a period of time —Rom. 11:15; “broken off”—Rom. 11:17; afflicted with “blindness”—cf. Isa. 6:9; Rom. 11:25; “hated”—Matt. 24:9). “Ye shall not see me” is an assertion which anticipates His total absence, respecting His peculiar relation to Israel “till” He returns, at which time “every eye shall see him”

(Rev. 1:7), “and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory” (Matt. 24:30). Israel will then say, “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” How great is the faithfulness of Jehovah to Israel! Isaiah records Jehovah’s message to that people as it will be at their final restoration: “For Zion’s sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem’s sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the LORD shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the LORD, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzi-bah, and thy land Beulah: for the LORD delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married. For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee: and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee. I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that make mention of the LORD, keep not silence, and give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth” (Isa. 62:1–7).

Matthew 24:1–3. “And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to shew him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?“

A brief interlude is set forth in these verses which has to do with a fulfilled prophecy, namely, the destruction of Jerusalem. The disciples have called Christ’s attention to the size and costliness of the Temple. Possibly He had not exhibited the usual Jewish admiration and amazement at the character of the stones (cf. Mark 13:1; Luke 21:5). Little did His disciples realize that He to whom they spoke had called every material thing into existence by the word of His power. These stones, however, Christ predicted would be thrown down. The same had been foretold before (cf. Jer. 9:11; 26:18; Mic. 3:12). This statement regarding the destruction of the temple, which statement was to the Jew most pessimistic to the last degree,

prompted the disciples to ask three questions, the answers to which enter largely into this discourse. They inquired, “Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?” (vs. 3). The answer to the first of these questions respecting the destruction of Jerusalem is not included in Matthew’s account, but is recorded in Luke 21:20–24 as follows, “And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judæa flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For those be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.” That all of this was accomplished by Titus in the year 70 A.D. is well known. There is need of warning, however, lest some phraseology in Luke’s account be confused with the same phraseology in Matthew’s account (cf. 24:16–20) and it be assumed on the basis of this similarity that the two accounts are parallel. In Luke’s account Christ is describing conditions and giving directions to the Jews about the time when the destruction of Jerusalem would be impending; Matthew’s account records the conditions and timely instructions to the Jews that will be in order when the tribulation comes and the King is about to return. A careful comparison of these two Scriptures will vindicate this assertion. It is at this point that the erroneous theory got its inception that the coming of Christ was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. The second and third questions, namely, “What shall be the sign of thy coming, and [the sign] of the end of the world [age]?” are answered by Christ in their reverse order. The disciples knew nothing of the order of events. This order Christ corrected by answering the last of these two questions first, and the first question relating to the sign of His coming He answered last.

It is needful to pause here for a consideration of what age is in view when they ask for a sign of its ending. As indicated above, it is probable that the word *sign* should be supplied in this question. The term *world* is a translation of the word αἰών which means *age*, or a period of time. Their

question was about the sign of the age in which they were living. Though some foreshadowing had been given by Christ, as recorded in Matthew, chapter 13, the disciples knew nothing of the present Church age (cf. Acts 1:6–7) and therefore could have known nothing of its end. They were living in the Mosaic age, the latter part of which Daniel had predicted would continue for 490 years. He predicted also that the last seven years of that period—Daniel's seventieth week—would be the time of the greatest human upheaval, including the great tribulation and the presence of the man of sin whom Christ styled "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet" (Matt. 24:15; cf. Dan. 9:26–27). In other words, the great tribulation and the man of sin belong to the Mosaic age that is past and are wholly unrelated to the present age of the Church. The man of sin will not "stand in the holy place" at the end of the Church age; it is at the end of that age then in effect when the disciples asked this question. The man of sin will stand in the holy place during the tribulation (Matt. 24:15; 2 Thess. 2:3–4).

Matthew 24:4–8. "And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are the beginning of sorrows."

Before answering the question about the sign of the end of the age, Christ gives a general comment on the intervening time before the Jewish age will come to its defined ending. At this point, for the disciples and all others there is need for special attention to these words of Christ lest deceptions arise. In spite of many false christs and of wars, etc., instructed saints are not to be deceived. These events—false christs, wars, famines, pestilences, and earthquakes—do not constitute a sign of the end of the Jewish age. This is the purport of Christ's words—"but the end is not yet," or more literally, *but not yet is the end.* Nations rise against nations and kingdoms against kingdoms. As always, famines and pestilences follow. None of these are ever to constitute the sign of the end of the Jewish age, though they may and do have real significance regarding this age in which they occur. They are the characteristics of the unforeseen intervening or

intercalary age. These age-characteristics are by Christ likened to “the beginning of sorrows.” The word *sorrows* is better rendered *travail*, which means labor at childbirth, anguish, or distress. It is true of birth pains that they grow more intense as the birth itself is approached. These conditions, then, which belong to this age, though they may increase in intensity, are the preliminary pains and to be distinguished from the excruciating pain of the birth itself. The birth pain itself serves to illustrate the tribulation and the accelerating characteristics of this age illustrate the “beginning of sorrows.” The important truth disclosed by Christ is that the “beginning of sorrows” is not the sorrow itself which belongs to Israel’s experience and to their former age and in which the abomination of desolation, or the desolater, appears.

> *Matthew 24:9–28:* Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name’s sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:) then let them which be in Judæs flee into the mountains: let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day: for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened. Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

This extended Scripture presents Christ’s own message to Israel regarding the great tribulation. As verse 8 with its reference to travail closes His brief picture of this present intervening age, verse 9, opening as it does with the word *then*, marks the time of the agony and pain of the birth. This time-word occurs throughout this context and serves to date all that is predicted within the bounds of this unprecedented trial on the earth. It is the same time as is referred to in verse 21: “For then shall be great tribulation.”

This same context, it will be seen, is followed by another time-expression in verse 29, “Immediately after the tribulation of those days.” Thus the boundaries of this context are determined. The student will bear in mind the truth that the tribulation period is described in various passages in both Testaments. Three distinct divine purposes may be discovered in this tribulation time. The passages here referred to are of great importance, but cannot be quoted in full. First, it is the time of “Jacob’s trouble.” Special and final judgments upon the chosen people, which have long been foretold, will end their agelong afflictions (Jer. 25:29–38; 30:4–7; Ezek. 30:3; Dan. 12:1; Amos 5:18–20; Obad. 1:15–21; Zeph. 1:7–18; Zech. 12:1–14; 14:1–3; Mal. 4:1–4; Matt. 24:9–31; Rev. 7:13–14). Second, this period will be a time when judgment will fall on the Gentile nations and the sin of the whole earth (Job 21:30; Ps. 2:5; Isa. 2:10–22; 13:9–16; 24:21–23; 26:20–21; 34:1–9; 63:1–6; 66:15–24; Jer. 25:29–38; Ezek. 30:3; Joel 3:9–21; Zech. 12:1–14; Matt. 25:31–46; 2 Thess. 2:3–12; Rev. 3:10; 11:1–18:24). Third, this time is also characterized by the appearance and reign of the man of sin whose career, like the period in which he appears, cannot begin until the divine restraint is removed (2 Thess. 2:6–10) and will end with the return of Christ and His coming in “power and great glory” (2 Thess. 2:8). This world-ruler is the fitting manifestation of the last efforts of Satan under his present freedom in his opposition against God and his attempted self-exaltation above the Most High. What God has been pleased to reveal respecting this time of trial will be comprehended only as these and similar Scriptures are considered with marked attention. This is the student’s reasonable task. Indeed, there is great solemnity in the words of Christ on this important theme.

This portion of the Oliver Discourse opens with specific counsel to Israel respecting their lot in this time of their affliction. That Israel is addressed alone in this context is determined with certainty in verse 9. That people alone will be hated of all nations, and, though the world cannot analyze its own passions, this hatred is their resentment against a divinely chosen race, which resentment has continued as a heritage from the earliest days of Israel’s history. That hatred is literally “for my name’s sake”; for His name has been upon that people from their beginning. They are to be delivered up, afflicted, killed, and hated. This will result in many of Israel being offended, who will then betray one another. These are to be misled by false

prophets and the abounding of iniquity, which will diminish the love of many. In this time, however, salvation is assured at the end of the trial. The reference to salvation is to that promised to Israel in Romans 11:26–27, “And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.” There is no reference here to a believer’s salvation by grace through faith, which salvation obtains in the present age. Were it such it would read, *He that is saved shall endure unto the end.* The assurance is that the end of the age will come when “this gospel of the kingdom” has been preached as a witness in all the inhabited earth. Immeasurable confusion has followed the attempted application of this verse to present world conditions. The believers of this age have a commission to evangelize every nation and this should be repeated with every new generation, but the coming of Christ to receive His Bride has never been made to await some total world-wide evangelization. That referred to in this passage is distinctly the gospel of the kingdom, which occupied the early ministry of Christ and, to that moment, was the only gospel known to the disciples. This gospel will be preached again by the 144,000 sealed ones of Revelation 7:1–8 and such other witnesses as God may elect for that service during the tribulation period. It is reasonable that the message which prepared for His Messianic kingdom in the first days before the Messiah and His kingdom were rejected should be renewed and preached before His second advent, when that kingdom will be set up by the power of God and without rejection of the King. There is no need to return at this point to a rediscussion of the difference that obtains between the gospel of the kingdom which announces once more that the King is at hand, and the gospel of the grace of God which offers eternal salvation in glory to individual Jews and Gentiles and on the one condition of faith in Christ. It is reprehensible to take this verse out of its setting as embedded in the Lord’s own description of the tribulation and from it draw a conclusion that Christ cannot come for the Church until the present gospel is preached in all the world. When this testimony of the kingdom is completed Christ declares that the end will come. Reference is to the end of the Jewish age and a deferred portion of that age. Of this end the disciples inquired. Having declared the program of kingdom preaching, Christ goes on to reveal the sign of the end of the age. This is stated in verse 15, and is

none other than the long-predicted appearance of the man of sin in the restored Jewish temple. Christ Himself looked backward to Daniel's prophecy regarding this desolater (Dan. 9:26–27). Later the Apostle Paul describes the same event thus, "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2:3–4). The temple will be the place provided by the unbelieving Jews, when they will have been given freedom for seven years by the man of sin and that to worship as they desire in their own land. This covenant is broken in the midst of the seven years (cf. Daniel's predictions and those of John in the Revelation). The presence of the desolater in the holy place is the identification given of him throughout the Word of God. It is his assumption to be God (cf. Ezek. 28:1–10). Since his appearance in the holy place commands so conspicuous a place in the prophetic Scriptures, it is not strange that Christ gives to it the character of a sign to the nation Israel of the end of that deferred portion of their own age.

Following the revelation of the sign of the end of the age, Christ gives specific instructions concerning the immediate action of all who observe this sign. These directions, as before said, though similar to those given in Luke respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, are nevertheless quite different, being adapted in each case to the impending crisis. One particular instruction in the Matthew account should be noted, namely, "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day" (24:20). In this verse evidence is found that the Jewish age is restored, since the Sabbath is again in effect. This is conclusive to one who has investigated the distinctions which obtain between the Sabbath for Israel and the New Creation Lord's day for His Church. Likewise, in this verse is an injunction to offer the prayer that flight should not be in the winter nor on a Sabbath day. These are strange petitions as viewed in their relation to the present age. No one assumes to offer this prayer—even the most confused antidispensationalist. Over against this is the fact that these same individuals are offended if it be intimated that one of this age is not appointed to pray, "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."

The declaration of verses 21 and 22, like Daniel 12:1, should silence posttribulationists who in defense of their theory that the Church goes through the great tribulation seek to soften the character of those excruciating days. To claim, as some have, that the terror of this period is "overdrawn" is to challenge Christ Himself—sustained by the Holy Spirit through Daniel—that never in the past nor yet in the future will any human experience equal that of those days, for suffering upon Israel and the world. For Israel, God's elect, those days are to be shortened else no flesh could be saved. God has two elect peoples—that of Israel and that of the Church. This Scripture, like its entire context, relates to elect Israel.

In verses 23–28 instructions are again renewed and especially with reference to the detecting of the claims of false christs. Though such may come by the desert—as John the Baptist—or in the secret chamber, shrouded in occult mysteries, none can duplicate the manner of the actual return of Christ, which will be as lightning coming out of the east and shining even unto the west. The coming of Christ as described in Revelation 19:11–16 (cf. Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; 2 Thess. 1:7–10) is accompanied by a great slaughter and the birds of the heavens are invited to be filled with the flesh of man and beast. It is probable that Matthew 24:28—"For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together"—makes reference to this feature of Christ's return as described in Revelation 19:17–21.

Matthew 24:29–31. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."

No more explicit division of time could be indicated than is expressed by the words with which this section of this address opens—"Immediately after the tribulation of those days." Since the coming of Christ terminates the tribulation and is brought to pass by Christ's own destruction of the man of sin (cf. 2 Thess. 2:8), the crushing of the armies who represent the nations of the earth (Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; Rev. 19:11–

21), the judgment of Israel (Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 24:37–25:30), and the judgment of the nations (Matt. 25:31–46), it is probable that the phrase “the tribulation of those days” refers to the particular anguish and trial of Israel as having been consummated rather than that all these events named above and which fall in Daniel’s seventieth week are completed. At this point, at whatsoever moment it occurs, there is the convulsion of nature which reaches to the stars of the heavens. It is then that “the sign of the Son of man” shall appear. It will be remembered this serves to answer the second, which in this revised order, is the last of the questions of verse 3 to be answered. There is no disclosure of what that sign will be. Men have advanced their conjectures, but Christ did not tell the nature of the sign and His silence may well be respected. He does say, however, that there shall be a sign and that it will appear. It will be such that all will recognize its significance, especially Israel; for when it is seen by them all their tribes—meaning the whole house of Israel (cf. Matt. 23:39)—shall mourn. They behold the One whom they have rejected coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. It is then that they recognize their Messiah. As the brethren of Joseph fell before him when his identity was revealed to them, in like manner will Israel acknowledge their Messiah. The sign will be worthy as one of the greatest of all divine manifestations and its effect complete. Some believe that this sign will be a mighty display of the agelong symbol of the cross. It is noteworthy that Zechariah, when speaking of Christ’s return, declares, “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn” (12:10). The designation, “the tribes of the earth,” belongs, in Scripture usage, only to Israel, but by Zechariah these same people are said to be “the house of David.” Thus added evidence is presented that in the Olivet Discourse it is Israel that is addressed. At this same time, also, Israel shall be regathered for the final time into their own land. Of this regathering the prophets have spoken, and that event cannot fail since the mouth of Jehovah has spoken it. However, that regathering is supernatural. It is here said to be achieved by angelic ministration. Great and marvelous was the display of divine power when He brought the children of Israel out of Egypt. To this stupendous event

Jehovah has often turned when seeking to impress His people with His might. He said, “I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt.” Jeremiah by the Spirit asserts that the final regathering of Israel into their own land will be a greater display of divine power than their deliverence from Egypt, so great, indeed, that there will be no remembrance of the Egyptian deliverance as compared with this last regathering. Jeremiah says, “Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that they shall no more say, The LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land” (23:7–8).

Matthew 24:32–36. “Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.”

Having declared the *manner* of His coming, Christ now turns to the *certainty* of His coming. The fig tree provides an illustration. Summer is evidently nigh when its tender leaves appear. It is doubtless true that the fig tree represents in other Scriptures the nation Israel (cf. Matt. 21:18–20), but there is no occasion for this meaning to be sought in the present use of that symbol. When the things of which Christ had just spoken, including even the beginnings of travail, begin to come to pass, it may be accepted as certain that He is nigh, even at the doors. When that hour has arrived, these words will be of the greatest value and blessing to those to whom they are addressed, and that people, Israel, shall not pass until all these things which concern them shall be fulfilled; even heaven and earth may pass away—and they will—but Christ’s promise to Israel thus made shall not pass away. The word γενεά translated *generation*, is a reference to the whole race or stock of Israel and is not here restricted to a people then living on the earth. Dean Alford’s comment on this portion of Scripture is clarifying:

> As regards the parable,—there is a reference to the *withered fig-tree which the Lord cursed:* and as that, in its judicial unfruitfulness, emblematized the Jewish people, so here the putting forth of the fig-tree from its state of winter dryness, symbolizes the *future reviviscence* of that race, which the Lord (ver. 34) declares shall not pass away till all be fulfilled. That this is the true meaning of that verse, must appear, when we recollect that it forms the conclusion of this parable, and is itself joined, by *this generation* passing away, to the verse following. We cannot, in seeking for its ultimate fulfilment, *go back* to the taking of Jerusalem and make the words apply to it. As this is one of the points on which the rationalizing interpreters lay most stress to shew that the prophecy has *failed*, I have taken pains to shew, in my *Greek Testament*, that the word here rendered generation has the meaning of *a race or family of people.* In all the places there cited, the word necessarily bears that signification: having it is true a more pregnant meaning, implying that the character of one generation *stamps itself upon the race*, as here in this verse also. The continued use of pass away (the word is the same in verses 34, 35) should have saved the Commentators from the blunder of imagining that the then living generation was meant, seeing that the prophecy is by the next verse carried on to the end of all things: and that, as matter of fact, the Apostles and ancient Christians *did continue to expect the Lord's coming, after that generation had passed away.* But, as Stier well remarks, "there are men foolish enough now to say, heaven and earth will never pass away, but the words of Christ pass away in course of time—; of this, however, we wait the proof."—*New Testament for English Readers*, I, 169

Dr. C. I. Scofield writes on Matthew 24:34: "Greek, *genea*, the primary definition of which is, 'race, kind, family, stock, breed.' (So all lexicons.) That the word is used in this sense here is sure because none of 'these things,' i.e. the world-wide preaching of the kingdom, the great tribulation, the return of the Lord in visible glory, and the regathering of the elect, occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, A.D. 70. The promise is, therefore, that the generation—nation, or family of Israel—will be preserved unto 'these things'; a promise wonderfully fulfilled to this day" (*Op. cit.*, p. 1034).

Over against the certainty of Christ's return is the uncertainty about the *time* of His coming. Of that day and hour no man knows, nor do the angels know. All of this, it must be remembered, bears upon the glorious return of Christ to the earth and therefore concerns Israel alone, who will then be on the earth and about to enter their earthly kingdom. The element of uncertainty on the time of Christ's return is also indicated in those Scriptures which promise His earlier coming into the air to receive His Bride, the Church, in which Scriptures the believers in each generation have been told to *wait* for their Lord (cf. Rom. 8:19; 1 Thess. 1:10; James 5:7). Thus it should be noted that the uncertainty of the time characterizes each of these events; but that truth does not serve to constitute the events to be

one and the same. The Church *waits* for her Bridegroom and her rapture into heaven, while Israel will in the day of Christ's near return in glory *watch* for that glorious return of her Messiah and the realization of her earthly kingdom.

> *Matthew 24:37–25:13:* But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the good-man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellowservants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. And five of them were wise, and five were foolish. They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them: but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.

While it is approached from several angles, the one objective of this extended section is the exhortation to Israel to be prepared for the coming of their Messiah-King. In the parable of the good and evil servants, He is likened to the lord of the household (24:45–51). In the parable of the ten virgins, He is the Bridegroom—not that Israel is the Bride and He their Bridegroom; but having been previously married in heaven (Rev. 19:7–8) He is returning with His Bride to His earthly reign. He will thus be greeted as the Bridegroom. In but one instance, the point at issue and which carries its own warning, is it true that some were unprepared for the return of their

King. In Matthew 24:37–39 history is cited as an example of unpreparedness. As in the days of Noah, so shall it be when Christ returns. Efforts have been made by some expositors to demonstrate that this passage teaches that the wickedness on the part of the antediluvian people will be duplicated in the days before Christ's return. There is much Scripture which avers that there was wickedness before the flood and that there will be wickedness before the Messiah comes, but this passage brings no charge of wickedness against the antediluvians other than unpreparedness and unbelieving in the face of the warnings that were given unto them. In the same manner and to the same purpose Matthew 24:40–42 is a declaration of the truth that, due to unpreparedness, where two may be together—in the field or grinding at the mill—one shall be taken and the other left. Again a parallel between the experience of people at the time of the rapture and this experience of Israel is set up, but with the strongest contrasts. In the instance of the Church in her rapture, those who are truly saved are without exception taken into heaven and the unsaved who were only professors outwardly are left for the impending judgments which follow on the earth. The notion which contends that there will be but a partial rapture including only the most spiritual believers and that unfaithful Christians will remain behind for the supposed discipline of the tribulation is an immeasurable dishonor to the grace of God. God has His own way of dealing with unfaithful believers; but no one saved by Christ and standing in the merit of Christ—as all believers stand—will be left behind for a supposed Protestant purgatory. Those who hold such beliefs fail to realize that those who are saved at all are perfectly saved in and through Christ. If Christians are to be admitted or rejected in the matter of entering heaven's glory on the basis of their personal worthiness, they all, without exception, would be rejected. Salvation by grace is not a scheme by which only good people go to heaven. Anyone can devise a plan by which good people might go to heaven—if there were such in the world; it is different, indeed, to devise a plan by which meritless and hell-deserving sinners—such as all are—are taken into heaven. God has executed that plan at infinite cost and all who believe are forever free from condemnation and judgment. Over against all this and according to the passage under consideration, those taken are taken in judgment and those left enter the kingdom blessings. In the light of this truth, the Jew of that day is told to "watch therefore: for ye know not what

hour your Lord doth come." This is not an instruction to a Jew within the present age of grace; such are shut up to the gospel of divine grace. It is a word to Jews living in a period which may be defined with respect to its time and circumstances as "when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors" (24:33). Again, the same truth regarding preparedness is enforced by the illustration (24:43–44) that the "goodman" of the house would not have suffered his house to be broken up by the thief had he known the hour the thief would come. This in turn is followed by the appeal, "Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh" (vs. 44). In 24:45–51 preparedness is likewise enjoined, and the parable of the good servant who at the coming of his master is found acting with faithfulness and the evil servant with unfaithfulness urges the same obligation upon Israel to watch and be ready. The lord of the evil servant comes at an unexpected time. The penalty is stated clearly, "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (vss. 50–51). The Jews are, in their relation to Jehovah, servants. On none, Jew or Gentile, in this age who have believed upon Christ could such judgments be imposed. This is the sentence which awaits the unfaithful and unprepared among Israel.

Continuing the same theme of the need of watching (cf. 25:13), the nation in the hour of her judgments at the return of Christ in glory and when the earthly kingdom is about to be set up, is likened to ten virgins of whom five were wise and five were foolish. The wisdom of the wise is displayed in the fact that they took oil, the symbol of spirituality, in their lamps, while the unwisdom of the unwise is seen in the fact that they had not sufficient oil. This parable has been subject to a great variety of interpretations. It is resorted to by those who seek to divide the children of God into two divisions with reference to their relation and standing before God. There is, however, but one Body of believers (Eph. 4:4). The time when this parable will be fulfilled is at the glorious coming of Christ to earth and therefore it could have no reference to the Church. The place is on the earth. The King is returning from heaven to earth with His Bride, to whom He has been married in heaven and after the marriage supper of the Lamb has been celebrated in heaven. Of the marriage supper in heaven it is written, "Let us

be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints" (Rev. 19:7–8). And, in perfect chronological order, the King is seen to return to earth following the marriage supper (cf. Rev. 19:11–16). Of this return to the earth Christ declared as recorded in Luke 12:35–36, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." The same figure of the lights burning is used here in Matthew and also the same theme of preparedness for the King's return. From this passage it is certain that Christ is coming from and not to His wedding. Israel on earth awaits the return of the Bridegroom with the Bride (cf. Rev. 19:11–16). Some old manuscripts add to Matthew 25:1 what is certainly sustained throughout the prophetic Scriptures, namely, that the virgins (Israel) go forth to meet the bridegroom "and the bride." The reception on earth is characterized by the marriage feast, admission to which is, for the Jew on earth, equivalent to entrance into the Messianic kingdom. The A.V. text of 25:10 requires revision to the extent of the addition to the word *feast* after "marriage" (note R.V. and all modern correct translations). This is an important change in rendering and precludes the error—so long drawn from the Authorized Version text—that Christ is coming, according to this parable, *to* His wedding, when, as cited above, it is asserted in Luke 12:35–36 that He is returning *from* His wedding. The objective in this parable is once more to stress the need of that form of watching which is fully prepared for the Messiah. Again, those excluded could not represent the true believer in this age of grace. Of such Christ could never say, "I know you not" (25:12). Describing this same situation and time Christ said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:21–23). So important, indeed, is this millennial scene in the King's palace (cf. Ezek. 40:1—48:35), that the enrollment of those present is given in the Book of Psalms. There it

is written, “All thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces, whereby they have made thee glad. Kings’ daughters were among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir. Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father’s house; so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty: for he is thy Lord; and worship thou him. And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift; even the rich among the people shall intreat thy favour. The king’s daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of needlework: the virgins her companions that follow her shall be brought unto thee. With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought: they shall enter into the king’s palace” (Ps. 45:8–15). In this vivid description of the palace and those present are named (1) the King in garments which smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia; (2) king’s daughters among the honorable women who are present; above all (3) the queen who stands at His right side in the gold of Ophir. The queen is the Church, the Bride of the Lamb (cf. Rev. 19:8–9). An address is given to the queen in verses 10 and 11 under the title of *daughter.* This address is renewed again in verses 13 and 14 where it may well be read, *the daughter who is the King’s* (bride). (4) The virgins follow the Bride, but the virgins are not the Bride. The virgins shall enter into the King’s palace, but some, according to the parable of Matthew 25:1–13, who started out to meet the Bridegroom and His Bride, do not enter for want of that form of preparedness which is enjoined. Thus, again, it is revealed that, at the glorious appearing of Christ, Israel shall be judged and many who have chosen the broad way which leads unto death cannot enter the kingdom, while some who have chosen the strait and narrow way which leads unto life shall enter therein (cf. Matt. 7:13–14; 19:28–29). It is concluded, then, that, as Matthew’s Gospel is addressed so largely to Israel —and the Olivet Discourse in particular—and since there is no message in this address related to Gentiles until 25:31, and even 25:31–46 is recorded there for Israel’s advantage, the very extensive theme of the future judgment of Israel is in view throughout this section, namely, 24:37—25:30. It is also concluded that the parable of the virgins represents the judgment of Israel only. They are the servants who follow the Bride and who enter the palace, but Israel is not the Bride.

Matthew 25:14–30. This extended parable need not be quoted in full. The lesson respecting the talents is, as in the case of other portions of this discourse, concerned with Israel's relation to her returning King. For that return they are to watch and be ready that they may satisfy His demands. The previous reference to the days of Noah, the impending division of two working together, the "goodman" of the house, the good and evil servants, and the virgins, all aim to stress the one admonition to *watch* for the Messiah's return. So great an emphasis upon this one injunction must not be overlooked. In the parable of the ten virgins and similarly in that of the good and evil servants there is represented the element of moral and spiritual values—such works as are required for admission into the kingdom (cf. Matt. 5:1–7:29; 19:28–30; Luke 3:8–14). The good servant is found by the returning King to be attending to the household and the wise virgins had oil in their lamps. No new feature is introduced when in the present portion recognition is promised to those who have used in a profitable way the talents committed unto them. No part of the Scriptures related directly to Israel presents more forcefully the need of individual merit as the basis of acceptance with God than this parable of the talents. Far removed, indeed, from the way of divine grace bestowed freely upon meritless sinners is the verdict against the one-talent man who made no use of that committed unto him (cf. 24:50–51). Of the one-talent man it is written, "Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury. Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents. For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (25:27–30).

A marked change in theme is reached at the end of the parable of the talents. Christ then turns to Gentile judgments. The entire discourse up to this point has concerned a well-defined people to whom certain responsibilities of merit have been entrusted, and these people are to be judged on the basis of their discharge of these responsibilities by the returning Messiah. The first demand upon them is that they be found watching with that faithfulness which is required of them. That this people thus addressed is Israel is clearly demonstrated throughout. As before

indicated, this discourse is the final message of the Messiah to His earthly people, who are related to God on the basis of merit (cf. Ex. 19:4–8). The fact that the Lord at this point turns in this address to truth respecting Gentiles indicates that in the previous portion He has been contemplating only those who are not Gentiles, namely, Israel.

> *Matthew 25:31–46:* When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.

As noted above, this discourse makes an abrupt change in its theme beginning at 25:31. It is still the judgments to be executed when Messiah returns; but the shift is from the judgment of the nation Israel to the judgment of the nations. In each case the judgment is closely related to the glorious appearing of Christ. Israel’s judgments as recorded in 24:37–25:30 are preceded by the coming of Christ with power and great glory (24:29–31), and the description of the judgment of the nations opens with the words, “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats” (vss. 31–32). Thus it is disclosed that both of these judgments follow at once upon His return to the earth. If an order exists, it will likely be in conformity to the order in which these are described in this address. There is little need to call the

attention of those who are faithful to the meaning of the Sacred Text to the wide difference between the judgment of the nations and the judgment of the great white throne (Rev. 20:11–15); yet many have failed to note these distinctions and suppose that the two are varied descriptions of one great judgment day. One is at the beginning of the thousand-year reign of Christ, the other is at its end. One concerns living nations, the other concerns the wicked dead of all human history; one divides the nations sending some into the kingdom and others into the lake of fire, while the other consigns all before the bar to the lake of fire.

According to the order of events in Biblical prophecy, the King will, on His return, first receive the nations from His Father. He then, by Himself, conquers them in the midst of their open rebellion. This is the prophetic picture presented in Psalm 2. This portion reads thus, "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (vss. 1–9). The opening section (vss. 1–3) presents a description of the attitude of the nations—the word *heathen* in the Old Testament Authorized Version is equivalent to the word *Gentiles* in the New Testament—toward Jehovah and His Messiah. The kings of the earth and the rulers are leading the people in this rebellion. In another Scripture—Revelation 16:13–14—wherein this same situation is again described, it is said that these kings are demon-possessed. The attitude of Jehovah is described in verses 4 and 5, and the declaration of Jehovah is recorded in verse 6. In this He states, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." According to Old Testament usage, the holy hill is the throne site and Zion is Jerusalem. The throne is David's, upon which Messiah must reign and that from Jerusalem. All Scripture harmonizes with this great expectation. In verses 7, 8, and 9 the Messiah-King speaks. He declares the

decree that Jehovah has acknowledged Him as King over all; so, also, Jehovah has said to Him, *Ask of me, and I shall give thee these raging nations.* This is not the first time the Father has given a portion of humanity to the Son. Christ designates the believers as them "which thou gavest me out of the world." However, the method by which these nations are to be conquered by the King is too often thought to be a peaceful missionary conquest; on the contrary, He breaks them with a rod of iron and dashes them in pieces like a potter's vessel. This violent subduing of the nations by the returning King is many times pictured in the predictions of God's Word. None of these is more vividly stated than Isaiah 63:1–6, which reads, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." In this connection attention should be given to 2 Thessalonians 1:7–10 and to Revelation 19:11–21. One verse (15) of the latter passage relates itself to both the Second Psalm and to Isaiah 63:1–6. That verse asserts, "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."

This violent subjugation of the nations by the returning King forms the preparation for appreciation of the description of the scene presented in Matthew 25:31–46. In that scene these very raging nations with their demon-driven kings and rulers are now standing in awful silence before the King, who is seated upon the throne of His glory. All resistance has been defeated and dissolved. The weapons of warfare, so much depended upon, are abandoned. All stand in solemn silence awaiting the verdict of the King. At His command, those indicated as *sheep* nations are required to move to

His right side, and those indicated as *goat* nations are directed to His left side. There is no hesitating or faltering. They have but one fear, that they might displease the Monarch who has conquered them. No picture could more perfectly describe the complete defeat and subjugation of these nations who so short a time before were defying Jehovah and His Messiah, saying, “Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.” The one question that now obtains in their minds is what disposition the King will make of them. To those on His right He says, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” It is at this point that misinterpretations may enter with endless confusion of ideas. There is no reason why the word *kingdom* should be given any other meaning in this passage than has been assigned to it throughout the Gospel by Matthew. The kingdom is Israel’s earthly, Messianic, millennial kingdom into which, by the authority of a large body of Old Testament prediction, Gentiles are to enter and sustain the subordinate place which is assigned to them (cf. Ps. 72:8–11; Isa. 14:1–2; 60:3, 5, 12; 62:2). The reason assigned by Christ for the admission of these sheep nations into the kingdom is altogether explicit. In them has been wrought out one thing which secures the divine approval and blessing. It is not a matter of bestowing divine grace, but rather of commending pure merit. They have provided food, drink, shelter, clothing, and comfort for the King. The remarkable feature of this is that they themselves do not identify any such service as having been wrought by them. The first word to break their awful silence is *When*? In like manner, those on the left hand are dismissed into the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and for the announced reason that they have not provided food, drink, shelter, clothing, and comfort for the King. They, in turn, are equally unconscious of this omission on their part and they, too, break their silence by the inquiry *When?* All of this creates a challenge to the thoughtful student. Is there an issue in the world so vast in its import that it determines the destiny of nations and yet it is wholly unrealized and unrecognized by those nations who will stand before the King? Such a problem is set up in this context by the King Himself and will not be overlooked by candid minds. It makes no difference at this point what method of interpretation is employed. The problem as thus stated is up for solution by every school of interpretation. Those who assume that this scene is the judgment of the saved and unsaved

at the end of the world find it most difficult to identify a third group whom the King styles “my brethren.” If the sheep nations are the saved people of all generations, who are these “brethren”? If the “brethren” are the saved ones who constitute the Church, who are the sheep nations? How could the Church ever be thus thrown back upon an unmitigated merit basis of acceptance with God when they have already been accepted in the Beloved? How could the Church be entering the kingdom as subjects of the King when she is sitting with Him on His throne and reigning with Him? Similarly, the Church has never been cast upon the bounty of the *cosmos* for her physical sustenance and comfort. To her it has been promised and fulfilled that “my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus” (Phil. 4:19). Any interpretation that would bring the Church into this scene either as the “brethren” or as the sheep nations is impossible from every consideration.

The King’s own reply to the query *When?* is the answer that should satisfy the student of the text as it will satisfy the nations that stand before Him. Whatever these multitudes are able to understand can be understood by the average person of today if he will approach the subject with unprejudiced consideration of all that is involved. The King will say, “Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.” Who, then, are these who are classed as “my brethren”? Upon a covenant theology which recognizes but two classes of men in the future estate—the saved and the lost—and but two places—heaven and hell—there has been an insuperable problem imposed in accounting for the third group who are identified by the King as “my brethren.” It is assumed by these theologians that the saved of all ages are on the right hand and the lost are on the left hand. Beyond these, according to their teaching, there could be no others; yet the King indicates a third class. There are two groups who may be identified as Christ’s brethren. (1) Christians are joint heirs with Christ (Rom. 8:17), and they are the “many brethren” to whom He is revealed as the First-Born (Rom. 8:29). However, as already indicated, Christians answer to none of the features set forth in this description. On the other hand, (2) Israel in her age did stand and must yet stand upon a merit basis, and in this age she is cast upon the bounty of the *cosmos* world. Those who, in the coming tribulation, will have suffered for Christ’s sake (Matt. 24:9) are His brethren after the flesh. The kingdom

which is in view belongs to Israel, and it is fitting to observe that, since certain Gentile peoples are to inherit a place in Israel's kingdom, they should be such as have by a previous demonstration exercised a sympathy for Israel, the elect nation before God. There is no mere accident in the fact that the two words *blessed* and *cursed* appear in the Abrahamic covenant respecting the attitude of Gentiles toward Abraham's seed according to the flesh (Gen. 12:1–3), and that these words appear again when Gentiles are being brought into judgment respecting their treatment of God's elect people. In Genesis it is written, "I will bless them that bless thee," and in the description of the judgment of the nations it is said, "Come, ye blessed of my Father." In Genesis it is said, "I will curse him that curseth thee," while in this same judgment it is said, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." But why? Only because *ye did it,* or *ye did it not unto one of the least of these my brethren.* Existing without attention to the Word of God, the nations have never realized the favored place Israel holds in the love and purpose of God. Nor do they accept this truth when it is presented to them. To no other people has Jehovah said, "For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt" (Deut. 7:6–8). It is to these same people that He said, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love" (Jer. 31:3). They are kept by Him as the apple of His eye and are graven upon the palms of His hands. Respecting the immutable character of Jehovah's devotion to Israel, it is written, "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). All this is true whether conceded by the nations or not. Warnings and counsels have been given them. What more direct or emphatic word could be uttered than is found in the closing portion of the Second Psalm? It reads, "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him" (vss. 10–12). Falling

as it does at the end of the great tribulation, the judgment of the nations concerns that one generation that will have afflicted Israel during the time of Jacob's trouble. With all the present sufferings of Israel at the hand of certain Gentile peoples, there is still no situation in the world today which would serve as a basis upon which the nations might be judged as they will be judged in that coming day. To some, these verdicts upon the nations seem extreme, especially that pronounced upon those on His left hand. It is probable, however, that their departure to the lake of fire is that which belongs to them because of their lost estate and that the actual casting of them into the lake of fire is deferred until the hour described in Revelation 20:11–15 (cf. Matt. 13:30). The place to be taken in the kingdom by the sheep nations is prepared and designed for them from the foundation of the world, which indicates a definite election under the sovereignty of God. What He has determined and declared can never fail.

In conclusion it may be well to restate that this is the Messiah-King's farewell message to Israel. In its early portions is recorded His own description of the great tribulation. Its severity is asserted and the sign of the end of the deferred portion of the Jewish age is disclosed. Following this is the description of the King's return as set forth by the King Himself. To this He adds long and faithful warnings to that people to the end that they may be prepared in the day when they "see all these things" begin to come to pass. Israel must be judged on the basis of faithfulness and right conduct and in the matter of watching. The nation must be judged also as a vindication of Jehovah's sovereign right and purpose to exalt one elect nation above all the nations of the earth, and in the demonstration of His resentment at the sufferings which the nations will have imposed upon that people beloved and cherished of God.

3. The Upper Room Discourse. The third and last of Christ's major discourses is recorded in John, chapters 13 to 17, and though given to His disciples, as are the other two, this is even more distinctive in character and purpose than the two already considered. The attentive and discerning student must become aware upon consideration of this portion that he is confronted at once with that form of doctrine which belongs only to the Church in the present age, and that it, unlike the Sermon on the Mount or the Olivet Discourse which look backward to the Old Testament setting,

looks forward into the following portions of the New Testament, which was then unwritten. This address—termed a conversation by some—is the seed plot of all grace teachings, and it is asserted here that in no portion of the Scriptures that which may be termed uncomplicated Christian doctrine is more clearly announced. In view of the habit of some theologians calling all Biblical doctrine *Christian*, it is pointed out again that in this work on theology that which is Christian in character is distinguished from Judaism and is confined to God's purpose in the present age, namely, the outcalling from both Jews and Gentiles of those who having been transformed through redeeming grace are the Body and Bride of Christ. The truth related to the Church, this heavenly people, is found in the latter portions of the New Testament, or, more definitely, all that follows the Synoptic Gospels. Since this heavenly company is to be distinguished from all other peoples of the earth by differences which are immeasurable, it is to be expected that there will be a body of revelation specifically addressed to and designed for them. There is such a body of truth and its first pronouncement was made by Christ Himself in the upper room. The Upper Room Discourse is, therefore, the voice of Christ and is the foundation of that which constitutes the positions, possessions, and privileges of the Christian. Again attention is called to the great difference which obtains between the three major discourses of Christ—so great, indeed, that they would hardly be attributed to the same speaker; but the Sermon on the Mount and the Olivet Discourse, since related directly or indirectly to the oncoming Messianic kingdom, have that much in common. Over against this, it will be seen that there is no bond of truth whatsoever between the two discourses already considered and the Upper Room Discourse. These far-reaching declarations should be attested by every student; and it is confidently believed that to identify the varied character of these discourses is to reach the foundation of a right understanding of the Sacred Text. Especially is it true that to comprehend the exact teachings of Christ in the upper room is to become aware of that which is purely Christian in its character. Likewise, attention is again called to the transition that evidently took place in the two or three days that intervened between the giving of the Olivet Discourse, which was addressed to the disciples as representative men of Judaism, and the Upper Room Discourse, which contemplates these same men as no longer in Jewish law (cf. John 15:25) but as *clean* through the Word spoken unto them

(John 13:10; 15:3); and no greater transformation could be indicated than is asserted by Christ when He said of these men, “They are not of the world [*cosmos*], even as I am not of the world” (John 17:14, 16) and these are now sent into the world (*cosmos*) as the Father sent the Son into the world (John 17:18). They are now vitally related to Christ as is indicated by the words, “Ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:20). They now form a new unity comparable only to that which exists between the Father and the Son. Of this unity Christ said, “That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me” (John 17:21–23). To these same men the entire new body of doctrine was delivered and from that time forth they found their relationship in the Headship of the One who died for them and in whom they were raised to newness of life. This discourse is clearly dated with reference to its application. It was to go into effect only after His death, His resurrection, His ascension and after the descent of the Spirit on Pentecost (cf. John 13:19; 14:20, 25; 16:8, 13). In other words, these age-transforming events are required before this age could be inaugurated. These men must await the outworking of the plan of God. It was said by Christ to them that they would come into the knowledge of the truth and know their relationship when the Spirit came (cf. John 13:7; 16:12–15; 17:13–14, 16). No such doctrine had ever been introduced into the world before. It is foreign to those Scriptures which went before. There are at least seven main doctrines presented in this discourse. These are not approached in a systematic and orderly teaching. The method is more a natural conversation such as doubtless had characterized His instructions to these men in the preceding three years. The informality of it is demonstrated by the fact that Christ returned to certain subjects several times. He refers to prayer three times and to the Holy Spirit’s new ministry in the world at least five times. This discourse has by expositors generally been extended to include the High Priestly Prayer as recorded in John, chapter 17. Verse 13 of that prayer so relates the prayer to the discourse; it reads, “And now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in

themselves." A complete exposition of all that that discourse presents cannot be entered into here. As before observed, it embraces the very foundation of all that belongs to Christian life and service and its fuller consideration must be assigned to other divisions of this work on theology. It will also be noted that there is little reference in this portion of Scripture to the way of salvation and the ground upon which it rests. The first twelve chapters of John declare the gospel of divine grace for the unsaved. Beginning with chapter 13, truth is presented which applies only to those who are saved; even John 16:7–11, though defining the Spirit's work for the unsaved, is not a message to them,but is a message of immeasurable value to the believer in directing his testimony and soul-winning activities. The major themes which are included in this discourse and which are so vital to Christian life and service are: (a) a new relationship to God through Christ, (b) cleansing unto unbroken fellowship, (c) abiding in Christ for fruit bearing, (d) a new relationship to the Holy Spirit, (e) a new relationship between believers, (f) a new ground of prayer, and (g) a new hope.

a. A New Relationship to God. In the Epistles—notably Romans —the supreme act of God which consummates all His mighty undertakings in the believer's salvation is justification, and justification, which is God's acknowledgment of the believer's perfection being in Christ, is made righteously possible only because of the truth that the saved one has been so vitally and eternally joined to Christ that he partakes actually and fully of what Christ is. Christ, be it said, is the righteousness of God. To be in Christ, then, is the greatest reality that can ever characterize a human being. As the race is fallen because of its place in the federal headship of fallen Adam, so the believer is righteous, having been transferred or translated out of that fallen estate into the Last Adam who is Himself the embodiment of God's righteousness. As certainly, then, as man, because of physical birth, is a partaker of that which Adam became through the fall, so certainly the believer, because of the new birth and his union to Christ through the baptism of the Spirit, partakes of that which Christ is, even the righteousness of God. In an earlier discussion this greatest of realities has been considered more completely and this, it is hoped, remains in the mind of the student. Justification, then, does not make the believer righteous; it is the divine acknowledgment or proclamation of the fact that the believer is

righteous. The formula already enunciated stands, namely, *The believer is righteous because he is in Christ, and he is justified because he is righteous.* God could not be just Himself and do otherwise than to justify the one who, being in Christ, is made the righteousness of God. What is declared to be a New Creation is that entity which is formed by the union of the resurrected Christ with those who are in Him. The term *Church* is applied to the Body and Bride of Christ. It represents the company of believers apart from or in distinction to the Head and Bridegroom; but the New Creation permits no such division. It incorporates the resurrected Christ and all that are in Him. Of the New Creation it is written, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5:17); "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26–28); "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" (6:15). A misleading error arises when it is assumed that all of this was equally true of Old Testament saints in their day. There could have been no perfected saints with regard to their standing until there was a resurrected Christ who might be the source of their imputed righteousness. On the other hand, there is no such thing as a Christian in the present age who is not thus perfected because of being in Christ; therefore, there is no such thing as a Christian who is not justified forever.

It is such knowledge-surpassing truth as this which advances the New Testament revelation over that of the Old Testament. It must be obvious to the most casual observer that no such relationship is contemplated in the Old Testament, the Synoptics, or even in John's Gospel until the record is given of this Upper Room Discourse. As before stated, the first twelve chapters of John—apart from the record of Christ's reasoning with the Jews—present the gospel of salvation by grace, and it is not until the record of the Upper Room Discourse that the word appears in the entire Sacred Text that the believer is *in Christ.* The first reference to this organic, vital union between Christ and the believer occurs in John 14:20, which reads, "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." Even the knowledge of this marvelous union is deferred until "that day," which

day, according to the context, is the Day of Pentecost, the day of the advent of the Spirit into the world. No deeper revelation respecting relationship has been made than is set forth by these seven words, “Ye in me, and I in you.” Well has it been said that the entire grace revelation is compressed into this twofold relationship. These are immeasurable undertakings on the part of the Holy Spirit. To be in Christ is a relationship wrought by the baptism of the Spirit; to have Christ indwelling is a relationship wrought by the regenerating power of the Spirit. This vital union with Christ is announced not alone to Jews who were His disciples, but to all that the Father hath given to the Son; and for the first time in human history this stupendous reality has come into actual existence. This truth concerning vital union to Christ and all it secures is again emphasized by Christ in John 15:2, where the branch is said to be in Christ (cf. John 17:21–23). Likewise, it is stated by Christ that the believer is removed out of the *cosmos* system and is now as unrelated to that system as Christ Himself. He declares, “If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you” (15:18–19); “These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world” (16:33); “I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. … As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world” (17:14, 18). No such relationship to God was ever predicated of Israel (cf. Rom. 9:4–5), and certainly not of the Gentiles (cf. Eph. 2:11–12). A most significant inclusion in this prayer is recorded in 17:20, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.” It is thus assured to those who have believed through the word of the disciples that they are equally partakers of all that this immeasurable prayer discloses; but it is just as significant also that Christ did not pray for the saints of the Jewish dispensation. If it be claimed that since they were dead there would be no occasion to pray for them, it may be asserted that there was a whole generation then living under Judaism and these were as much entitled to a share in His prayers as was any previous generation. He did not pray for saints that were then in Judaism. He prayed for those who would believe, and the Old Testament

saints were not related to God on the sole basis of belief in a Savior. The designation is clearly restricted to those of this age who are saved by grace alone. From this prayer the conclusions must be drawn that an entirely new divine undertaking has been introduced into the world, its objective being the outcalling of a company of saints each one of which company will have been perfected forever, being in Christ, and that each has attained to that exalted position by the one act of believing on Christ. So far as previous human relations to God are concerned, this is wholly new—even for the disciples themselves—and with the introduction of this truth as presented in this discourse the way is paved for its larger development in the Epistles of the New Testament. Even those Scriptures, already considered, which deal with the oncoming millennial age, give no hint that anything relating to the New Creation will then be on earth. In the same connection, attention should be given to the title by which believers are identified by the Son when He is speaking to His Father. Within that innermost fellowship, by what name will they be designated? It is probable that when speaking to His own about themselves the Lord might adapt His language to their restricted conceptions; but when speaking to the Father about believers He identifies them by the title which obtains in the highest heavenly association—the term common to Father and Son from all eternity, since their identity has been determined and they have been chosen in Himself from before the foundation of the world (cf. Eph. 1:4). If this appellation is to any degree a description of their character or position, it will refer to the most exalted feature of this divine undertaking. In this prayer the Savior refers to believers seven times, but under only one cognomen, and therefore this title must be contemplated as being the highest of all designations assigned to them in heaven or on earth. He speaks of them, though in varied forms, as those “which thou gavest me out of the world.” Since no such classification has ever been suggested for any people on earth before and since it is wholly foreign to all later groups who are anticipated in prophecy, it is to be accepted that the present age, concerning which the Lord is speaking in this discourse, is not only heaven-high with respect to its divine purpose, but contemplates a heavenly people who are, by divine exaltation and transformation, wholly different from all peoples that have been or ever will be on the earth.

b. Cleansing Unto Unbroken Fellowship. In the order of Christ's own approach to the themes which this discourse sets forth, this one respecting the cleansing of the believer unto unbroken fellowship with the Father and the Son is the opening theme. There should be no confusing of this doctrine with that of the salvation of the lost, which doctrine asserts that there is a complete removal of all condemnation for time and eternity from the one who believes. As it has been often stated, those who are in view in this discourse are considered as clean through the Word spoken to them and accepted as being in Christ. But, since sin continues to some degree in the Christian, there is needed a constant removal of defilement. This is not a renewal of salvation, but is rather a cleansing to the end that fellowship with the Father and with the Son may be unhindered. Writing of this cleansing, the Apostle John states in his first Epistle, "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1:5–7). The point now to be considered is that this message about the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleansing from all sin is a message which John declares "we have heard of him." It is probable that the Lord spoke often to His disciples on this theme, but it is noteworthy that He placed it first in the order of truth considered while in the upper room. It is possible that John in saying that this truth was heard directly from Christ was looking back to this upper room teaching. Having loved His own which were in the *cosmos* with an everlasting love, and knowing the truth that He came from God and was about to return to God, Christ laid aside His outer garments, girded Himself with a towel—the insignia of a servant—and, having poured water into a basin, began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded. The contrast is strong, indeed, between this that might be termed a miniature of a larger scene and the actuality—when He arose from the heavenly fellowship and girded Himself with humanity and by the shedding of His blood provided a perfect salvation and cleansing for all who believe. The larger picture is likened to a whole bath, such as the priest of old received when inducted into the priestly office; the smaller picture is likened to that partial bathing which the priest needed for himself at the

brazen laver before every temple service. It was a partial bathing which Christ wrought in the upper room, that is, a bathing of those whom He declared were clean. The Old Testament priest is a type of the New Testament Christian. The Christian has received the whole washing of regeneration through the Word, but is ever in need of cleansing from the defilement gained through contact with the world. It is the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, which goes on cleansing from all sin (1 John 1:7), and "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). This is the basic truth which Christ was demonstrating by bathing the disciples' feet. He did point out one application of the deed in the need of humility and service among the disciples one for the other; but He also said to Peter, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." Plain, indeed, is the implication in these words that there was a deeper meaning to His act of washing than could be understood at the time. It will be remembered that Peter, like the rest of the disciples, did not realize that Christ was going to die, nor could they then know anything which was based on His death. This they could and would know after His death had taken place. It is the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, which cleanseth from all sin that was represented in that symbolic bathing of the disciples' feet. This could not be explained to them until the blood was actually shed. The conversation with Simon Peter is illuminating to all believers, as it was to Peter. The question, "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?" is his recognition of the inconsistency of the act in view of that in his heart to which he had but recently made confession when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16). It was far from reasonable to Peter that Christ should wash his feet. Having been told that the washing had in it a hidden meaning, Peter declares, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." This protest secured the words from Christ which reveal the meaning of this specific cleansing, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Two words in this saying of Christ's need to be understood. The word *wash*—νίπτω, used eight times in this context, refers to a partial bathing only, such as Christ was undertaking. The words *no part* (οὐκ μέρος), meaning no normal fellowship, evidently reached Peter's innermost heart as indicated by the entire change of attitude when he said, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." To this the Lord replied, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet,

but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all" (John 13:10). In this verse the word *washed* is λούω and indicates a full bath. It is a thing already completed in the past—such as is accomplished for believers when they are saved. For such a bath there is no further need, save in case of the defilement of sin in the believer's life. Not only must the sin be cleansed if fellowship is to be enjoyed, but Christ alone is able to cleanse. It is possible for one disciple to serve another in humility, and that is the application which, for the moment, Christ gave to His act and example. It would seem unnecessary to point out that all that is indicated by the washing of the disciples' feet is wholly new so far as the Old Testament and Judaism are concerned. There was remedy for the sins of saints of Old Testament times in the sacrifices. For the Christian there is cure for sin constantly and instantly on a basis of faith in Christ's blood, which cure is secured by confession of sin. This doctrine is new.

c. Abiding in Christ for Fruit Bearing. What is known as a spiritual life (1 Cor. 2:15) is the result or product of the unhindered energy of the indwelling Spirit (Phil. 2:13), who undertakes in connection with two major realities, namely, the suppression of evil in the life and the expression of that which is good. Though of great value in itself, a life is not spiritual in the fullest sense when only evil is overcome. Such an achievement is negative. The positive output of divine virtues sustained by divine enablement is required as well. A believer should not measure his spirituality by reckoning only the evil things which he does not do; the spiritual life is better measured by the God-honoring things which he does do. In the preceding division of this thesis the removal of defilement has been in view and that discussion could have been extended to the control of those tendencies in life which engender evil conduct. In the present section, fruit bearing, effectual prayer, and celestial joy are set forth as the result of abiding in Christ. The truth presented in the former division as disclosed in John 13:1–10 represents a negative aspect of spirituality, while the truth set forth in the figure of the vine and the branches presents a positive spirituality. As an illustration of a spiritual reality, the figure of the vine and the branches is easily misunderstood. Arminians have read into this figure the notion that it represents a saved or unsaved estate, that is, that one is saved so long as he abides in Christ and lost whenever he ceases to abide. Little, indeed, do they

realize what is involved when the believer is joined to the Lord and thus in Christ. The idea that a believer is lost when he ceases to be fruitful is hardly the teaching of this parable. At the very opening of this passage a branch in Him which does not bear fruit is designated, thus indicating that there is such a thing as a branch in Him which is not fruitful; and human experience —even that of a saved Arminian—demonstrates this to be possible. This thought of abiding in Christ does not suggest the idea of remaining in a saved state, but it does indicate unbroken communion with Christ on the part of the one who through infinite grace has entered into an unchangeable union with Christ. This truth is established fully by Christ Himself as recorded in John 15:10, “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” It is certain that Christ’s abiding in the Father was not to the end that He might remain saved, but that unbroken fellowship between them might be realized. He did always the will of His Father and thus abode in the Father’s love. It was no attempt to maintain His sonship relation. Thus the obedient believer will abide in Christ’s love and there will be an unhindered inflow of spiritual vitality from Christ which, like the sap of the vine, will result in fruitfulness. In verse 2 it is said that those in Him who do not bear fruit are lifted up out of their place. The Father reserves the right to remove such into heaven. At this point the Arminian protests that the branch, if it is not fruitful, has no right to go to heaven, not recognizing the basic truth that no person will ever enter heaven on the ground of his own merit, but, if he enters at all, it will be on the basis of the imputed merit of the Son of God. God knows how to deal righteously and perfectly with unfruitful branches, and who among all Christians is able to assert in truth that he is fruitful to the degree which is wholly pleasing to God? Not every believer who dies is removed because of unfruitfulness. God reserves this form of correction to Himself and is faithful to the extent of giving full warning about that which might occur. Those branches in Christ which bear fruit are pruned that they may bear more fruit. Thus each class in Christ—the unfruitful and the fruitful—are said to be under the immediate care of the Father, who is the Husbandman. Wholly within the sphere of his public testimony the believer may, by not being adjusted to the will of Christ, be “cast forth as a branch” and be “withered.” His profession is rejected by his fellow men and his spiritual vitality is diminished. This figure which represents the disapproval

of men is very strong. It is, nevertheless, true that men repudiate the pretense of the believer whose daily life becomes an abhorrent thing in their eyes. Such, indeed, is the justification by works to which James refers when he writes, “Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. … Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only” (James 2:17–18, 21–24). It is true that only faith will justify before God (cf. Rom. 5:1), and that only works will justify before men; thus it is justification by faith before God which crowns the whole present divine undertaking in salvation by grace. Incidentally, instructions on how a branch may be fruitful to the glory of God are included, but the objective in view in the figure of the vine and its branches is to show the possibility of bearing fruit. A fruitful life is that which brings honor and glory to God, and that which is profitable. There is little need for the utterly new character of this body of truth to be pointed out. No saint of old, under any circumstances, ever sustained a perfected position in Christ, and apart from this perfected position there could be no rightful use of this figure. The saints of old had no vital union to Christ, hence they could sustain no vital communion with Christ.

d. A New Relationship to the Holy Spirit. If a dominating theme is to be found in this discourse, it is Christ’s announcement of the coming of the Holy Spirit into the world to continue the Former’s ministry as Παράκλητος throughout this age. For three and one-half years Christ had been the All-Sufficient One to the disciples. He was about to withdraw, but they are not to be left unattended. Another Παράκλητος was to come as He did come on the Day of Pentecost. The new Advocate was to be to men more than the bodily presence of Christ had been. It was better that Christ should go away and that the Spirit should come. That the present provision in which the Third Person indwells every believer is advantageous needs but a moment’s reflection. The Christ of the three and one-half years was not in all places at

the same time. When Lazarus was ill, Christ was removed from the Bethany home by a two-day journey. Under the present relationship between the Holy Spirit and the believer, there is never a separation, nor is there occasion to share Him with others or to await available moments of contact. He the indwelling Spirit is the priceless heritage of every Christian in every moment of the Christian's life. The fact that Christ was looking on in this discourse to a time and condition that was to be made possible through His death, His resurrection, His ascension, and the advent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost is especially emphasized by the words, "And when he is come," which words are spoken both in connection with the Spirit's ministry to the unsaved (cf. 16:8) and His ministry of teaching to the saved (cf. 16:13). It is theologically correct to state that the Spirit is sent into the world both by the Father (cf. 14:16, 26) and by the Son (cf. 16:7). This passage respecting the Holy Spirit records the central truth relative to the Person and work of the Spirit in this age.

John 14:16–17. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

The promise of Christ—"I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter" (Παράκλητος)—may well be set over against Christ's word recorded in Luke 11:13, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" This assurance was uttered early in Christ's ministry and, being so great an innovation over the relationships provided in Old Testament times to which the disciples were alone accustomed, evidently was never entered into by them. After His ministry is well concluded and before He departs out of this world, He declares that He will pray the Father and for the very presence of the Spirit for which they had failed to pray. The provisions included in Christ's prayer are more extensive and anticipate at least two age-characterizing realities: (1) That the Spirit should be given as an indwelling Person to each of the eleven men present. They, according to Old Testament usage, had been accustomed to think of the Spirit as bestowed only for very specific purposes by the sovereign will of God. That the Spirit might be given to all men of faith and

without exception was wholly new to them. Thus was introduced one of the greatest features of the new dispensation that was then coming into view—a feature too often overlooked by theologians, that the Spirit is given to all believers from the least of them to the greatest of them. Though emphasized constantly in the Epistles, this fact of the indwelling Spirit is here announced by Christ for the first time. (2) The second age-characterizing feature is the truth that the indwelling of the Spirit in the child of God is an unchangeable fact. Christ prayed that the Spirit might abide with believers forever, and that prayer is answered as definitely and certainly as the prayer that the Spirit should come at all. Thus it is assured that the Spirit indwells and that He abides in the heart forever. This same truth John again asserts in his first Epistle, "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you" (1 John 2:27). This truth, it will be observed, determines much in the doctrine of the security of those who are saved. The Christian may grieve the Spirit, but he will never grieve Him away; he may quench the Spirit (in the sense that the Spirit is suppressed), but the Spirit will never leave the heart into which He has come to abide.

John 16:7–11. "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."

Twice in this discourse Christ refers to the world (*cosmos*) in its relation to the Holy Spirit. In the portion just considered He is reported as saying of the Spirit, "Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." In the passage now being contemplated it is said that the Spirit upon coming into the world would enlighten (ἐλέγχω), not respecting every possible subject, but those of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. These are the great themes of the gospel of God's grace, which three themes are each in turn beyond the natural understanding of the unregenerate man and therefore must be especially and supernaturally revealed to him. As has just been asserted, the unsaved do not see or know the Spirit. The Apostle Paul says, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he

know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14). And, again, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (2 Cor. 4:3–4). The Arminian notion that men everywhere are able, because of a supposed common grace, to believe on Christ and thus to receive Him as Savior is rebuked by these and other Scriptures. No unregenerate person can make an intelligent acceptance of Christ as Savior until this preliminary work of the Spirit is wrought in the heart. It is most arresting, and should claim the attention of all who undertake a soul-winning ministry, that Christ introduces this specific theme in His teaching regarding the work of the Spirit in this age. The passage is not addressed to unregenerate men; it concerns only the saved and serves to bring to their attention a vital divine provision apart from which no really successful soul-saving ministry can be pursued. A preliminary work must be wrought in the heart of those who are unsaved before they can enter, by their own choice, into any saving relationship with Christ. That preliminary work is not a part of their salvation, but is rather an indispensable preparation for it. So, also, the Apostle writes, "moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called" (Rom. 8:30), and Christ announced that "no man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6:44). This specific enlightening work of the Spirit within the unsaved is governed wholly by divine sovereignty and is the means by which God calls out His elect people. That company is determined, not by a supposed limited redemption in which Christ is said to die only for those who are to be saved, but by this sovereign, efficacious call. This work of the Spirit within the unsaved is limited to conviction on three topics, namely, those "of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." Respecting sin it is to be noted that the Spirit does not remind the unsaved of all their sins, a totality which Christ has borne, but He rather brings to their consciousness the one new sin, and that which alone secures condemnation. Of this same distinction, Christ said, "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18). It would be difficult indeed either by sermon or appeal to make

an unregenerate person realize the full condemning power of unbelief toward Christ as Savior; yet this very understanding is essential if a real decision is to be made by the unsaved. In like manner, the unsaved must come to realize that their only ground of acceptance with God is in the unseen Savior, now at the right hand of God on high. Sermons and appeals cannot create this understanding in the heart; yet such an understanding is essential if the blinding of Satan is to be overcome. And in the third instance, the Spirit will enlighten respecting judgment. This is no reference to a judgment to come, but rather it recognizes a judgment which is past. It is that judgment which belonged to the sinner, and which fell upon the Lord Jesus Christ as the sinner's Substitute. Again, sermons and appeals seem in vain when depended upon to create an understanding in the mind of the Satan-blinded, unregenerate person respecting these immeasurable values already wrought for him. Thus the unsaved persons, according to the divine plan and provision, will not only come into the possession of the understanding of realities which are essential to a right choice, but they are thus provided with something to believe respecting Christ and His saving work for them. All soul-saving ministry is confronted with this human inability caused by Satan's blinding of the mind (2 Cor. 4:3–4), and such servants of God as evangelists would do well to pause for adjustment to these revelations. Both sermon and methods should be conformed to this great reality. The supreme import of this truth is seen in the fact that Christ introduced it into the Upper Room Discourse.

John 16:12–15. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you."

As the preceding passage—dated regarding the time of its application by the words "when he is come"—disclosed the work of the Spirit in bringing truth to the unsaved, this portion—bearing the same time indication, and following immediately in the context—describes the work of the Spirit in bringing truth to the saved. It is true that Christ's provision for the writing of the New Testament is indicated in this Scripture, but neither Luke who

wrote his Gospel and the Acts nor Paul who wrote the larger portion of the Epistles was present when these words were spoken. It is also clear from John 17:20 that Christ has in mind all believers of this age. The disciples had been with Him in closest intimacy as learners for three and one-half years. They had heard all His preaching and teaching and had conversed with Him as only those may who have lived together for a term of years. Their introduction to the truth was extended, though so largely pursuant to His kingdom expectation; despite all this, the Lord declares that He yet has many things to say unto them. Such, in general, is the challenge which ever confronts each child of God. Regardless of high attainments in the knowledge of God's Word, it is true that He still has many things to disclose. It will be remembered that up to that time these disciples did not believe that Christ would die or rise again from the dead. Therefore they could not receive any teaching which was based on either His death or resurrection. When all doctrine which is related to Christ's death or His resurrection is eliminated, there is comparatively little left of that which is in the most exact sense Christian. As the Synoptic Gospels disclose, Christ had been occupied largely with those features which belong to Israel's earthly kingdom. With that body of truth the disciples, like all instructed Jews, were familiar. Not believing He would die or be raised from the dead, it was imperative that they see Him die and greet Him in resurrection. Not only did they thus become aware of His death and resurrection, but they, by the Spirit, began at once to understand something of the meaning of these age-transforming events. Not long before Christ's death Peter rebuked Christ for predicting His death; yet it was this same Peter who but fifty days after the resurrection preached the greatest sermon—from the angle of results—ever preached by a man, and he based that sermon on the death and resurrection of Christ. Thus it is made evident that Peter advanced rapidly in the knowledge of the truth when taught by the Spirit. It is this possible advancement in the truth which Christ is presenting to these disciples and to all believers, that is set forth in the passage under consideration. It is here recorded that a new arrangement would be set up by the coming of the Spirit. Not only would the Spirit indwell each believer as assured in 14:16–17, and decline to speak from Himself as the originator of the message, but He would hear the message which Another would speak and would show it unto the one in whom He abides and whom He serves. The identification of

the One who thus originates the message points to none other than Christ, who said “I have yet many things to say unto you.” It is revealed, then, that in the process of divine instruction Christ originates and sends the message that the individual Christian needs, and this is heard by the Spirit and from Christ conveyed to the mind and heart by the indwelling Holy Spirit. The Spirit may choose to employ a human teacher or a printed page or any other means by which He can bring the message to the attention of the believer for whom it is intended. Christ’s unfolding of this new divine arrangement, as set forth in this context, is momentous in its import to the Christian. By this procedure he may make uninterrupted and measureless progress in the knowledge of the truth of God. The outstanding features of this method of divine instruction are, as named above, first, that the Spirit is ever present in the least of those who are saved; second, the Savior Himself is the Teacher who devises the lesson which the pupil requires, and announces for each one the next truth He would have comprehended; and, third, the Spirit, from His incomparable position of advantage as the indwelling Person, hears this truth and passes it on to the Christian’s mind and heart. Most consequential is the fact of the Spirit’s position as Indweller, which gives Him command of the very springs of human understanding. In fact, He is there in a position to create understanding. It is significant that, as indicated above, He works thus in the inner consciousness of the unsaved by enlightening them, and also teaches from within those who are saved and who are adjusted to Him. Such a limitless approach to the human understanding and emotions should not be confused with the restricted influence one human being may have over another. One person may influence the thought of another, but none creates the thought and understanding which He promotes.

A second feature of this teaching ministry of Christ through the Holy Spirit as revealed in this context is the listing of the measureless field of truth which He will disclose. Beyond the general statement that the Spirit will guide into “all truth,” the first specified theme in the order as presented by Christ is that the Spirit will show the believer “things to come.” Though human teachers, in forming an order in which the truth of God should be comprehended, would hardly place the subject of prophecy first, it remains true that Christ gave it that distinction and with the implication that, apart from this teaching ministry of the Spirit in the heart, there will be little understanding respecting the vast field of prophecy. What relation to the

Holy Spirit is sustained by those in the Christian profession who confess no interest in the prophetic Scriptures must be determined by others. Christ asserts that whosoever is taught of the Spirit will be led into the right understanding of prophecy. That which follows in this divine curriculum embraces the whole field of truth respecting the Father, Christ, and all things related to Them. "He shall glorify me." By the reality which these four words represent, the believer may judge himself with respect to attainment in the things of Christ. "He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." The boundaries of human knowledge appear exceedingly small compared to the things of the Father and Son. What, indeed, could be added to that represented by the words "all truth"? This same fact that the believer is taught by the indwelling Spirit is taken up for a large consideration by the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 2:9–3:3, and there, after having asserted the truth that the Spirit is the Master Teacher, he distinguishes three classes of people who are divided according to their relation to the written Word of God—the unregenerate (ψυχικός) man, described in 2:14; the spiritual (πνευματικός) Christian, who discerns all things (2:15); and the carnal (σαρκικός) believer, who can receive only the milk of the Word (3:1–3). From this context it is to be seen that the teaching ministry of the Spirit is impossible in those who are unsaved, that it is unhindered in those who are in right relation to Him, and it is greatly hindered in those who are carnal or fleshly in their lives. The student should observe in particular the fact that the great truths related to the presence and work of the Spirit in the world and to the believer were announced by Christ before He went to His cross.

e. A New Relationship Between Believers. The devout mind must stand in awe and wonder when, having contemplated the ineffable mystery of unity in the blessed Trinity, it is told that, in answer to Christ's prayer, believers are related to each other in a unity comparable only to the unity between the Father and the Son. When in the Scriptures a truth is stated twice it assumes important emphasis (cf. John 17:14, 16; Gal. 1:8–9). Should it be declared three times the emphasis is extreme; but, when presented four times in the same context, all human measurements with regard to relative importance are surpassed. It would seem, too, that when speaking to the Father all repetitions on the part of the Son would be superfluous; yet in His High Priestly prayer Christ prays four times for this unity between believers to be

wrought by God. In John 17:11 it is recorded that He asked “that they may be one, as we are.” In verses 21–23 He repeats this petition three times —“that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee …,” “that they may be one, even as we are one,” and “that they may be made perfect in one.” No human mind can comprehend the importance of this fourfold petition voiced by the Son to the Father. The unity desired is that which the Father alone could accomplish; for Christ not only appeals to the Father for its realization, but He indicates its superexalted, divine character —even as the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the Father. That believers should be thus related to each other is a disclosure which staggers the minds of men. In addition to the unity within the Godhead and the unity between believers, the passage—John 17:21–23—presents still a third unity, that which exists between the Persons of the Godhead and the believers. To this truth attention recently has been given; however, the unity of believers has been created by virtue of their position in Christ, and, therefore, both the unity between believers and the unity between the Persons of the Godhead and believers are asked for by the Savior in this prayer. Thoughtless and absurd is the modern notion that Christ was praying that denominations which exist in this remote time and in a country then unknown might become organically united in one, and therefore it is the duty of all sects to unite and thus help to answer this prayer. As indicated before, this unity is sought at the hand of the Father, indicating that it is a divine undertaking. It is that, and it results in a unity as organic and vital as that between the Father and the Son. This prayer began to be answered on the Day of Pentecost when believers were by the Spirit baptized into one Body, and is constantly answered whenever a soul is saved and thus joined as a member to the Body of Christ by the same baptism of the Spirit. The determining truth to be recognized here is that a God-wrought unity exists in answer to Christ’s prayer, and one that in magnitude, vital actuality, and heavenly ennoblement is by the Savior Himself classed with that which is highest in heavenly realms. Even though this truth regarding the unity of believers is knowledge-surpassing, a partial response may be given to it, which response is far more commendable than the almost complete neglect of it or the violent opposition to it which arises in the centers which are committed to a program that excludes other believers from its fellowship.

The Apostle Paul arises to the elevated responsibility of amplifying by the Spirit a vital theme advanced in the Upper Room Discourse, when he writes, “I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. 4:1–3). Having declared in chapters 1 to 3 the high positions and possessions of the one who is in Christ, it is needful, lest they be filled with pride, to beseech such to remember to be meek and lowly; also, in view of their true divinely wrought unity, they are besought to exercise longsuffering, forbearance, and love one toward another and by so much “endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” This unity, it will be observed, is that already made by the Spirit and is not a unity which is formed when believers are faithful to each other. Keeping the unity engendered by the Spirit when He united all as members in Christ’s Body is far removed from an attempt on the part of believers to make a unity which is no more than the outward exercise of good fellowship one with another. That a unity is divinely accomplished and does exist is demonstrated by the seven cardinal factors which enter into it. These seven the Apostle asserts when he goes on to state, “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all” (4:4–6). The emphasis in this Scripture is on the word *one*. There is one body, one Spirit indwelling, one calling, one Lord, one body of truth, one baptism by which the unity is formed, and one God and Father. In the light of this declaration, the unity is to be kept. Thus, also, in the light of Christ’s fourfold prayer that it might exist, to break this unity becomes an immeasurable sin against the work of God and the heart of Christ; yet this unity is broken outwardly when sectarian divisions exist, and inwardly when the divisions are nourished and cherished by Christians. When the same Apostle undertook to correct the wrongs in the Corinthian Church, as set forth in his first Epistle to them, before all else he mentions divisions that existed among them, even before he mentioned immorality and the dishonor to God which was caused by going to law before the unbelieving. The first commandment of Christ given in the upper room is that Christians are under the greatest imperative to love one another (John 13:34–35), and

by this love one for the other all men are to know that those who so love are His disciples. Similarly, in His prayer for oneness (John 17:21–23) Christ said that through this unity for which He prayed the world would come to believe concerning Himself. Such an opportunity has hardly been accorded the world in this age, since the early days of the Church. There is little hope that it will be otherwise in a situation characterized by sectarianism and with no apparent disposition to judge and renounce this high crime against God.

It is clear then that a unity does exist which is wrought of God, and that men therefore do not have to make a unity. It is equally clear also that believers are appointed to keep this divinely wrought unity. This they do when they love all other believers perfectly, disregarding class distinctions and rising above prejudice. God alone can evaluate the extent of the sin against Himself which sectarianism has caused—a great sin which is never condoned or commended, but is unreservedly condemned in the New Testament. The correction does not lie in a mere union of organizations or any mass movements, though these might help in the matter of an outward appearance. The injunction to keep the unity of the Spirit, like the one to love one another, is personal in its outworking and is fulfilled when the believer recognizes and loves every other Christian.

f. A New Ground of Prayer. The unique character of the Upper Room Discourse is especially seen in its new revelation regarding prayer. A moment's thought respecting the new relations between the Persons of the Godhead and the believers will suggest at once the necessity, arising from those relations, of an entirely new reality in prayer. In other words, the dispensational feature of prayer—so little considered by theologians—is, nevertheless, of paramount import and its recognition is imperative if the scope of the entire field of prayer is to be comprehended. Not only the general significance of prayer but also its new ground is indicated by the fact that Christ returns to this theme five times in this one discourse (cf. 14:12–14; 15:7, 16; 16:23–24, 26).

Since no Christology is complete which does not contemplate Christ's own exercise of the ministry of prayer, attention should be given to that engaging theme. As the humanity of Christ is the divine ideal in the human sphere, it was essential that the Savior fulfill what is man's highest service

in the sphere of prayer. Naturally the subjects of Christ's prayer transcend the field of the Christian's praying, but His attention to prayer must ever be an example to His own. Of one occasion it is written, "And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples" (Luke 11:1). Discovering the Lord in prayer, the disciples are impressed with His complete devotion to the exercise of prayer, and they may have reasoned that if He who is so perfect in Himself needed to pray, how much more needful it would be for men like themselves. Hence the request, "Lord, teach us to pray." The force of this petition is sacrificed when it is supposed that they asked Him to teach them *how* to pray. The problem is not one of a better method; it is one of really attending to this limitless ministry. Outside the High Priestly prayer found in John, chapter 17, there is little record, comparatively, covering that which entered into the prayers of the Savior; yet He often prayed all night and at other times arose a great while before day that He might give Himself to prayer. The inner life of any person is revealed in that one's private prayer; and rich indeed would be the revelation could a record be had of Christ's extended prayers.

During His earth ministry Christ taught much concerning prayer, before He came to the upper room. His instructions were largely related to the age of the law, which obtained to the hour of His death. He also anticipated the exercise of prayer in the future kingdom. These instructions, pursuant to both the past and future ages, deserve careful study; but an entirely new ground and manner of prayer was introduced in the upper room. It was thus of necessity. Through Christ's death and resurrection and the new relationship to be wrought by the Holy Spirit following His advent into the world at Pentecost, new privileges and responsibilities were established which determine the whole form and character of prayer. The present measureless advantage is that those who are saved, being joined to the Lord as members in His Body—as all who believe are joined—are in a favored position: they pray in the name of Christ. The disciples are reminded—as are all others who read the record of Christ's words—that "hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name." Since the new ground of prayer provides access to the limitless resources of Him who is infinite, the new appeal which conditions this measureless possibility is important to the last degree, and well it becomes the earnest Christian to enter intelligently and fully into

these unbounded provisions. Of Christ's five references to prayer in this discourse, three are of major importance.

John 14:12–14. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it."

It is well to observe that this introductory passage establishes, in the first instance, the truth that the believer's relation to Christ is that of a partnership. A great enterprise has been launched into which the child of God of this age is drawn and into which his service has been incorporated. Such declarations as "we as workers together with him" (2 Cor. 6:1) and "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Cor. 1:9) serve to amplify this thought of partnership. It is because of the truth that this joint interest exists that the believer is enjoined to be "always abounding in the work of the Lord"; for it is this divine undertaking in which the entire "firm" is engaged. It must therefore be shared alike by all who are within its bounds. It is thus that the significant words of Christ apply, namely, "the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." The greater deeds, generally speaking, will be accomplished by the partnership formed. At no point does Christ release to another the responsibility for the actual achievement of these greater works. Twice in this context (vss. 13–14) He gives assurance thereof in the words, "I will do." However, as certainly as Christ reserves to Himself the actual doing of the works, as certainly He assigns to the believer-partner the service of prayer. He declares, "If ye shall ask any thing … I will do it." Such is the divine arrangement, which carries with it the implication that unless the believer-partner discharges his specific service of asking there may be failure in that which otherwise might be achieved.

The new ground of prayer is seen in the truth that all efficacy depends upon the prayer being presented in Christ's name. Since all depends on the power of that name, it concerns every Christian to understand what is involved in this new basis of prayer. At least two vital relationships are involved: (1) that the believer, being in Christ, must ever pray from that position. He may pray what would of itself prove to be an unworthy prayer; but still he could not pray outside of his position in Christ, and his voice in

prayer is heard by the Father even as He hears the voice of His Son, whose every prayer is assuredly answered. As the believer is accounted righteous since he is in Christ (Rom. 3:22; 2 Cor. 5:21), and accepted because he is in the Beloved (Eph. 1:6), and loved as the Son is loved (John 17:23), in like manner he is heard as Christ is heard, being in Christ. (2) It is also to be recognized that the Christian, being in the partnership with Christ, may expect that his prayer, if prompted by the Spirit, will be indited by Christ Himself. It is as though Christ offered the prayer; and that, again, assures the answer. The limitlessness of the promise, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do," can be guaranteed only as the prayer is such as Christ would present to the Father. Such a prayer is granted directly and specifically for Christ's sake. The believer's acknowledged inability to discern what constitutes an acceptable subject of prayer is overcome, in the divine arrangement, by the ministry of the Holy Spirit. This ministry of the Spirit is vouchsafed to the Christian in other Scriptures of the New Testament which are equally applicable to the child of God in this age. The Apostle declares, "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. 8:26–27), and by the same Apostle the Christian is exhorted to be "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Eph. 6:18), and Jude speaks of the high privilege of "praying in the Holy Ghost" (Jude 1:20). It is therefore to be concluded that prayer is the exalted service of the believer in his present partnership with Christ, and that to some degree it measures the extent of the achievement to be wrought by the new association formed by Christ and all Christians. It is certain, too, that a new ground of prayer is provided which is not to be compared in its effectiveness with any other ground of prayer that has ever existed before.

John 15:7. "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you."

This the second major teaching by Christ on prayer in the Upper Room Discourse presents the same unlimited possibility. The phrase, "ye shall ask what ye will," is without bounds; however, in the form that the prayer

which is thus unrestricted takes, there are two conditions set forth: “if ye abide in me, and my words abide in you.” To have the words of Christ in the heart is to be informed about that which constitutes His will, or that which He elsewhere has termed “my commandments” (vs. 10). That which constitutes His will must be comprehended before it can be undertaken. On the other hand, to abide in Christ is, according to verse 10, not a matter of remaining in *union* with Christ, but rather a matter of remaining in *communion* with Christ through obedience. Having learned His will, it is essential that it be obeyed. It becomes, then, a matter of finding and doing the will of Christ. John in his first Epistle calls attention to the lack of confidence toward God which arises in the believer’s heart when he has consciously failed to do Christ’s will. He writes, “For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight” (1 John 3:20–22).

John 16:23–24. “And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.”

In addition to the limitless scope of prayer which this passage asserts, the order of prayer is here revealed and a final declaration is made of the high privilege of praying in the name of Christ. The momentous phrase, “Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name,” is a plain averment of a fact which may easily go unobserved otherwise. The ground of prayer in Christ’s name is strictly a new divine administration and so all former prayer, whatever the basis of its appeal, is lacking in this respect. In this all-inclusive statement Old Testament prayers and even the so-called Lord’s Prayer—all of which were familiar to the disciples—are comprehended. This teaching by Christ is also distinctive in that it asserts that prayer is not to be addressed to Him—the Second Person. This is reasonable in view of the truth that Christ is the believer’s Partner in the practice of prayer and therefore not the Person to be addressed in prayer. In like manner, the Holy Spirit enables the child of God in prayer and therefore is not the One to whom the believer should pray. The right order or form of prayer is to pray

to the Father in the name of the Son and through, or by the power of, the Holy Spirit.

In conclusion it should be emphasized that for all believers the greatest of all service is the exercise of prayer to the Father in the name of the Son and that in the power of the Holy Spirit.

g. The Promised Return. "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (14:1–3).

Earlier in this work (Vol. IV) the student has been reminded of the wide difference between two great events which, though in no way related, are each in their turn rightly styled a coming of Christ. The first in the chronological order is the signless, timeless, and prophetically unrelated coming of Christ into the air to gather the Church, His Body and Bride, to Himself; and that event, which might occur at any moment, marks the termination of the Church's pilgrim sojourn on the earth. By their removal the way becomes clear for the concluding of that portion of the Mosaic age which, as represented by Daniel's seventieth week, yet remains to run its course. The period of Daniel's seventieth week is clearly the time of Jehovah's judgments in the earth and the moment of His fulfillment of all His covenants with His earthly people, Israel. This leads to the second coming of Christ per se, which is His glorious appearing. This event constitutes a major theme of Old Testament prediction, itself continued on into the Synoptics and other portions of the New Testament. It is not until the very end of Christ's ministry, as recorded in the Upper Room Discourse, that the first event—that which concerns the Church alone—is introduced. Since this event is an important feature of the future experience of the Church, it is to be expected that Christ would anticipate it in this discourse. This He did as recorded in John 14:1–3, quoted above. In the main, the passages which relate to the first (in their chronological order) of the two events may be distinguished by the fact that in them the movement is from the earth into heaven (cf. John 14:1–3; 1 Thess. 4:16–17), while the movement in the second event is from heaven to earth (cf. Matt. 24:30; 2 Thess. 1:7–9; Rev. 19:11–16). With this general distinction in mind, the

words of Christ recorded in the Upper Room Discourse should not be misconstrued. He said: “I will come again, and receive you unto myself.” As revealed in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18, He comes only to the upper-air spaces and the believers are gathered together unto Him (cf. 2 Thess. 2:1).

It is reasonable that this stupendous event, as it relates itself to each Christian in this age, should be given its introduction as a revelation from Christ Himself; and it is equally reasonable that, as the event concerns only those who make up His Bride, it would not be mentioned by Christ until this company are addressed by Him, as they are for the first time in the upper room. Much, indeed, is introduced in the Scriptures generally concerning Christ’s coming again to Israel and to the earth, but His call for His Bride is not foreseen until He speaks to them of it in particular. In this discourse, Christ refers in other portions of it to the relation He will sustain to them after His departure and assures them that He will come to them (cf. John 14:18, 28; 16:16, 19, 22); but the clear, all-important declaration respecting the removal of the Church is found only in the passage under consideration.

Conclusion

Beyond the seven major themes of the Upper Room Discourse, designated above, it will be noted that almost every important doctrine of theology is directly or indirectly included in these five brief chapters of John: (1) the truth that the Scriptures are inspired—"I have given them thy word," "Thy word is truth" (John 17:8, 14, 17); (2) revelation respecting the Godhead, for in this portion the separate, individual activities of the Persons of the Trinity are more evident than in any other portion of the Bible; (3) of the angels, only a passing reference to Satan as the evil one is included (John 17:15, R.V.); (4) of man and his sin it is recorded that the unsaved may be enlightened by the Spirit respecting sin, righteousness, and judgment—and in so far as the message is addressed to the saved, it concerns their cleansing (13:1–20; 15:1–10); (5) likewise, being addressed to the saved, there is little about the way of salvation (cf. John 14:6; 16:8–11); (6) in no other Scripture is the doctrine of the one Body, the basis of all revelation concerning the Church, so emphasized (cf. John 13:34–35; 14:20; 17:11, 21–23); (7) of the future, that which immediately concerns the true Church is announced for the first time, namely, the rapture (cf. John 14:1–3). As the Sermon on the Mount relates itself to the Old Testament, the Upper Room Discourse relates itself to the Epistles of the New Testament. An unrelenting study of this discourse is enjoined upon the student—especially as it relates itself to the Epistles of the New Testament.

II. Parables

Contrasts may be drawn between the types of the Old Testament and the parables of the Synoptic Gospels, and yet both portions are quite as unsatisfactory with respect to the usual manner of their interpretation and their general neglect. The parables contain within themselves those aspects of truth which they represent, while the type is dependent upon its combined relation to the antitype. Essential doctrine is thus not clearly and finally established by the type, but the truth embodied in the parables is sufficient unto itself. The parables of the Synoptic Gospels concern Israel to a large degree, while the types relate to a wider variety of themes. A

standard work on the parables for nearly a century has been *Notes on the Parables of Our Lord* by Richard C. Trench; nevertheless, though Trench was a scholar of the highest order in the field of original languages, he possessed slight understanding of dispensational distinctions apart from which but little progress can be made in the right interpretation of the parables. In concluding his discussion of the distinguishing marks of a parable, Archbishop Trench summarizes thus: “To sum up all then, the parable differs from the fable, moving as it does in a spiritual world, and never transgressing the actual order of things natural,—from the mythus, there being in the latter an unconscious blending of the deeper meaning with the outward symbol, the two remaining separate and separable in the parable,—from the proverb, inasmuch as it is longer carried out, and not merely accidentally and occasionally, but necessarily figurative,—from the allegory, comparing as it does one thing *with* another, at the same time preserving them apart as an inner and an outer, not transferring, as does the allegory, the properties and qualities and relations of one *to* the other” (9th ed., pp. 15–16).

That Christ employed parables in His teaching is evident. In more modern terminology it might be said that He made large use of illustrations. His use of illustrations not only served to irradiate the truth to those to whom He spoke, but these parables which He employed have become the divinely appointed and provided illustrations of the truth for all succeeding generations; however, in His relation to Israel Christ asserted in answer to the disciples’ question, “Why speakest thou to them in parables?” (Matt. 13:10), “Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people’s heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear.

For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them" (13:11–17). In this Scripture it is disclosed that Christ not only anticipated the blindness of Israel, which blindness will extend throughout the present age (cf. Rom. 11:25; 2 Cor. 3:13–16), but He purposely veiled His meaning by the use of parables lest Israel should understand. On the other hand, within the perfect plan of God, Israel is held accountable for the hearing and doing of all that He addressed to them either directly or through parables. Since the precross ministry of Christ is so evidently addressed to Israel and concerning her earthly kingdom, it is to be expected that the parables will, to a large degree, represent truth related to that kingdom. The difficulty is no small one for many expositors when confronted with the teaching relative to Israel's divinely imposed blindness—the judicial withholding of vital truth from their understanding. Such difficulties, though complex as related to the divine way of dealing with His chosen people, are much clarified when the divine purpose in the present age is discerned. The veiling of kingdom truth does not in any way lessen its importance, nor does it supply an excuse for students to be confused—as too often they are—regarding these subjects. The parables of Christ may be divided into two classes: (1) those respecting the Messianic kingdom and (2) those that are general in character.

1. MESSIANIC. As bearing upon the Messianic kingdom parables, no more worthy or discriminating tabulation and classification has been found than that by J. G. Princell, a gifted and Biblically informed theologian of two generations ago. His outline is incorporated at this point.

> *First*, Five Parables concerning the Postponement of the Kingdom—(a) Luke 12:35–40; (b) Luke 12:42–48; cf. Matthew 24:45–51; (c) Luke 19:11–27; cf. Matthew 25:14–30; (d) Luke 21:29–33; cf. Matthew 24:32–35; Mark 13:28–31; (e) Mark 13:34–37.
>
> *Second*, Five Parables respecting the Preparation for the Coming Kingdom during Previous Times—(a) Mark 4:26–29; (b) Mark 4:30–32; cf. Matthew 13:31, 32; Luke 13:18, 19; (c) Matthew 13:33; cf. Luke 13:20, 21; (d) Matthew 13:44; (e) Matthew 13:45, 46.
>
> *Third*, Six Parables concerning the Establishing of the Kingdom, Who Will Enter it, and Who Will Be the Ruling Element in It—(a) Luke 14:16–24; (b) Matthew 22:2–14; (c) Matthew 18:23–35; (d) Matthew 20:1–16; (e) Matthew 21:28–32; (f) Matthew 21:33–44; cf. Mark 12:1–12; Luke 20:9–18.
>
> *Fourth*, Three Parables concerning Cleansing, Separation, and Judgment—(a) Matthew 25:1–13; (b) Matthew 25:14–30; (c) Matthew 25:31–46. *Fifth*, Two Parables concerning the

Final Separation of Evil from the Good—(a) Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43; (b) Matthew 13:47–50.—Unpublished Ms.

2. General. These may be listed as follows: of the creditor and two debtors (Luke 7:41–50), of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:30–37), of the rich fool (Luke 12:16–34), of the barren fig tree (Luke 13:6–9), of the building of a tower (Luke 14:28–30), of a king going to war (Luke 14:31–33), of salt (Luke 14:34–35; Matt. 5:13; Mark 9:50), of the threefold restoration (Luke 15:1–32), of the unjust steward (Luke 16:1–13), of service (Luke 17:7–10), of the unjust judge (Luke 18:1–8), and of the Pharisee and the publican (Luke 18:9–14).

III. Special Teachings

Very much vital truth is set forth in the special or disconnected teachings of Christ. The more important of these are: the great commandments (Mark 12:28–34), the tribute money (Mark 12:13–17), warning respecting hell (Mark 9:42–50), the law of divorce (Mark 10:1–12), warning respecting riches (Mark 10:23–31), Christ's self-revelation in Nazareth (Luke 4:16–30), prayer (Luke 11:1–13), warning respecting the leaven of the Pharisees (Luke 12:1–15), the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–34), instruction respecting forgiveness (Luke 17:1–6; cf. Matt. 18:21–35), eternal life (John 3:1–21), the Water of life (John 4:1–45), general teaching to the Jews (John 5:17–47), the Bread of life (John 6:1–71), the Light of the world (John 8:1–59), the Good Shepherd (John 10:1–39), special teaching addressed to Andrew and Philip (John 12:23–50).

IV. Conversations

It will be noted that some of Christ's more important declarations were made when engaged in conversation with individuals, and these are: with the lawyer (Luke 10:25–37), with the rich young ruler (Luke 18:18–30; cf. Matt. 19:16–22; Mark 10:17–22), with the Jews respecting tribute money (Luke 20:19–26; cf. Matt. 22:15–22; Mark 12:13–17), regarding His own authority (Luke 20:1–8; cf. Matt. 21:23–27; Mark 11:27–33), on the theme of David's Son (Luke 20:39–47; cf. Matt. 22:41–46; Mark 12:35–37), with Nicodemus (John 3:1–21), with the woman at the well (John 4:1–45), with

the Jews (John 7:1–8:59), with the man born blind (John 9:1–39), with Judas (John 12:1–11; .13:27), with Pilate (John 18:28–38; cf. Matt. 27:1–14; Mark 15:1–5; Luke 23:1–7, 13–16).

Chapter VIII

The Miracles of Christ Incarnate

Those who are imbued with supernatural resources should manifest supernatural power. The Christian as being immediately related to God—indwelt, guided, and empowered by God—should not be unaccustomed to supernatural features and experiences in his daily life. Since it follows no well-defined laws of procedure, the supernatural in the Christian is a nearer approach to the miraculous than that in nature which is inexplainable. However, a miracle, in the strict use of the word, is some special achievement which is outside the known laws of either human experience or nature. The Bible draws aside the veil and discloses the truth respecting the living, all-powerful God as well as a whole empire of angelic beings—good and evil—with resources and competences which, in the case of God, reach on into infinity, and which, in the case of the angels, transcend all human limitations. No small deceptions—Satan's "lying wonders"—have been wrought in the past and, according to prophecy, even more will these wonders appear in the future (2 Thess. 2:9; cf. Acts 16:16; Rev. 13:1–18). The cessation of signs and wonders after the first generation of the church has given occasion to counterfeit manifestations. This cessation is not due to lack of faith or faithfulness. The greatest of all saints, though like Abraham and Daniel, have not done mighty works in this age. The usual belief that all supernatural manifestations arise with God gives Satan the opportunity to confirm in the minds of many his misrepresentation of doctrine. Without exception, those manifestations of supernatural power which are acclaimed as divine today appear in support of false or incomplete doctrine. As an example of this, such manifestations as have been published are found among people who receive not enough of the truth respecting saving grace to believe that one once saved is always saved, and such limitation of doctrine so devitaliaes the gospel that it becomes "another gospel." Yet these misunderstandings are sealed in the minds of many by what is supposed to be manifestations from God, though serving really as a sanction to the perversion of doctrine.

The Bible is itself a supernatural Book and it records supernatural manifestations without hesitation or apology. The whole field of miracles which the Bible presents may be divided into: (1) miracles which belong to the Old Testament order, (2) miracles wrought by Christ, and by His disciples who wrought miracles by His authority (Matt. 10:1) and in His name as was ordained for kingdom preaching (cf. Matt. 10:7–8; Luke 10:17–19), and (3) miracles wrought by various men of the early church, after the death of Christ and after the Day of Pentecost. The present theme concerns only the miracles wrought by Christ. Of the Old Testament miracles it may be said in passing that, in purpose, they resemble closely the miracles wrought by Christ to this extent, that they served as a sign of the divine presence, an attestation of the truth of God with which they were associated. The Old Testament miracles gather largely around two epochs in both of which a new divine order is being set up. The great majority of Old Testament men, such as Noah, Job, Abraham, David, and Daniel did no mighty works or miracles. But to Moses was given the power of signs and wonders, to the end that he might deliver Israel from Egypt and become their divinely acknowledged leader. The effect of the miracle of the Red Sea is declared in these words, "And Israel saw that great work which the LORD did upon the Egyptians: and the people feared the LORD, and believed the LORD, and his servant Moses" (Ex. 14:31). A later need of the supernatural arose in the time of Israel's apostasy, which apostasy Elijah estimated to have included all but himself (1 Kings 19:10). The miracles wrought by Elijah were continued by Elisha. In fact, as Elisha requested of Elijah that a double portion of his spirit might be upon him, his recorded miracles are double the number of those attributed to Elijah. Thus were the people reminded respecting the God of Israel both in the generation to whom Elijah and Elisha ministered and in all succeeding generations. They, like all of God's wonders, "were done once that they might be believed always." How stupendous is the task of confirming a divine testimony as such, of authenticating a message as word from heaven! The fallen, Satan-energized heart of man would hardly believe though an angel spoke from heaven.

Regarding the miracles wrought by men of the early church, there has been some controversy: Not that the signs then wrought are not believed, but that men disagree over why these miracles ceased, as they did in the first generations of the church. Some are disposed to claim that the

discontinuation is due to lack of faith and that if a like faith were exercised now these manifestations would return automatically. Over against this is the fact that the most saintly, spiritually blessed of all these generations have exerted no supernatural power. Such is universally the case and only ignorance would contest such an evident fact. So-called manifestations of speaking with tongues and supposed gifts of healing have constantly reappeared and as an assumed divine sealing of doctrine which is not true to the Bible or complete. Not one of these cults holds enough recognition of the gospel of divine grace to believe that the saved one is by grace so identified with Christ that he is secure forever. Satan is ever active with devices, strategies, and lying wonders; and no greater deception—he deceives the whole world—will be found than that of sealing a false or incomplete doctrine with an apparently divine, miraculous manifestation. Others believe that it has pleased God to withdraw the supernatural once the records of the New Testament were completed, and that it is not the purpose of God that the whole age should be characterized by miracles, but rather that the mighty work of the Holy Spirit is vouchsafed to believers to the end that they may live and serve unceasingly by His indwelling power. The unregenerate are not called to believe some divine works, but they are called to believe the divine Word. This important distinction respecting the object of faith is recognized by Christ when He said, “Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works’ sake” (John 14:11). That the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit in the heart when accompanying the proclamation of the gospel is more advantageous than supernatural manifestations could be is evident. A miracle might incite wonder, argument, or curiosity; but it would not have the power to engender in the heart conviction of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, nor could it create that inner thirst for the Water of life apart from which there is no personal, intelligent appropriation of Christ as Savior. It might be easy to believe that missionaries to the unevangelized would be benefited in their work by supernatural manifestations; but the work to be done in the heart of the unsaved, be they heathen or civilized, if it is to amount to the complete change which saving grace alone can secure, would not be made possible by signs and wonders, but by the enlightening power of the Spirit. Some believed and some did not when Lazarus was

raised from the dead. The miracle of a regenerated life is the missionary's greatest attestation to the message which he proclaims.

Turning more specifically to the miracles wrought by Christ, it may be asserted that they were intended to sustain His claim to be Jehovah, the theanthropic Messiah of Israel, and to give divine attestation to His teachings. The miracles wrought by Christ were largely, if not wholly, a vital feature of His kingdom ministry. Miracles, signs, and wonders are evidently the credentials of those who preach the kingdom gospel. It was commanded as the disciples went forth to preach the kingdom of heaven as "at hand" that they were to "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils" (Matt. 10:7–8), and Joel predicts the supernatural in relation to the oncoming kingdom. He states: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered …" (Joel 2:28–32; cf. Acts 2:16–21). It is true that the miracles of Christ suggest His spiritual power. The healing of the sick suggests His power to cleanse from sin, the feeding of the multitude suggests His ability to care for His own, the raising of the dead suggests His power to raise all when and as He may determine.

The miracles of Christ are themselves worthy of God both in their dignity and scope. In this they are far removed from those human inventions which are found in the Apocryphal writings. Those recorded in the *Evangelium Infantiæ* are not only absurd but are incapable of conveying any corresponding truth whatsoever. Since the miracles wrought by Christ indicate the presence of the omnipotent God, it is to be expected that Satan's opposition will be mustered against these mighty works to discredit them. Such opposition has been voiced by unbelief throughout all generations. Since Christ has come into the world and His Jehovah identity is proved by mighty works which are fully commensurate with His Godhead Person, the consideration of His supernatural power is demanded of all who are of a serious mind. These works should be contemplated in the

light of all they demonstrate and the result should be unrestrained worship and adoration. Nicodemus gave feeble though true testimony when he said, “Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him” (John 3:2). From this recognition which was true as far as it went, Christ led Nicodemus on to a right understanding of His own Saviorhood—“whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life”—and to believe on Christ to one’s eternal salvation is vastly more important than to be impressed with mighty works, even though those works demonstrate His divine origin.

In his work, *Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord*, R. C. Trench has made valuable distinctions respecting the different terms used to indicate the supernatural works. This material is here reproduced.

> In the discussion upon which now we are entering, the names are manifold; for it is a consequence of this, that, where we have to do with any thing which in many ways is significant, that will have inevitably many names, since no one will exhaust its meaning. Each of these will embody a portion of its essential qualities, will present it upon a single side; and not from the exclusive contemplation of any one, but only of these altogether, will any adequate apprehension of that which we desire to know be obtained. Thus what we commonly call miracles, are in the Sacred Scriptures termed sometimes “wonders,” sometimes “signs,” sometimes “powers,” sometimes, simply “works.” These titles they have in addition to some others of rarer occurrence, and which easily range themselves under one or other of these;—on each of which I would fain say a few words, before attempting to make any further advance in the subject.
>
> To take then first the name “*wonder*,” in which the effect of astonishment which the work produces upon the beholder is transferred to the work itself, an effect often graphically portrayed by the Evangelists, when relating our Lord’s miracles (Mark 2:12; 4:41; 6:51; 8:37; Acts 3:10, 11), it will at once be felt that this does but touch the matter on the outside. The ethical meaning of the miracle would be wholly lost, were blank astonishment or gaping wonder *all* which they aroused; since the same effect might be produced by a thousand meaner causes. Indeed, it is not a little remarkable, rather is it singularly characteristic of the miracles of the New Testament, that this name “wonders” is never applied to them but in connection with other names. They are continually “signs and wonders,” or “signs” or “powers” alone, but never “wonders” alone. Not that the miracle, considered simply as a wonder, as an astonishing event which the beholders can reduce to no law with which they are acquainted, is even as such without its meaning and its purpose; that purpose being that it should forcibly startle from the mere dream of a sense-bound existence, and, however it may not be itself an appeal to the spiritual in man, should yet be a summons to him that he should open his eyes to the spiritual appeal which is about to be addressed to him.
>
> But the miracle, besides being a “wonder,” is also a “*sign*,” a token and indication of the near presence and working of God. In this word the ethical end and purpose of the miracle comes out the *most* prominently, as in “wonder” the least. They are signs and pledges of something more than and beyond themselves (Isaiah 7:11; 38:7); they are valuable, not so much for what they are, as for what they indicate of the grace and power of the doer, or of the

connection in which he stands with a higher world. Oftentimes they are thus seals of power set to the person who accomplishes them ("the Lord confirming the word by *signs* following," Mark 16:20; Acts 14:3; Heb. 2:4), legitimating acts, by which he claims to be attended to as a messenger from God. We find the word continually used in senses such as these: Thus, "What *sign* showest thou?" (John 2:18) was the question which the Jews asked, when they wanted the Lord to justify the things which he was doing, by showing that he had especial authority to do them. Again they say, "We would see a *sign* from thee" (Matt. 12:38); "Show us a *sign* from heaven" (Matt. 16:1). St. Paul speaks of himself as having "the *signs* of an apostle" (2 Cor. 12:12), in other words, the tokens which should mark him out as such. Thus, too, in the Old Testament, when God sends Moses to deliver Israel he furnishes him with two "signs." He warns him that Pharaoh will require him to legitimate his mission, to produce his credentials that he is indeed God's ambassador, and equips him with the powers which shall justify him as such, which, in other words, shall be his "signs" (Ex. 7:9, 10). He "gave *a sign*" to the prophet whom he sent to protest against the will-worship of Jeroboam (1 Kings 13:3). At the same time it may be as well here to observe that the "sign" is not of necessity a miracle, although only as such it has a place in our discussion. Many a common matter, for instance any foretold coincidence or event, may be to a believing mind a sign, a seal set to the truth of a foregoing word. Thus the angels give to the shepherds for "a sign" their finding the child wrapt in the swaddling clothes (Luke 2:12). Samuel gives to Saul three "signs" that God has indeed appointed him king over Israel, and only the last of these is linked with aught supernatural (1 Sam. 10:1–9). The prophet gave Eli the death of his two sons as "a sign" that his threatening word should come true (1 Sam. 2:34). God gave to Gideon a sign in the camp of the Midianites of the victory which he should win (Judges 7:9–15), though it does not happen that the word occurs in that narration. Or it is possible for a man, under a strong conviction that the hand of God is leading him, to set such and such a contingent event as a sign to himself, the falling out of which in this way or in that he will accept as an intimation from God of what he would have him to do. Examples of this also are not uncommon in Scripture (Gen. 24:16; Judges 6:36–40; 1 Sam. 14:8–13).

Frequently, also, the miracles are styled "*powers*," or "*mighty works*," that is, of God. As in the term "wonder" or "miracle," the effect is transferred and gives a name to the cause, so here the cause gives its name to the effect. The "*power*" dwells originally in the divine Messenger (Acts 6:8; 10:38; Rom. 15:9); is one with which he is himself equipped of God. Christ is thus in the highest sense that which Simon blasphemously suffered himself to be named, "The great *Power* of God" (Acts 8:10). But then by an easy transition the word comes to signify the exertions and separate puttings forth of this power. These are "powers" in the plural, although the same word is now translated in our version, "wonderful works" (Matt. 7:22), and now, "mighty works" (Matt. 11:20; Mark 6:14; Luke 10:13), and still more frequently, "miracles" (Acts 2:22; 19:11; 1 Cor. 12:10, 28; Gal. 3:5), in this last case giving sometimes such tautologies as this, "miracles *and* wonders" (Acts 2:22; Heb. 2:4) and always causing to be lost something of the express force of the word,—how it points to new *powers* which have come into, and are working in, this world of ours.

These three terms, of which we have hitherto sought to unfold the meaning, occur thrice together (Acts 2:22; 2 Cor. 12:12; 2 Thess. 2:9), although each time in a different order. They are all, as has already been noted in the case of two of them, rather descriptive of different sides of the same works, than themselves different classes of works. An example of one of our Lord's miracles may show how it may at once be all these. The healing of the paralytic, for example (Mark 2:1–12), was a *wonder*, for they who beheld it "were all *amazed*"; it was a *power*, for the man at Christ's word "arose, took up his bed, and went out before them all"; it

was a *sign*, for it gave token that one greater than men deemed was among them; it stood in connection with a higher fact, of which it was the sign and seal (cf. 1 Kings 13:3; 2 Kings 1:10), being wrought that they might "know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins."

A further term by which St. John very frequently names the miracles is eminently significant. They are very often with him simply "*works*" (5:36; 7:21; 10:25, 32, 38; 14:11, 12; 15:24; see also Matt. 11:2). The wonderful is in his eyes only the natural form of working for him who is dwelt in by all the fulness of God; he must, out of the necessity of his higher being, bring forth these works greater than man's. They are the periphery of that circle whereof he is the centre. The great miracle is the Incarnation; all else, so to speak, follows naturally and of course. It is no wonder that he whose name is "Wonderful" (Isa. 9:6), does works of wonder; the only wonder would be if he did them not. The sun in the heavens is itself a wonder, but not that, being what it is, it rays forth its effluences of light and heat. These miracles are the fruit after its kind, which the divine tree brings forth; and may, with a deep truth, be styled "works" of Christ, with no further addition or explanation.— 2nd Amer. ed., pp. 9–14

Conclusion

In terminating this consideration of the incarnate Son of God in His life and teachings here on earth, restatement is made that, in view of the fact that His earth-ministry occupies almost two-fifths of the entire New Testament, it is fitting that this important body of truth be given a correspondingly extended treatment in any Christology which is true to the Divine Record. Christ came as the manifestation of God to the restricted minds of sinful men. He is God manifest in the flesh— the fullness of the Godhead bodily, but nonetheless God.

Chapter IX

The Sufferings and Death of Christ Incarnate

All that may be known respecting the efficacious sufferings and sacrifice of Christ, the Son of God, is contained in the revelation which God has been pleased to release to men; therefore the theology which Christ's death engenders is wholly contained in and wholly dependent upon the Scriptures of truth. In Volume III under Soteriology, the distinctive doctrinal aspects of Christ's death have been presented. The present discussion will be devoted to an analysis of the Sacred Text, from which all right understanding must be derived. Fourteen achievements, stupendous in character, which were wrought by Christ through His death have been indicated already, and the sum of these demonstrates that this great event is the center of all Christian doctrine. Since there can be no saving relation to God apart from the redemption which Christ has accomplished, His death becomes the ground of nearly all aspects of Christian truth. The present approach to this great theme, accordingly, will not be related to aspects of doctrine, as in the previous volume, but instead to the order in which it is found in the progressive revelation of the whole Bible. These proposed divisions are: (1) the death of Christ typified, (2) the death of Christ prophesied, (3) the death of Christ historically declared in the Synoptics, (4) the death of Christ according to John, (5) the death of Christ according to Paul, (6) the death of Christ according to Peter, and (7) the death of Christ according to the letter to the Hebrews.

I. In Types

Reference has been made earlier in this volume (Chap. II) to the types of Christ in general. This consideration is to be restricted to the types of Christ in His death. At least sixteen of these may be identified. These can, at best, be treated with brevity.

Aaron (Ex. 28:1; Lev. 8:12). The priesthood of Christ was foreseen in two types—that of Aaron and that of Melchizedek. The Aaronic type

anticipated the offering Christ would make of Himself without spot to God. In this aspect of typology Christ was both the Lamb sacrificed and the officiating Priest who executed the offering (cf. John 10:17). Thus the whole range of truth respecting the death of Christ and His shed blood is foreshadowed in the Aaronic type. However, the Melchizedek type speaks of Christ in resurrection and continuing forever in glory.

The Brazen Altar (Ex. 27:1). Since the Old Testament sacrifice was offered upon the brazen altar, that altar became the type or typical anticipation of the cross upon which Christ died. He, a spotless Sacrifice, was the just One who offered Himself for the unjust.

The Two Birds (Lev. 14:4). As in the instance of the two goats, two creatures are required to complete one type. One bird is slain, which represents Christ as in His sacrificial death; the other bird, dipped in the blood of the slain bird and released, represents Christ in resurrection taking His own blood into heaven on behalf of those for whom He died. His redemptive work which He accomplished by His death having been completed, He arose from the dead. Death had no more claim upon Him (Rom. 4:25).

The Sacrificial Blood (Lev. 17:11). No single type, except it be that of the lamb, is more fraught with meaning than that of the sacrificial blood as it was shed upon the altar. Of this Dr. C. I. Scofield writes on Leviticus 17:11, "(1) The value of the 'life' is the measure of the value of the 'blood.' This gives the blood of Christ its inconceivable value. When it was shed the sinless God-man gave His life. 'It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins' (Heb. 10:4). (2) It is not the blood in the veins of the sacrifice, but the blood *upon the altar* which is efficacious. The Scripture knows nothing of salvation by the imitation or influence of Christ's life, but only by that life yielded up on the cross. The meaning of all sacrifice is here explained. Every offering was an execution of the sentence of the law upon a substitute for the offender, and every such offering pointed forward to that substitutional death of Christ which alone vindicated the righteousness of God in passing over the sins of those who offered the typical sacrifices (Rom. 3:24, 25; Ex. 29:36)" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 150).

The Sweet Savor Offerings (Lev. 1:1–3:17). In the most exhaustive manner the five offerings of the first five chapters of Leviticus set forth that

accomplished by Christ in His death. The first three—the burnt offering, the meal offering, and the peace offering—look forward to that in Christ's death which was well-pleasing—a sweet savor—to the Father. Of these (a) the burnt offering or the whole burnt offering speaks of Christ offering Himself without spot to God and as a substitute in that the believer has neither obedience nor righteousness of his own to present to God; but both obedience and righteousness, which He is in Himself, were presented by the Savior in behalf of sinners. Quite apart from the remission of sin, the provision of that which is lacking and which the sinner must gain if ever to be accepted of God is released by Christ in His death and made available for all who believe. Salvation thus secures far more than the canceling of evil; it also provides the saved one with that merit or standing which heaven and holiness demand. The details of the whole burnt offering are set forth in Leviticus 1:3–17. (b) The meal offering is described in Leviticus 2:1–16, and represents the perfection of Christ in whom the Father delights and whose fullness is imputed to the child of God (John 1:16; Col. 2:9–10). (c) The peace offering recognizes the truth that Christ has made peace between the believer and God through His sacrificial death. This offering does not magnify the bearing of sin, but rather the result in bringing about a peace relation between God and the believer (cf. Rom. 5:1).

The Non-Sweet Savor Offerings (Lev. 4:1–5:19). Christians generally are more familiar with the truth represented by the non-sweet savor offerings, since these underlie the whole divine freedom to forgive sin, and, as has been before indicated, the gospel as preached by the great majority—if not universally—offers to the unsaved little more than the divine remission of sin. Such, indeed, is not to be esteemed lightly, but far more and of measureless value is the divine provision through Christ's death whereby all the merit of the Son of God is reckoned over to those who believe. It is so reckoned and the sinner is thus blessed when he has Christ as his portion; however, that limitless benefit is as much a message to the unsaved as the remission of sin. It is a vital part of the good news which the gospel represents. It is true that some are saved on a restricted presentation of the divine provisions; but it stands to reason and is experimentally demonstrated that many more may be reached when all the antitype truth of the five offerings—the sweet savor as well as the non-sweet savor aspects of Christ's death—is presented.

The Goat as a Sacrifice (Lev. 1:10). Among the several animals allowed for sacrifice the goat has a peculiar significance. As a symbol of that which God rejects (cf. Matt. 25:33), the goat presents Christ as numbered with the transgressors (cf. Isa. 53:12), made sin and a curse for sinners.

The Two Goats (Lev. 16:5). On the great Day of Atonement a bullock was first offered for the sins of the high priest, which sacrifice finds no antitype in the Savior. That offering was most essential for the preparation of the high priest for the service he was appointed to render that day, as himself a type of Christ. Two goats were selected and one sacrificed. The blood of the slain goat was carried by the high priest into the holiest place, which typified Christ's death and His presentation of His blood in heaven as the divinely provided remedy for the sins of the people. Upon the second goat hands were laid, which ceremony acknowledged the transfer of sin's penalties to the substitute, and then the goat was led away into the wilderness, which serves as a symbol of oblivion, and thus was foreshadowed the perfect disposition of sin by Christ in His death and burial (cf. Rom. 6:2–3; 1 Cor. 15:3–4).

The Kinsman Redeemer (Lev. 25:49; Isa. 59:20). Earlier portions of this work have made much of the Kinsman Redeemer type. It sustains the truth of its antitype, which is that only the great kinsman may redeem. To this end Christ came into the human family. Christ met every requirement of such a redeemer. He was free from any share in the calamity from which He must redeem others, He was of the human family by the incarnation, He was able to pay the price of redemption —which was no less than the shed blood of the Son of God—and He was willing to redeem. In every respect Christ is the one perfect Redeemer.

The Lamb (Isa. 53:7; John 1:29). When tested and proved to be without blemish, the lamb is the type of Christ which is most employed by the Holy Spirit throughout the Word of God. This one type is inexhaustible in all its representations of the sacrificial, substitutional death of Christ.

The Laver (Ex. 30:18). Every priest was required to be cleansed at the brazen laver before each service. Of how much greater importance it is for the believer-priest of this age to be cleansed constantly if he would be effective in his life and testimony! The blood of Christ constantly applied is the antitype of the Old Testament laver (cf. 1 John 1:7, 9).

The Passover (Ex. 12:11). In the Passover type of Christ unlimited riches of truth are involved. The lamb must be without spot, it must be tested with respect to its fitness, its blood must be shed, and the shed blood must be applied. The oft-repeated celebration of the Passover was only a memorial and provided nothing of either salvation or security for those who observed it.

The Red Heifer (Num. 19:2). A peculiar provision in the antitype is foreseen in the type of the red heifer sacrifice. As the ashes were preserved and became the means of a perpetual statute for cleansing, so the blood of Christ is ever the cleansing agent in the believer's daily need (1 John 1:9).

The Rock (Ex. 17:6; Num. 20:8). On this extended type Dr. C. I. Scofield writes, "The rock, type of life through the Spirit by grace: (1) Christ the Rock (1 Cor. 10:4). (2) The people utterly unworthy (Ex. 17:2; Eph. 2:1–6). (3) Characteristics of life through grace: (*a*) free (John 4:10; Rom. 6:23; Eph. 2:8); (*b*) abundant (Rom. 5:20; Psa. 105:41; John 3:16); (*c*) near (Rom. 10:8); (*d*) the people had only to take (Isa. 55:1). The smitten-rock aspect of the death of Christ looks toward the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as a result of accomplished redemption, rather than toward our *guilt.* It is the affirmative side of John 3:16. 'Not perish" speaks of atoning blood; 'but have' speaks of life bestowed" (*Ibid.*, p. 91).

Two Persons (Gen. 22:2). Isaac offered upon the altar represents many specific features of Christ's death. The type is strengthened by the fact that Abraham represents God the Father offering His only Son (Gen. 22:2; Rom. 8:32). Isaac represents Christ obedient unto death, while the ram caught in the thicket (Gen. 22:13) introduces again the ever reappearing theme of substitution.

Joseph (Gen. 37:20–27). A portion only of the extended type of Christ which Joseph provides relates to the feature of death. As Joseph was rejected and all but murdered by his brethren, so Christ not only was rejected but did die at the hand of the rulers of His people.

II. In Prophecy

Prediction in the Old Testament concerning the death of Christ is second, in extent, only to that which relates to His first and second advents. Prophecy respecting His death may be divided into four parts for purposes

of study: (1) a major historical prediction, (2) a major doctrinal prediction, (3) various lesser predictions, and (4) Christ's own declaration.

1. The Major Historical Prediction. That the 22nd Psalm is an anticipation of the crucifixion scene can be denied only by blind prejudice —such as is discovered in the unbelieving whether Jew or Gentile. The first portion of this Psalm (vss. 1–21) is evidently a record of what Christ addressed to God the Father during the six hours of His crucifixion suffering. Not one word of this extended context, it will be seen, is uttered by any other than Christ Himself, nor is any word of His thus spoken directed to any other than the One addressed in the opening words, "My God." Added to the much esteemed seven sayings of the cross, which are recorded in the four Gospels, are these twenty-one verses with their immeasurable wealth of revelation, and all from the lips of the dying Savior. This Psalm was written one thousand years before Christ died and, though it vividly describes a death by crucifixion, it was written many centuries before any human mind had conceived of that manner of torture. The Psalm opens with an address to God inquiring why the Speaker is forsaken of God. This cry with its implied limitations relative to understanding arose from the humanity of the Savior. This truth is evidenced by the fact that His address employs the title *God* rather than *Father.* As has been observed, the First Person is the God of the humanity of Christ, but not the God of His Deity, or of the Second Person. Later in the record He declares, "I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly" (vs. 10). Having uttered this initial plea, He at once vindicates God by the words, "But thou art holy." This is a word of complete trust and confidence in the midst of such an abandonment. Why, indeed, should He be forsaken at all? Naught had He done amiss in all His years on earth and the Father has declared that in Him He was well pleased. The answer is that the Sufferer was being *made* an offering for sin and from such a thing the Father's face is turned away. The Sacred Text records the experience of two others who in the time of great testing have vindicated God—Job (Job 1:21; 2:10) and the Shunammite woman (2 Kings 4:26).

For a clear comprehension of the redeeming work of Christ on the cross, it is essential that the fact of His humanity with all its actual limitations should be recognized. As God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,

He knew the full meaning of His suffering and death, but as the suffering Lamb He learned obedience respecting the Father's will in regard to those things which were not known hitherto. That an actually contradictory attitude toward one and the same thing could exist cannot be understood. Nevertheless the unexplainable feature of this fact does not militate against the reality of it; nor should it be allowed to modify to the least degree belief that, on the one hand, Christ's humanity was subject to normal human limitations, or, on the other hand, His Deity was free from limitation with its omniscience and omnipotence. It is a grievous error to suppose that, because of His Deity, His human problems were all but done away; and it is equally erroneous to contend that, because of the presence in Him of His humanity, His Deity was suppressed to any degree.

According to verses 4 and 5 of the Psalm, Christ is reported as saying to His God that He is the first and only individual in all human history to put His trust in Jehovah and find Him to fail. The subsequent addition of nearly two thousand years of history has not changed this fact, that Christ alone has suffered abandonment in the midst of a perfect trust in Jehovah. This stupendous truth only increases the initial problem of *why* this One should be forsaken. It is not difficult to find a reason why a sinner might be forsaken of Jehovah, but in this instance it is the only One in Himself well-pleasing to Jehovah. This is the holy, spotless, undefiled Son of God. The answer respecting why is found only in the fact that He was a substitute for others who were and are meritless before God.

In verses 6 to 8 Christ recounts the utter rejection of Himself by those who are watching His crucifixion. In their eyes He is "a worm, and no man." That which His tormentors actually did say is predicted in verse 8. It reads, "He trusted on the LORD that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him." In no instance of human history is the sovereignty of God and the freedom of the human will so brought into juxtaposition as in the crucifixion of Christ. There could be no doubt that the death of Christ was divinely determined from all eternity, both with regard to the fact of it and the manner of it. He was to be executed by "wicked hands" (Acts 2:23). The very words they would say (vs. 8) and the means they would employ (vss. 16–18) were anticipated in this 22nd Psalm a thousand years beforehand; yet in the most unrestrained manner these men followed what was to them the inclination of their own wills. For this

crime, though divinely determined from all eternity, they are declared to be guilty—even the Savior Himself prayed that their sin might be forgiven. Had there been no crime of crucifixion, from all appearances there would have been no redemption from any sin. For the Savior to declare, then, as in verse 15—"and thou [Jehovah] hast brought me into the dust of death" — does not lessen the problem of His suffering and death. The God to whom He speaks is charged with His death. He also at once enters a charge against the wicked who have "enclosed" Him, who have "pierced my hands and my feet." It is thus true that He died at the hands of His Father (cf. Rom. 3:25; 8:32; John 1:29; 3:16), but equally true that He died at the hands of men, who could do no more than commit a tragic crime although no thanks is ever due them for any part they took in this advantageous death. On the other hand, the Father wrought a reconciliation through the sacrifice of His Son, and so to Him be the honor and glory and thanksgiving forever.

2. The Major Doctrinal Prediction. The preceding theme is evidence that the doctrinal element could hardly be eliminated from any consideration of the death of Christ. However, the prediction set forth in Isaiah 52:13–53:12, though a statement of facts, is distinctly doctrinal and from that point of approach is all but inexhaustible. Again the humanity of Christ as involved in His sacrificial death is in view. He is, according to the opening declaration (52:13), Jehovah's Servant, One who because committed to do Jehovah's will shall in all things, especially in His death in behalf of others, deal prudently. The reward for so doing is that He shall be exalted very high. Thus, also, it is written in the Philippian Epistle (2:6–11) that He who humbled Himself and became obedient unto death is highly exalted. In His humanity He was made an ignominious sacrifice and His face was marred to the extent that it lost the semblance of a man (52:14); yet this afflicted One shall sprinkle many nations and before Him kings shall be silent (52:15). The 53rd chapter opens with the challenge, "Who hath believed our report?" This will at once be identified as a far look into the future, when the value of that death in the salvation of men shall depend upon a simple response of faith to the gospel report. Not often in the Old Testament are men said to have something to believe (cf. Gen. 15:6); rather they are enjoined to do the whole law of God. Isaiah, chapter 53, is a declaration of that which the Savior wrought in His death and of the benefit

secured thereby. It presents no directions for human action or faithfulness. "The arm of Jehovah" is not revealed to every one any more than it is true that all believe the gospel report. To those who do believe, the arm is revealed. The phrase "the arm of Jehovah" is suggestive when compared with Psalm 8:3, which states: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained." In the one instance the creation of solar systems is likened to God's finger-play; but in the other instance the saving of a lost soul requires the almighty arm of Jehovah to be made bare, to the end that His utmost power may be exercised. No greater exertion could confront the Almighty than that which He has put forth for the salvation of men. That Jehovah might save, He took the sinner's place in the most exact kind of substitution. This is the dominant theme of this entire context. Here it is recorded: "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.… For the transgression of my people was he stricken.… When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin.… He shall bear their iniquities.… He bare the sin of many." Little wonder that the high priest was moved to say regarding Christ's death: "Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (John 11:49–50). The Holy Spirit adds these explanatory words, "And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation" (vs. 51). Later it is reported of the same Caiaphas, "Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people" (18:14). The great joy that was set before Him for which He endured the cross and despised the shame (cf. Heb. 12:2) is anticipated in the words with which this doctrinal prediction closes: "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.… Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured

out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors" (Isa. 53:10, 12).

3. Minor Predictions. Only some of the brief predictions of the Old Testament which anticipate the death of Christ are to be noted.

Genesis 3:15. "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

This proclamation is notable not only for the direct message which it conveys, but for the early time of its utterance. It is a divine pronouncement, quite apart from human agencies, and concerns but one feature of Christ's death, namely, its relation to Satan and through Satan indirectly to all fallen angels. The great crisis of the cross as it bears upon Satan is in view and while Christ was to bruise Satan's head, Satan, in turn, was to bruise Christ's heel. By so much it is manifest that Christ's death was, to an unrevealed extent and in the permissive will of God, an attack by Satan upon the Son of God. The triumph of the latter is sure, as a wound in Satan's head speaks of destruction while a bruising of the heel is at most but an injury.

Isaiah 50:6. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting."

The details of this prediction are too specific to be misapplied. In the preceding verse the testimony is given by the suffering One that "the Lord God hath opened mine ear," which doubtless refers to the sealing of the voluntary slave (cf. Ex. 21:1–6; Ps. 40:6, and all passages bearing on Christ's obedience to the Father's will), and in nothing was He "rebellious, neither turned away back." This obedience led Him into these sufferings and into death.

Zechariah 12:10; 13:6–7. "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.… And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hand? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends. Awake, O sword, against

my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones."

The future mourning of Israel over their part in the crucifixion of Christ occupies an extended place in prophecy (cf. Isa. 61:2–3; Matt. 24:30). This prediction asserts that their mourning will be over the fact that, in His crucifixion, they pierced Him. When He comes again, Israel will recognize Him by the wounds which He bears. Dr. A. C. Gaebelein writes at this juncture in his volume *Studies in Zechariah* (pp. 121, 124) as follows:

> The mourning then is described as a universal one. All the families will mourn; family by family apart, and their wives apart. Such a mourning and weeping has never before been seen in the earth nor will there be one like it again. But why mourning and weeping? Should there not rather be joy and feasting, gladness and hallelujahs? The hallelujahs will come during the entire millennium, but the beginning will be mourning, national, by Israel. The mourning is on account of Him, Jehovah, who has appeared in His glory and whom they now behold. The long-expected Messiah has at last appeared, and He is Jehovah.… There is still another passage which is in close connection with the appearing of Jehovah, the pierced One, in Zechariah 12, namely, Revelation 1:7, "Behold He comes with the clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they which have pierced Him and all the tribes of the land shall wail because of Him. Yea. Amen." This passage corresponds with the one before us in Zechariah. The tribes in Revelation are the same as mentioned in Zechariah, and the wailing in Revelation stands for the mourning with which the twelfth chapter in Zechariah closes.… They see the sign in the heavens and there will be the glad shout, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of Jehovah, this is our God, we have waited for Him." And now they behold a person upon that cloud. He is a Son of Man. Again they look and they see that His hands and His feet and His side are pierced. Who can this be with pierced hands, feet and side, who cometh thus in power and glory from the heavens to save His people? The truth so long denied by them flashes upon them, "This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews, the rejected One, the One who suffered that shameful death on yonder hill, whose hands and feet were pierced, and from whose loving side and heart the Roman spear drew forth blood and water." Jehovah-Jesus, the pierced One, is seen again.

Dr. H. A. Ironside adds here, as written in his *Notes on the Minor Prophets* (pp. 406–7):

> The word "look" might be rendered "contemplate." It implies an earnest attention, beholding with thoughtfulness, that every lineament of His face may be imprinted upon their souls. His once-marred visage, His pierced hands and side—all will be indelibly impressed upon them. When they thus learn that He who was spurned as a malefactor and a blasphemer was really the Lord of glory, their grief and repentance will know no bounds. We have two New Testament pictures of this scene: Thomas the apostle, called Didymus (the twin), believed when he saw. In the remnant of Judah, the other twin— may I say?—will come to the front, equally unbelieving till the marks of spear and nails shall prove convincing. Then in Saul of Tarsus we have a preeminent picture of the same remnant. Hating the name of

> Jesus, He goes on his way, zealously persecuting all who love that name, till arrested by a light from heaven: his eyes, blinded to earth's glory, peer into the holiest; and there, upon the throne of God, he beholds the Nazarene! Thus he was one born before the time; that is, before the time when, by a similar sight, the remnant will be brought to cry, as he did, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

While these references to Christ's death are as a retrospect, when that death is before Israel in the latter times, these Scriptures serve also to indicate that these features—the recognition, the mourning, the smiting of the shepherd, and the scattering of the flock (cf. Matt. 26:31)—were foreseen many centuries before Christ died.

4. Christ's Predictions. Though Christ repeatedly announced His oncoming death (Matt. 16:21; 17:22–23; 20:17–19; 26:12, 28, 31; Mark 9:32–34; 14:8, 24, 27; Luke 9:22, 44–45; 18:31–34; 22:20; John 2:19–21; 10:17–18; 12:7), it never really reached the consciousness of His disciples. Doubtless it was withheld from them; but a deeper reason for their inability to understand is found in the fact that, up to the time of His death and even after (cf. Acts 1:6–7), the disciples, like all others who followed Him, were centered in their thought and expectation on the realization of the long-predicted, Messianic, earthly kingdom. Though during the three and one-half years these men preached constantly under the direction and authority of Christ, they could have preached no gospel based upon Christ's death and resurrection. Of those events—so basic in the gospel of divine grace—they knew nothing. This fact is a final answer to those who—too often without due thought— have supposed that the gospel of grace based on Christ's death and resurrection was not only the message of the twelve during Christ's earthly ministry, but was shared by the saints of the Old Testament. The fact that Christ foresaw His death and resurrection while He at the same time announced His kingdom as at hand, does not lend authority to any to assume that these are but one and the same thing. On the contrary, it is thus revealed that Christ with infinite clarity indicated the distinctions between His two advents, though, by the very nature of the case, He could not proclaim these distinctions before the time of His death (cf. Matt. 23:38–25:46; John 14:1–3). He did forecast His coming and kingdom to Peter, James, and John in the mount of transfiguration. It is a study of vital import, yet almost wholly neglected, how the second advent was introduced by Christ both before and after His death and resurrection. The kingdom

gospel—unrelated to His death and resurrection—was abruptly terminated before its completion by the death of the King. It is not a function of a king to die. “Long live the king!” However, that very death and resurrection became the ground of a new message of sovereign grace apart from all human works of merit and is the divine appeal for the outcalling of a heavenly people. The hour must come when the Church will be completed and removed from the earth. It is then, without fail, that God returns to the uncompleted purpose respecting a kingdom over Israel in the earth, and that by virtue, not of His death, but by the power and coming again of the King. Christ predicted both His death and the coming again and all that He will accomplish when He returns.

III. In the Synoptics

As may be deducted from what has gone before, the Synoptics, since they are largely concerned with His purpose and message, do not feature the death and resurrection of Christ beyond the historical record of that which occurred in connection with His death and resurrection. They do record Christ’s prediction respecting His death and also the instituting of the Lord’s Supper as a memorial of that death. These Gospels recount the life and action of Christ and His disciples in the days before Christ’s death was believed, and therefore before that death could enter into the doctrinal understanding of His followers. In all this the Gospel recorded by John is different, as will be observed in the next division of this chapter. While the testimony of such a portion of Scripture as the 22nd Psalm is concerned with, and restricted to, the thoughts and words of Christ while on the cross, the Gospels, including John, tell the historical facts about that which was said and done by many people. The narrative is a true one indited by the Holy Spirit. The arrest, the trial, the scourging, and the crucifixion are told in terms of perfect accuracy. The death of Christ being central in doctrine, central in history, and central in human life and experience is well sustained by these infallible records. As certainly as a sacrificial body was provided for the greatest sacrifice (Heb. 10:5) and as certainly as all types and prophecies anticipated the blood actually to be shed before it thereby became efficacious, so certainly do the inspired records of the Gospels give final assurance that that which the heart of God required the judgment of

angels demanded, and the need of man necessitated, was wrought out perfectly in the sufferings and death of Christ. Thus these historical documents assume an importance far beyond the mere tabulation of immediate facts related to the life and death of a man— though He be the greatest of all. Meditation upon these God-breathed chronicles cannot help but serve a large purpose in the full understanding and heart response to the supreme, divine sacrifice (cf. Gal. 6:14).

IV. In John's Writings

This part of the subject in hand may be divided in a threefold manner: (a) as recorded in John's Gospel, (b) as recorded in the Epistles by John, and (c) as recorded in the Revelation.

1. The Gospel. Every attentive student awake to sacred realities recognizes the peculiar spiritual character of the writings by John, as he reports the death and resurrection of Christ. Even his historical narratives of these events, like all of his Gospel, look on into the fathomless depths of divine grace. There are in all, and not including his historical chronicle of the cross, seven momentous and consequential passages to be considered in this Gospel.

John 1:29. "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

In two recorded utterances, John the Baptist, as declared by the Apostle John, reaches out into the oncoming glories of divine grace made possible through the death and resurrection of Christ. Since the preaching of John the Baptist, as set forth in the Synoptics, is so drastically legal and so clearly a call to a merit system, the recognition of the ground and fact of a grace relationship, presented only in John's Gospel, is significant. The entire context of John 1:15–34 constitutes a rare unfolding of the grace vision accorded in some measure to John the Baptist. But two of these utterances by John may be noted here. In 1:29 one is written as quoted above. The great forerunner—to whom evidently it was not given to understand that the Messianic kingdom which he announced was to be rejected and postponed, with a new heavenly, divine purpose to be ushered in—did, nevertheless, by the Holy Spirit announce the immeasurable

declarations of divine grace. John the Baptist could not fail to comprehend to some degree that the title “Lamb of God,” which he himself employed, implied a sacrificial death; and the assurance that He would take away the sin of the world measured an achievement far beyond the bounds of his own nation or of the usual Messianic expectation—but then have not prophets often spoken beyond the range of their own understanding? In fact, is not this great proclamation far beyond the understanding of all human minds? It is averred that the sin of the world is taken away by the dying Lamb. The scope of this undertaking—something to affect the whole *cosmos* world (cf. John 3:16)—must not be misinterpreted. There is no reference here to the elect of this age, else language ceases to serve as an expression of truth. The Church is a company saved out of the *cosmos* and therefore not to be confused with the *cosmos.* It is true that the Scriptures specify that Christ died for the Church (Eph. 5:25–27), but it is as clearly said that He died for the *cosmos.* The assumption that Christ could have but one objective in His death has led to much error. His death was as well the judgment of angels, a specific dealing with the sins of Israel past and future, the end of the law, and the ground of heaven’s purification. However, the question concerning the sense in which the sin of the world is “taken away” is pertinent at this point. It would be a defenseless contradiction of subsequent New Testament doctrine to contend that the sin of the *cosmos* is so removed by the death of Christ that the individual unregenerate person could not come into judgment. The same, subsequent Scriptures teach that sin has been dealt with in three spheres of relationship—with reference to its power to enslave, Christ has provided a ransom; with respect to its effect upon the sinner, Christ has wrought a reconciliation with God; and with regard to its effect upon God, Christ has achieved a propitiation. These three consummations—redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation—are not things which God *will* do if one believes; they are already finished and constitute the very thing which the sinner must believe. The sin of the world is taken away in the sense that by Christ’s threefold accomplishment in His death every hindrance is removed which restrained God from the saving of even the chief of sinners. However, it has pleased Him to require personal acceptance of this Saviorhood of Christ, at which time, and on this sole condition, He will apply all of His saving grace. Even though Christ has completed so perfect a basis for salvation, men are not saved thereby except

they believe. Similarly, to claim that men *must* be saved since Christ died for them is equally at fault. The Scriptures teach a finished work for the entire *cosmos* (cf. John 1:29; 3:16; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2), but the same divine revelation asserts that vast multitudes of those who are of the *cosmos* will be lost forever. These are not problems which belong to some one system of theology; they belong to every exegete who receives the words of Scripture in their plain meaning (cf. 2 Cor. 4:2). Through the death of Christ, God has so dealt with the problem of human sin that the *cosmos* stands in an entirely new and different relation to Him. The human family is reconciled, not in the sense that they *are* saved, but in the sense that they may be saved (2 Cor. 5:19). The prison door which Satan would not open (Isa. 14:17) has been unlocked for all (Isa. 61:1; Col. 2:14–15).

John the Baptist announced, likewise, the immeasurable results of divine grace when he said, "And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John 1:16–17). By the death of Christ—not by His birth—a new reality is secured which he terms "grace and truth." This new thing supersedes the Mosaic system. Grace upon grace, or grace added to grace, accomplishes no less for the believer than experience of the πλήρωμα of Christ for all who come within the range of its provisions. No more all-inclusive statement of the limitless workings of divine grace than this is to be found. The πλήρωμα of the Godhead is that which grace bestows upon those who are saved (cf. Col. 1:19; 2:9–10). Whatever John the Baptist himself may have comprehended is a secondary issue. He did by the Spirit declare the whole basis, scope, and consummation of divine grace.

John 3:14. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up."

A most vivid representation of the death of Christ with its essential value was suggested to Nicodemus, whether comprehended or not, by the reference to the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness (Num. 21:8–9). The serpent serves as a symbol of sin and brass speaks of judgment. The pole on which the serpent was lifted up is a symbol of the cross whereon Christ was made to be sin, or a sin offering, in behalf of those for whom He died. It is also to be noted that as those bitten in the wilderness had but to look at the serpent on the pole to live, so there is life for a look of faith at the crucified One. Hence the essential New Testament

doctrine that salvation with all its provisions is secured by faith alone—that faith which Christ went on to emphasize when He said to Nicodemus: "Whosoever believeth in him [the Son of man lifted up] should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:15; cf. vss. 16–21). In this declaration to Nicodemus Christ recognizes that, because of His infinite love, God gave His only begotten Son as an offering for man's sin, and that a complete healing from sin's injury is made possible and available for all who believe. So final, indeed, is this one condition—that man's acceptance or condemnation before God depends only upon his believing or not believing—that Christ went on to say, "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18). On this passage Erling C. Olsen in his commentary on John writes:

> Jesus Christ did not come into the world to condemn the world; the world was condemned already. The Gospel is preached to men who are condemned because of their sin. Therefore the Gospel is offered to the sinner as the satisfaction for his sins. We can leave the heathen who have never heard about Christ with utmost confidence in the hands of the God of the universe who doeth all things well. But this portion of Scripture teaches that irrespective of the character or lack of character an individual possesses, if he has heard of the name of the only begotten Son of God but refuses to believe on Him, that one is doubly condemned in the sight of God for he has charged God with being a liar. It would be sheer presumption on our part to suggest to any man that he is a sinner and that he is going to hell. Well might such a person say to us, Who made thee a judge? But our Lord said, of the man who *does not believe* in the name of the only begotten Son of God that he "is condemned (or judged) already." If language means anything, that means that any man who does not believe in the only begotten Son of God is already judged, and that judgment is condemnation. Some have an idea that men are on parole and that God is taking a record of men's lives and some day before a great judgment throne He will examine our lives and there determine whether we are to be condemned or commended. But no such idea entered any man's mind as a result of reading the Bible. There is not even a suggestion of the kind in the Book. Our Lord said that a man is condemned already "because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." But He also said that "He that believeth on him is not condemned …" Both statements are remarkable for their absolute assurance. Let me illustrate by a personal reference. I believe on the name of the Son of God. I believe that Jesus Christ was born of a virgin; that he suffered under Pontius Pilate; that he was crucified; that He was buried; and that He arose from the dead on the third day. I believe He died for my sin and put that sin away by His death. I believe God when His Word declares that "He that hath the Son hath life …" Thus, I have eternal life. I am not condemned. That fact, however, is not the result of anything I have done except that I have believed God. It has not the slightest bearing upon anything I have ever done or ever shall do. It is a question of faith in the Son of God. It could not be otherwise, for every man in his natural state is condemned already. Man is a sinner; man is lost in his sin; man is absolutely condemned in the sight of God. His lips are sealed,

his head is bowed, and his conscience has added its voice to his conviction. How then can a man save himself?—*Walks with Our Lord through John's Gospel*, I, 111–13

John 6:51. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

The mystery of bread becoming physical life when consumed and assimilated by the human body symbolizes the far greater mystery that to those who receive Christ He becomes life everlasting. Manna was divinely sent down from heaven, and of it Christ said, "Your fathers did eat" and though it sustained them for a time, they are all dead (6:49); but the Bread which Christ is, which also came down from heaven, if partaken of, provides eternal life. Of this, Christ stated, "This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever" (vs. 58). The central teaching of this figure is that His flesh must be sacrificed and His blood shed, to the end that He may become that spiritual nourishment which eternal life is. "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me" (vss. 53–57).

John 10:11. "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep."

In this, yet another anticipation of His death, Christ indicates that the release of His own life will provide life eternal for those who become His through faith. "I am come," He said, "that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (10:10); and speaking to the Jews He declared: "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one" (vss. 26–30).

John 11:49–52. "And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad" (cf. John 18:14).

At this point God by His Spirit introduces a most arresting declaration and uses an unwilling and unsympathetic high priest to announce it. This context discloses the fact that Caiaphas did not originate his utterance, but was rather the mouthpiece of God. The proclamation is far-reaching. First, notice that the Jewish rulers, including Caiaphas, were destitute of understanding concerning what was divinely required and what was about to be accomplished. Second, observe that it was said one man should die for the people. This statement would be justified by reference to Isaiah 53:8, "For the transgression of my people was he stricken," though it is to be doubted whether Caiaphas ever thought of such a truth before. Third, note he predicted that Jesus would die for the nation Israel; and He did die for them in a specific sense. Not only in His death did Christ bear the sins of this people living in past generations which had been covered only by animal sacrifices, but He prepared a basis upon which members of that race along with Gentiles may be saved in this age, and upon which "all Israel" shall yet be saved (Rom. 11:26–27). This prophecy by Caiaphas served in no way to hinder the crucifixion of Christ at the hands of the Jewish rulers and at the hand of Caiaphas himself. It made little impression on the high priest, as is disclosed in Matthew 26:57–68. On this important utterance by Caiaphas, H. A. W. Meyer writes:

> Vv. 51, 52. Observation of John, that Caiaphas did not speak this out of his own self-determination, but with these portentous words—in virtue of the high priest's office which he held in that year—involuntarily delivered a *prophecy.*—The high priest passed in the old Israelitish time for the bearer of the divine oracle, for the organ of the revelation of the divine decisions, which were imparted to him through the interrogation of the Urim and Thummim (Ex. 28:30; Num. 27:21). This mode of inquiry disappeared, indeed, at a later time (Josephus, *Antt*. iii. 8. 9), as the high-priestly dignity in general fell gradually from its glory; nevertheless, there is still found in the prophetic age the belief in the high priest's prophetical gift (Hos. 3:4), exactly as, in Josephus, *Antt*. vi. 6. 3, the idea of the old high-priesthood as the bearer of the oracle distinctly appears, and Philo, *de Creat. Princ.*, sets forth at least the *true* priest as prophet, and consequently idealizes the relation. Accordingly—as closely

> connected with that venerable and not yet extinct recollection, and with still surviving esteem for the high-priestly office—it was a natural and obvious course for John, after pious reflection on those remarkable words which were most appropriate to the sacrificial death of Jesus, to find in them a disclosure of the divine decree,—expressed without self-knowledge and will,—and that by no means with a "sacred irony" (Ebrard). Here, too, the extraordinary *year* in which the speaker was invested with the sacred office, carries with it the determination of the judgment; since, if at any time, it was assuredly in this very year, in which God purposed the fulfilment of His holy counsel through the atoning death of His Son, that a revelation through the high-priestly organ appeared conceivable.… *For the benefit of* the nation Christ was to die; for through His atoning death the Jews, for whom, in *the first instance*, the Messianic salvation was designed (4:22), were to become partakers by means of faith in the eternal saving deliverance. But the object of His death extended still further than the Jews; not for the benefit of the *nation* alone, but *in order also to bring together into one the scattered children of God.* These are the *Gentiles*, who believe on Him, and thereby are partakers of the atonement, children of God (1:12). The expression is *prophetic* and, just as in 10:16, *proleptic*, according to the New Testament *predestinarian* point of view …—*Commentary on the New Testament, in loc.*

John 12:24. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

A principle is announced in this text which, though working throughout nature generally, is especially evident in Christ's death and resurrection as they reach out in benefit to others. It is through death that life is multiplied (cf. 1 Cor. 15:36). That the principle applies to men is declared by Christ when He went on to say, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal" (John 12:25). In His death Christ entered the greatest sphere of sacrifice. Of this Dean Alford makes note, "The saying is more than a mere parabolic similitude: the divine Will, which has fixed the law of the springing up of the wheat-corn, has also determined the law of the glorification of the Son of Man, and the one in analogy with the other: i.e., both *through Death.* The symbolism here lies at the root of that in ch. 6., where Christ is *the* BREAD *of life*. it abideth by itself alone, with its life uncommunicated, lived only within its own limits, and not passing on" (*New Testament for English Readers*, I, 572). So, also, R. Govett adds:

> He compares Himself, then, to the grain of wheat which must die before it appears in a new form, and associates others with itself. As the Son of God risen from the dead and ascended to heaven, He can knit to Himself in closest contact both Jew and Gentile, who are made of one spirit with Him. Thus His atonement and His righteousness may be ours. The grain in the granary is possessed of life, but single and limited. If it is to expand, it must die

> and take a new form. He must, then, die and be buried; like the grain of wheat, which is to spring out of earth in a new shape, having many new grains united with it. Thus He would discover to His persecutors, if they had had eyes to see it, the falsehood of their hopes. They grieved over Jesus' success while *living*, and thought to cut off all by putting Him to death. "Let us *kill* Him, and there will be an end of the matter!" They did so; but it was only to find that the disciples then multiplied by thousands, and filled Jerusalem and the land—nay, and the Gentiles also, with their doctrine. Our Lord, then, knows the counsels of His Father, whose ways are not as ours. Death and resurrection is His plan. And as for Jesus, so for His members. We are familiar with this view of it in the ancient saying, "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."—*Exposition of the Gospel of St. John*, II, 69–70

John 15:13. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

In this saying Christ not only anticipates His death (cf. John 10:17–18), but discloses the truth regarding His own devotion to each one who is included in His sacrifice, especially those who would believe on Him. How broad are the objectives in His death! Although that death is effective in immeasurable realms of achievement, it still has its closest personal character. To this the individual should respond and one at least has so responded as recorded in the New Testament. The great Apostle Paul wrote of Christ and himself: "who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20) and "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14). Thus the death of Christ at once comprehends the vast issues which reach to creation's outmost bounds and is the joy and hope of the least of individual believers.

2. The Epistles. No direct reference to Christ's death is found in either Second or Third John. The First Epistle presents four important teachings on the subject:

1 John 1:7. "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

In this Scripture the blood of Christ is contemplated as shed and available as a constant benefit to those who "walk in the light." As already seen, this aspect of truth is typified in the red heifer sacrifice (cf. Num. 19). As the ashes were preserved for a perpetual cleansing, so the believer, upon confession to God, is forgiven and cleansed (1 John 1:9). What is involved in "walking in the light" is well stated by Dr. C. I. Scofield in his comment

on this passage. To quote: “What it is to ‘walk in the light’ is explained by vs. 8–10. ‘All things… are made manifest by the light’ (Eph. 5:13). The presence of God brings the consciousness of sin in the nature (v. 8), and sins in the life (vs. 9, 10). The blood of Christ is the divine provision for both. To walk in the light is to live in fellowship with the Father and the Son. Sin interrupts, but confession restores that fellowship. Immediate confession keeps the fellowship unbroken” (*Op. cit.*, p. 1321). The truth remains that sin is ever sinful even when committed by a believer, and the shed blood of Christ is ever available to cleanse perfectly.

1 John 2:2. “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our’s only, but also for the sins of the whole world.”

With respect to the imperative demands which outraged holiness must otherwise impose upon sinners, God is rendered propitious by Christ’s judgment death for them. Propitiation on the part of God is not salvation on the part of sinners. It rather secures the possibility of salvation. God is propitious, therefore the sinner may be saved upon such terms as a propitious God may dictate. The sinner is not called upon by tears and entreaties to persuade God or to influence Him to be well disposed; that much Christ’s death as a substitute has wrought to infinite completeness. The sinner has but to believe, by which act he reposes confidence in that which God has provided. In like manner, when the Christian sins, his restoration to divine fellowship is conditioned on the same truth—that, through the death of Christ, God is propitious. The passage under consideration sets forth a primary statement regarding the sins of Christians and only a secondary statement regarding the sins of the unsaved. Preceding this assertion, that God is propitious concerning “our sins,” the Apostle John has brought into view two great questions along with their answers: (1) What is the effect of sin upon the Christian himself who commits it? The answer, stated throughout this Epistle and especially in chapter 1, is that fellowship with the Father and Son is lost, as also all spiritual power and blessing. (2) What is the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God? This is a most vital problem, for it determines everything with respect to the unchangeable character of the believer’s salvation. The answer of a shallow rationalism which argues that, because of God’s holiness. He must disown His child is wholly at fault, since it ignores the present ministry of Christ as Advocate in heaven. The believer is told that, when he sins, he has an

Advocate in heaven. This is a distinct and sufficient provision. The Advocate is Christ and He stands to plead that He bore the sin on the cross. His advocacy is so absolutely perfect with regard to its equity that He wins in this service a title which is given Him in no other relationship—"Jesus Christ the Righteous" (1 John 2:1). This perfect advocacy in which He pleads His finished work on the cross thus becomes the ground of the propitiation which He is to God, all of which is mentioned in the next verse, the one under consideration. There would be no hope for any sinner—saved or unsaved—apart from the death of Christ; but, sheltered under that provision, divine propitiation is infinitely real and unchangeably effective for man.

1 John 3:16. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."

Again (cf. John 15:13; Rom. 5:8) the immeasurable love of God for those injured by sin is said to be manifested, enacted, and demonstrated by and through the death of Christ. It would be useless indeed for one to seek to discover or comprehend the knowledge-surpassing love of God as expressed in the cross. It is not manifest elsewhere just the same, though the Father's care of His own is prompted by His Love for them. "To know the love of Christ" (Eph. 3:19) is that to which every believer may well seek to attain.

1 John 4:10. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

The same theme—God's love expressed in and through the death of Christ—is presented by the Apostle John once more. Nothing could be built on the love of man toward God; but God's love is a perfect basis for all His mighty achievements.

3. The Revelation. The Revelation, which looks on to the closing days of God's dealing with sinful men and which records His final triumph over all evil, also looks backward to the death of Christ in four significant passages.

Revelation 1:5. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

The eternal Jehovah character of Christ has been asserted possibly by the words: "from him which is, and which was, and which is to come" (vs. 4).

He is “the faithful witness,” not only with respect to the character of God, but also with regard to the sinfulness of man and His redemption perfected through the shedding of His own blood. To those who believe in an actual blood-redemption, this passage is a surpassing casket of heavenly jewels. He it is “that loved us,” which marvelous truth has been so constantly emphasized in Scripture. He it is that “washed us from our sins,” and who shed His blood to that end.

Revelation 5:9. “And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.”

The new song is heaven’s worship of the Lamb, and is sung only by those who have been redeemed by His blood out from all the peoples of the earth. The song of triumph not only acknowledges that Christ was slain, but its singers are ever reminded of the ground of their acceptance with God and of their right only through the blood of Christ to occupy celestial spheres. Though a modern religious song anticipates a time when the “old, rugged cross” will be exchanged for a crown and though inattentive multitudes lend their voices to such a baseless notion, it remains a fact that the redeemed in heaven recognize their right to be in glory as a privilege extended them only through the blood of the cross, and no intimation is ever given that any other song will be on their lips. Those who sing redemption’s song will never reach a place where through some merit of their own they can stand in these celestial spheres. As certain, also, is the truth that only those thus redeemed, who stand in the merit of Christ, will be in glory. All the dreams of Christ-rejecters who hope to be received into glory through the love of God apart from redemption are in vain.

Revelation 7:14. “And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.”

Those who have attained by His grace to the courts of glory are identified, not by their works, their sufferings, or their personal merit, but they are described as those whose robes have been washed in the blood of the Lamb. This is a figure calculated to represent purification as high as heaven in quality. It is termed a figure of speech, but it is not meaningless on that account; and so there is limitless reality in it. It may be understood

only as Christ's blood is seen to be the one divinely provided means whereby the soul and spirit of man may be purified. Cleansing so depends upon the blood of Christ that it may be said to be accomplished directly by that blood (cf. 1 John 1:7).

Revelation 13:8. "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

This passage, though so vitally important along with 1 Peter 1:19–20, should create no difficulty. Why should not God anticipate from all eternity the greatest of all His undertakings? Back of the revelation that the Lamb sacrifice has been foreseen is the accompanying disclosure, traced through reason, which is that God also foresaw the evil for which the Lamb must die. The fact thus established, that sin has existed as a divine expectation as long as the purpose of redemption has existed, is not a form of dualism, for sin as a thing merely foreseen is not in active conflict with another reality. The passage does give instruction, however, to the end that it may be recognized that the presence of evil in the world is not an unforeseen fortuity. Because of the immeasurable achievement of Christ in His death, the fact of sin will, when the values of that death shall have accomplished their intended ends, be only a retrospect. God Himself has asserted that, as for His own attitude toward it, sin shall be called no more to remembrance (cf. Isa. 43:25). Because of the indefiniteness of the Greek construction in Revelation 13:8, some have contended that the eternal feature mentioned in this passage refers to the things written in the "book of life." On this combination of words Dean Alford has well said:

> They may belong either to is written, or to is slain. The former connexion is taken by many. But the other is far more obvious and natural: and had it not been for the apparent difficulty of the sense thus conveyed, the going so far back as to is written for a connexion would never have been thought of. The difficulty of the saying is but apparent: 1 Pet. 1:19, 20 says more fully the same thing. That death of Christ which was foreordained from the foundation of the world, is said to have *taken place* in the counsels of Him with whom the end and the beginning are one. Ch. 17:8, which is cited by De Wette as decisive for his view, is irrelevant. Of course, where simply the writing in the book of life from the foundation of the world is expressed, no other element is to be introduced: but it does not therefore follow, that where, as here, other elements are by the construction introduced, that, and that alone is to be understood.—*Op. cit., in loc.*

Thus it is seen that from the writings of the Apostle John a wealth of meaning in the death of the Savior is to be gathered. Scarcely any particular meaning assigned to that death is absent from these portions; yet the doctrinal argument of the Apostle Paul extends this testimony still further, to immeasurable length.

V. In Paul's Writings

In the writings of this great Apostle, the death of Christ may be classed as one of four major themes including: Christ's death in all its applications and achievements; Christ's resurrection as the basis of a New Creation with corresponding relations to Israel and the *cosmos* world; Christ in His manifold relation to the Church; and the walk, warfare, and witness of the believer in the present age. Three of these Pauline themes are foreign to this thesis. While the preponderance of evidence points to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it seems best to reserve that book for a special consideration later on. In all the thirteen assured writings of the Apostle, only 2 Thessalonians and Philemon are without reference to that event which in the Pauline system of theology is the basis of all that endures for time and eternity. As there are in the Pauline writings—excluding Hebrews—more than thirty references to the death of Christ, it seems best to consider these as they appear in separate books or related portions of these writings.

1. ROMANS. The very heart of the gospel of divine grace as grounded in the death and resurrection of Christ is exhibited in the Letter to the Romans.

Romans 3:23–26. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Having pronounced, by that divine authority which inspiration supplies, that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," the Apostle goes on to describe that divine undertaking which is a complete and final

salvation, and in a manner which is without doubt the most perfect and all-inclusive proclamation of it. This affirmation has been preceded in the context by an extended portrayal of the utter ruin of humanity, as seen by the holy eyes of God. Also, in verses 21 and 22 appears that imputed righteousness of God—a theme already introduced in 1:16–17—which is said to be available on no other terms than simple faith in Christ Jesus as a personal Savior. Thus is introduced the greatest of all the divine accomplishments which enter into salvation by grace. Both the forgiveness of sin and the gift of eternal life are important factors in this salvation; but since the Epistle to the Romans is the Magna Carta of the gospel of grace and since that Epistle exhibits the truth of imputed righteousness as its supreme disclosure, it follows that the fact of imputed righteousness ("the gift of righteousness"—Rom. 5:17) is the central revelation in the gospel. The fact that such has not been exalted, and more often not even mentioned, by gospel preachers does not weigh at all against the logic introduced above. This great bestowment of righteousness is properly secured through two divine operations: (a) One in which—as foreshadowed in the sweet savor offerings—Christ through His death offered Himself without spot to God and, by so doing, released and placed legally at the sinner's disposal all that He the Son of God is. (b) One in which, the moment an unsaved person believes, he is invested and furnished with the πλήρωμα ('fullness') of Christ (cf. John 1:16), which is no less than the πλήρωμα of the Godhead (cf. Col. 1:19; 2:9–10). The saved one is instantly "made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12). This measureless enriching is divinely applied through the new union set up between Christ and the believer. Instantly coming to be in Christ by the baptizing work of the Holy Spirit and thus a living member in Christ's Body, the believer automatically becomes what Christ is. God then sees him in His Son and as a part of His Son. Above that exaltation nothing could ever exist. It is the πλήρωμα of the Godhead imputed to the one who believes in Christ as his Savior. Romans 3:24 opens with a new revelation, namely, "being justified"—certainly not merely aspiring to be, or hoping to be, justified. No greater challenge to human conviction could ever be made than that it acknowledge the truth that absolute, immutable justification from God is the present position of everyone who is saved at all. As before demonstrated, justification, as set forth in Romans, is not the fact of

righteousness being imputed, but is rather the divine recognition that such righteousness has been imputed. So the believer is righteous because he is in Christ, but is divinely declared to be justified immutably because he is righteous. The added word in this text (3:24) is “freely”—δωρεάν—which, as all have conceded, is better translated “without a cause” (cf. the original of John 15:25; Gal. 2:21). The thought is not that God justifies in a free or generous manner, but rather that He finds no ground or cause for justification in the believer’s own self, any more than there was a cause within Christ for the hatred directed against Him. The answer to the question of how a meritless sinner may by simple faith in Christ become immutably justified is at once declared in the very next words, namely, “by his grace.” The limits of divine grace, since it is God working with a view to the satisfying of infinite love and now that love set free to act because of Christ’s death for the sinner, could never be less than the πλήρωμα of Christ, which fullness is acknowledged by God to be what it is by the decree which proclaims the saved one immutably justified, in response to simple faith in the Savior. Again, if it be inquired how such knowledge-surpassing grace can be exercised toward a meritless sinner without God’s holiness being compromised by the making light of sin, the answer is also provided in the same text, with the phrase, “through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” Thus, if this sequence of doctrine which is compressed into verse 24 be traced backwards, it is seen that, because of Christ’s death which satisfies the holy demands of God against the sinner, God’s grace—the unrestrained expression of His infinite love—is released toward those who believe and that love will never stop short of a bestowment of the πλήρωμα of Christ, which is itself the πλήρωμα of the Godhead. Since the believer is thus invested with all that infinite holiness can require, God, apart from all merit or demerit in the believer, proclaims the one thus invested to be justified forever. A further word of assurance is added in verse 26, where it is affirmed that God is Himself *just* when He thus justifies the ungodly sinner who does no more than to believe in Jesus. In such a transaction God is not trafficking in mere pretense or fiction. The ungodly are justified (Rom. 4:5) and that without drawing on a supposed divine leniency and without compromising the divine character. So great, indeed, is the redemption which is in Christ Jesus in its outworking toward the meritless and sinful! It should be repeated often that such an exalted position as immutable

justification proclaims calls for a heaven-high manner of daily life, not that the sinner can *attain* to or *maintain* by any works of merit a position so exalted, but to the end that he may not *profane* that which God hath wrought in answer to simple faith in Jesus.

Romans 4:25. "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."

Two important aspects of doctrine are seen in the words "was delivered for our offences"—that by divine authority Christ was a sacrifice and that it was all done for the sins of men. No more fundamental truths are related to Christ's death than these two. The word παραδίδωμι, translated *delivered*, is used to describe a casting into prison or a being brought to justice (cf. Matt. 4:12; 10:17, 19, 21), and is the common term to describe the betrayal of Christ (cf. Matt. 10:4; 17:22; John 6:64, 71). That He was delivered intimates that aspect of His death which reckons it a deed at the hand of God and equally a work of wicked men. There is an aspect in which it is true that no man took His life from Him (John 10:18).

Romans 5:6–10. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

Here the love of Christ for the lost is in view. He died for those "without strength," the "ungodly," His "enemies." This is indeed a dark picture of the estate of men yet unsaved. These are not prevarications such as men employ; it is the infinite accuracy of an inspired record. Because these words represent the divine estimation of the unsaved, the indictment againt them is by so much augmented; however, even though man represents immeasurable unworthiness before God, for such the Savior died and by so much the love of God in Christ is demonstrated. In this, "God commendeth his love." In the range of human competency it is true that "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," but in the range of divine competency love is expressed thus: "While we were yet sinners" (not, holy), "ungodly" (not, godly), "enemies" (not, friends),

“Christ died for us.” It is also true, as the latter part of this context reveals, that, being justified and being reconciled—the one said to be by Christ’s blood and the other by Christ’s death, there is a “much more” attitude of divine devotion than could have existed before; but still that which this passage presents as its primary message is the knowledge-surpassing love of God for those whose demerit, as He sees them, knows no bounds.

Romans 6:3–6, 10. “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. … For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.”

Various misleading interpretations of this portion of Scripture are given. Some have contended that the purpose of the passage is to establish the supposed importance of a mode of ritual baptism. Others see here a command looking to self-crucifixion, not discerning that the crucifixion referred to is that of Christ already accomplished in which the believer has had his portion. The context sets forth the crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ all as deeds wrought in behalf of the believer. This Scripture is not for the unsaved unto justification. (That great aspect of Christ’s death, as already indicated above, is presented in Romans 3:21–5:21.) It is, however, for the saved unto sanctification in their daily life. The death, burial, and resurrection of Christ for the unsaved are at the very center of the gospel and so it has been indicated in 1 Corinthians 15:1–4. But the believer, now looking backward upon all that Christ has accomplished, is able to see how it may be all applied to his own heart by faith. It is in this consciousness that he is able to walk upon a new principle of daily living, namely, by the power of the indwelling Spirit. Recognizing his cocrucifixion (which, incidentally, no symbol of ritual baptism ever attempts to represent), his codeath, his coburial, and his coresurrenction, the believer finds himself on resurrection ground, indwelt by the Holy Spirit, and, not only logically called upon because of his exalted position to live unto God, but fully equipped to do so. The sin nature, though still alive and

active, has been judged by Christ's death unto it (6:10), and, because of that judgment which has no experimental place in the history of the Christian, the Holy Spirit is righteously free to take control of that otherwise-active sin nature. The believer's part is to "reckon" and "let not" (6:11–12). To *reckon* is to count on what is true of one's complete indentification with Christ in His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection. To *let not* … is to depend on the indwelling Spirit for deliverance from the power of the sin nature. Such, indeed, is the walk upon a new principle of daily living. These provisions now obtain under grace, but were never provided under the Mosaic system; therefore the Apostle writes, "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Rom. 6:14).

Romans 7:4–6. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."

Here, as in Galatians 3:13, the one result of Christ's death—its efficacy in terminating for the believer the whole merit system—is in view. It is through the body of Christ as a sacrifice that all law, as a ground of acceptance or as a rule of life, has been abolished. Salvation is now by grace apart from works (cf. Titus 3:5); and the believer's acceptance before God, which acceptance is perfected to infinite proportions, is wholly due to his position in Christ (Eph. 1:6; Heb. 10:14) and not to aught within himself. The sweet savor aspect of Christ's death is again in the foreground, which provides by release to believers the merit of Christ in behalf of those who are without merit. The obligation to merit being ended, the saved one is thus brought into perfect liberty (cf. Gal. 5:1) and sustains no other responsibility than to walk worthy of that estate into which infinite grace has brought him. It is thus that, through the death of Christ, a complete deliverance from the merit system is accomplished.

Romans 8:3–4. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us; who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

This is one of three vitally important references to Christ's death within this one chapter. This, the first instance, is a reference to Christ's death unto the sin nature, as considered above under Romans 6. The law made its appeal to the very sin nature which is in the flesh, therefore the law failed because of the "weakness of the flesh" to which it appealed; but Christ by His death unto the sin nature condemned, or completely judged, that nature to the end that the Spirit might be free to control it. When thus sustained and empowered by the Spirit the law—here referring to the whole will of God for the believer—is fulfilled by the Spirit *in* the believer, but is never said to be fulfilled *by* the believer. The one condition imposed is that the believer walk in dependence upon the Spirit (cf. Rom 8:4; Gal. 5:16–17). This, likewise—as in the case of the death of Christ for the believer—is something to believe or reckon to be true. It is not secured by petition or prayer. The sin nature *is* judged, the Spirit now indwells; there remains only the human responsibility of reliance upon the Spirit.

Romans 8:32. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"

In the type (Gen. 22:1–14), Abraham the father is called upon to offer his "only son" (22:2) and is in the last moment spared that ordeal; but, in the antitype, God the Father "spared not" His Son, and by this it is again disclosed that the love of God toward sinners is expressed in the gift of His Son (John 3:16; Rom. 5:6–11; 2 Cor. 9:15; 1 John 3:16). With so great a Gift as the Son is and He already given, there is boundless assurance that, in connection with that Gift, the Father will give all else. Expectation respecting lesser things should be free from doubt and hesitation. The Apostle can say that nothing "shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:39).

Romans 8:34. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

The absolutely substitutionary character of Christ's death is the message of that portion of this verse which bears upon the subject. The dominant theme of the entire eighth chapter to be sure, is announced in the first verse: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." Verses 28 to 39 but verify that introductory statement. Justification, it is said (vs. 30), is the portion of all who are called; and, on the ground of

the truth that they have been justified, God will bring no charge against His elect whom He has thus declared righteous forever. He may correct or discipline those whom He has thus received, but no condemnation can rest upon them since they are justified on the merit of Another who never fails, He who is the righteousness of God and as such is "made unto them" (1 Cor. 1:30). "Who is he that condemneth?" is the direct question, and the answer is that to those who believe the condemning power of sin is broken, since it has been borne by Christ. Clarity in Soteriology is impossible apart from this basic truth, that sin has already been borne by the Substitute. Too often the impression is created by the preacher that God will do something if He is urged to do so and moved by penitent tears; but, since Christ has died, there is nothing left for the sinner to do but to believe and there is nothing left for the Christian who has sinned to do but to confess his sin.

2. First and Second Corinthians. *1 Corinthians 1:18, 22–24.* "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. … For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

The preaching of the cross is God's appointed way of reaching the lost with that very message of His infinite grace. The cross, however, sustains a somewhat different relation to the Jew than it does to the Gentile. Though regarding the cross the Jew has found a stumbling stone (cf. Rom. 9:30–33) and the Gentile, mere foolishness—his most serious effort to explain it, because of spiritual blindness, is so far short of the glory of the cross that it is comparatively foolish, it is nevertheless a perfect display of the wisdom of God and the power of God. In the outworking of the plan of redemption, God has wrought on an infinite plane and has disclosed the unsearchable depths of His wisdom and prudence (Eph. 1:8). In 1 Corinthians 1:23–24, the great transaction of the sacrifice of Christ is declared to be the manifestation of divine power and wisdom. As revealed in the Scriptures, the greatest problem that ever confronted the Almighty is not creation, which in Psalm 8:3 is likened to mere finger-play: it is rather the redemption of a lost soul, which, according to Isaiah 53:1, required the

making bare of His great right arm. His *wisdom* is seen in the solving of the problem how God can remain just while being, according to the compassion of His heart, the Justifier of the sinner. His *power* is set free to act in behalf of all who believe on Christ as their Savior; and, when thus set free, He will not stop short of the satisfaction of His measureless love: He will present the saved one in glory, conformed to the image of His Son. God is satisfied with the payment Christ has made; and it is in Him who alone is worthy that we have a perfect redemption, even the forgiveness of sins—not, indeed, a partial forgiveness, which would be no manifestation of infinite grace, but that which, being complete enough to last forever, remains an abiding glory to God. Thus the believer is accepted eternally into the family of the redeemed; yet in that family relationship he will, time and again, need to be forgiven—in the sense of being restored, and that not to the family again, but to the fellowship of the Father and the Son (1 John 1:9).

1 Corinthians 5:7. "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us."

No forsaking of that which is contrary to the holiness of God or the will of God is too great for the believer, in the light of Christ's sacrifice for him. Evil, which is as leaven, is to be "purged out" even as it was prohibited in the typical offerings of the Old Testament. The one phase of Christ's death —His voluntary yielding of Himself to be the Passover lamb—is presented in this context. Likewise, in 1 Corinthians 6:20 a direct reference is made to Christ's death as a ransom from the divine judgment which must otherwise fall upon those who have sinned.

1 Corinthians 8:11. "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?"

In addition to its renewed reference to Christ's death on behalf of others, this passage imposes the obligation to guard the weak upon those who through knowledge of the truth are strong. In this instance, it is assumed that the weak brother recognizes the superior knowledge of the strong and is misled with good motives. However the facts may be, the true value of a soul is seen here in the immeasurable truth that Christ died for it (cf. 2 Cor. 5:13–16).

1 Corinthians 15:3. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures."

A thoughtful reader of the Scriptures cannot but be impressed with the manifold assurances that Christ died on behalf of or in the stead of others. Repetition of this truth can hardly be avoided in the writing of these lines; in consequence, let it be said that this one text is direct and conclusive and is here related to the gospel as the very heart of it. The wisdom of this world has exhausted its limited field of speculation but still has failed to devise any explanation for the words "Christ died for our sins" which will answer the demands of the text, other than to aver that He died the death which rightfully belongs to the sinner. The great prediction of Isaiah 53:5–6 must be accepted as the understanding of all that Christ's death did accomplish for the lost. No new idea is introduced in the New Testament.

2 Corinthians 5:14–21. "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

In this great declaration, three features are introduced: (a) Christ's death on behalf of the world, (b) the witness thereunto, and (c) the infinite results of salvation upon those who believe the witness about the all-sufficient death. The outreach of Christ's death is described in the words: "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead"—that is to say, those for whom He died died in a legal sense in His death. Dean Alford states it thus: "This was true, *objectively*, but *not subjectively* till such death to sin and self is realized in each: see Rom. 6:8 ff. The rendering of the A.V., '*then were all dead*,' is inadmissible both from the construction of the original, and the context: '*One on behalf of all* died, therefore *all* died: if One died the death

of [belonging to, due from] *all, then all* died [in and with Him]' " (*Ibid., in loc.*). That which Christ undertook to do respecting the sinner has been accomplished to perfection. As may be seen in verses 18–19, He has wrought for them a complete reconciliation. Their position before God is vitally changed by being those for whom Christ died. God is satisfied with that which Christ has wrought, as a solution of the problem of sin and its required judgments. Whether the sinner will believe and receive this provision to the point of being himself suited with what satisfies God is quite another question. To the end that the unsaved may believe, the reconciling message is committed to ambassadors who are appointed to go forth beseeching the unsaved to be reconciled to God. It is not a mere sentimental appreciation of Christ's death which constrains or impels the gospel messenger. This appreciation, on the contrary, reaches to the point of recognition of the truth that all have received provisionally the benefits of Christ's death for them. This is what "we thus judge" teaches. Verse 15 is of a parenthetical character, and therefore the effect of observing that Christ died for all is not described until verse 16: "Wherefore, henceforth know we no man after the flesh." The soul-winner thus moved by the death of Christ for all men no longer sees them as rich and poor, bond and free, white or black; rather he sees each one as a soul for whom Christ has died. The greatest distinction which could come to any human being has come to every human being, which is that the King of Glory should die for man on the cross. One's appreciation of the value of Christ's death, if experienced at all, is specifically the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the witness. By the Spirit, or out from the indwelling Spirit, the love of God for the lost gushes forth (cf. Rom. 5:5), for the fruit of the Spirit is love (Gal. 5:22; cf. John 17:26). Love for lost souls is not a human competency; it is no part of a fallen human being—even for those who are saved it is impossible unaided. It is experienced only as it is inwrought by the Spirit of God. When this dynamic energizing is welcomed by anyone, the witness will be "instant in season [and] out of season" (2 Tim. 4:2). This passage emphasizes again the truth that there was in Christ's death a substitution which secured for the believer the very righteousness of God, and that that righteousness is rightfully gained on the ground of the believer's participation in the new Headship of the resurrected Christ. Thus the Apostle himself asserts it: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new

creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God" (vss. 17–18); and again, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (vs. 21).

2 Corinthians 8:9. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

In the preceding context, the Apostle has urged upon the Corinthian believers personal sacrifice for Christ. Now Christ is held before them as the supreme example of sacrifice. What His riches were and to what depth of poverty He descended cannot be comprehended by men; nor can the riches which He thus provides for all who are saved be estimated. As before indicated, John writes of the same truth and in connection with the same theme of generosity: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John 3:16–17).

3. GALATIANS. *Galatians 1:4.* "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father."

He who "gave himself for our sins" did so, not only with a view to bearing the guilt of sin, but that "he might deliver us out of this present evil age" (R.V. marg.)—which is none other than the day of the *cosmos* world system. Through the death of Christ, those who believe are delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of the Son of God's love (Col. 1:13). The importance of a Scripture which declares that the believer is delivered from the satanic system is evident; however, it is also taught that in addition the believer becomes a rightful sharer in the eternal kingdom of Christ. Elsewhere, the same believer is said to be a citizen of heaven (Phil. 3:20, R.V.).

Galatians 2:20; 6:14. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.…

But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."

It is the personal element in Christ's death linking each sinner with his Savior individually which the Apostle stresses in this testimony. In addition to the constantly reiterated truth that Christ died for others and not for Himself, Paul speaks of this normal, but so unusual, ability to react with great appreciation to the fact of Christ's sacrificial death. Such a heart response may well be sought for by all who would glorify their Lord. On the other hand, this reality in the Apostle's experience must come, by way of contrast, as a rebuke to the vast company of believers. How immeasurable is the obligation to give thanks and glory for and in the cross of Christ!

Galatians 3:13; 4:4–5. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. … But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

As in Romans 7:4–6, the fact is here presented that Christ's death is a deliverance from the whole merit obligation—whether it be the Mosaic order or the inherent obligation of the creature to the Creator. The Mosaic system was never addressed to Gentiles and therefore it was not addressed to the Galatians; but they, as all Gentile believers, were called upon to recognize the truth that Christ has provided a perfect acceptance for them before God, which satisfies every demand of infinite holiness and thus terminates the entire merit obligation. It is also true that the condemnation which a violated merit system imposes was borne by the Savior. His death was a redemption from the curse of the law. C. F. Hogg and W. E. Vine in their *Epistle to the Galatians* state:

> **from the curse of the law, having become a curse**—*i.e.*, by becoming; the words describe the means taken for the accomplishment of the redemption. The curse attaches to all under the law, inasmuch as all have failed to meet its requirements, with one exception, Christ, Who was "born under the law," but Who did not Himself incur the curse, because He was "the Righteous One," (Acts 3:14) not in the sight of men, indeed, for they crucified Him as a blasphemer, but in the sight of God Who raised Him from the dead. So being Himself free from the curse, He passed under it voluntarily, that those under it by inheritance and desert might escape. By the death of Christ the unbending rigour of the law is confirmed and illustrated. The law of God makes no exceptions, but demands always the full penalty from

all who come within its jurisdiction. In view of that awful exhibition of its terrors, how could the Galatians suppose that their efforts to keep it would result other than disastrously for themselves? The Son of God did not "become a curse for us" in His Incarnation. From before His birth He was called "holy"; He "advanced in … favour with God" (Luke 1:35; 2:52); and at the close of thirty years of life in the flesh God spoke of Him from heaven in the words, "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased," and later repeated the testimony (Matt. 3:17; 17:5). There is no statement made in Scripture that He became the sin-bearer in His baptism, or in Gethsemane, or at any juncture in His life previous to the Crucifixion. With the Cross alone, then, must these words of the Apostle be associated, and this the quotation of Deuteronomy 21:23 confirms. The language of 2 Corinthians 5:21, "made to be sin," should be compared with this, "became a curse." In each case the reality of the association of the Lord Jesus with the sins of His people, and the completeness of the satisfaction He offered to the law in His death upon the Cross, is vividly set forth.—Pp. 134–35

So also respecting the second passage, Galatians 4:4–5, the same commentators assert:

v. 5. **that He might redeem**—as at 3:13, above. Neither the Incarnation of the Son of God, nor His keeping of the law in the days of His flesh availed, in whole or in part, for the redemption of men. Apart from the Incarnation death would have been impossible for Him; hence this was the condition necessary for the accomplishment of the redemption, but was itself no part of that redemption. His redemptive work proper began and ended on the Cross; accordingly the statement of the Saviour's relation to sin is invariably made in terms that confine that relationship to His death. Hence it is nowhere said in N.T. that Christ kept the law for us. He is not said to have borne sin during any part of His life; it was at the Cross that He became the sin-bearer (1 Pet. 2:24). The first part of Isaiah 53:4 is interpreted in Matthew 8:17, where the context in which these words are quoted makes it plain that they are to be understood not of the death of the Lord Jesus, nor of any vicarious suffering endured by Him, but of His sympathy with suffering humanity and the expression of that sympathy in the alleviation of distress wherever He came in contact with it. Some parts of Isaiah 53 do undoubtedly describe the vicarious sufferings of the Cross, as the closing part of verse 5, *e.g.*, which is quoted in 1 Peter 2:24. These are typical illustrations of the principle that the N.T. is the only guide to the understanding of the O. T. In the first part of Mark 10:45, *e.g.*, the Lord declares the purpose of His life "not to be served but to serve," and of His death, "to give His life a ransom for many." His death was in harmony with His life, and was its fitting climax, but the two are here distinguished by the Lord Himself, and this distinction is observed by each of the N.T. writers.—*Ibid.*, pp. 186–187

Similarly, on redemption from the law Martin Luther in what is termed his greatest work—*Commentary on Galatians*—expresses his understanding of a redemption from the law as this is taught in Galatians. He writes:

Furthermore, this place also witnesseth that Christ, when the time of the law was accomplished, did abolish the same, and so brought liberty to those that were oppressed therewith, but made no new law after or besides that old law of Moses. Wherefore the monks

> and Popish schoolmen do no less err and blaspheme Christ, in that they imagine that he hath given a new law besides the law of Moses, than do the Turks, which vaunt of their Mahomet as of a new lawgiver after Christ, and better than Christ. Christ then came not to abolish the whole law, that he might make a new, but, as Paul here saith, he was sent of his Father into the world, to redeem those which were kept in thraldom under the law. These words paint out Christ lively and truly: they do not attribute unto him the office to make any new law, but to redeem them which were under the law. And Christ himself, saith, "I judge no man." And in another place: "I come not to judge the world, but that the world should be saved by me" (John 8:15; 12:47); that is to say, I came not to bring any law, nor to judge men according to the same, as Moses and other lawgivers; but I have a higher and better office. The law killed you, and I again do judge, condemn, and kill the law, and so I deliver you from the tyranny thereof. … Wherefore, it is very profitable for us to have always before our eyes this sweet and comfortable sentence, and such-like which set out Christ truly and lively, that in our whole life, in all dangers, in the confession of our faith before tyrants, and in the hour of death, we may boldly and with sure confidence say, O law, thou hast no power over me, and therefore thou dost accuse and condemn me in vain. For I believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, whom the Father sent into the world to redeem us miserable sinners oppressed with the tyranny of the law. He gave his life and shed his blood for me. Therefore, feeling thy terrors and threatenings, O law, I plunge my conscience in the wounds, blood, death, resurrection, and victory of my Saviour Christ. Besides him I will see nothing, I will hear nothing. This faith is our victory, whereby we overcome the terrors of the law, sin, death, and all evils, and yet not without great conflicts. And here do the children of God, which are daily exercised with grievous temptations, wrestle and sweat indeed. For oftentimes it cometh into their minds that Christ will accuse them, and plead against them; that he will require an account of their former life, and that he will condemn them. They cannot assure themselves that he is sent of his Father to redeem us from the tyranny and oppression of the law. And whereof cometh this? They have not yet fully put off the flesh, which rebelleth against the Spirit. Therefore the terrors of the law, the fear of death, and such-like sorrowful and heavy sights, do oftentimes return, which hinder our faith, that it cannot apprehend the benefit of Christ, who hath redeemed us from the bondage of the law, with such assurance as it should do.—Ed. of 1860, on 4:4–5

4. The Prison Epistles. This group of Paul's writings—Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians (with Philemon), known as the Prison Epistles—introduces the truth respecting the believer's exalted position in Christ, which exalted position is grounded upon and made possible through the death of Christ only.

Ephesians 1:7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."

At the very opening of the Ephesian Letter and as a ground of the realization of the eternal purpose of God for each of those chosen in Christ, it is said that redemption is accomplished, which is the basis upon which God can righteously forgive sin. In this text no mention is made of the estate of fallen man, which demands both redemption and forgiveness. That

need is assumed and is but a necessary step in the preparation of the more essential manifestation of superabounding grace. In Christ Jesus we *have* redemption. On the divine side, the great redeeming work is accomplished. It is now a completed transaction; therefore, not a thing which God *will* do for man upon some condition of human worthiness, but a thing which He *has* done for man already and when man was without merit, without strength, a sinner and an enemy of God. That there is an elect company in the divine view is no part of the gospel of divine grace which is addressed to a lost world; it is one of God's secrets intended only for those who are saved. On the other hand, the announcement of an accomplished blood-redemption as potentially provided for all is the evangel of infinite grace: "Whosoever will, may come." Redemption has always been by blood alone. Blood is the divinely determined ransom which an outraged holiness must demand. That very blood-ransom was prefigured in all Old Testament sacrifices, as it is now available through the death of Christ; hence, redemption has been offered to man as a benefit throughout the history of the race. Having contemplated the holy nature of God and His uncompromising, unyielding character and righteous government, it is not difficult to accept the solemn decree: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; likewise: "The wages of sin is death"; and, again: "Without shedding of blood is no remission." God never deals with sin in leniency or mere generosity. The awful penalty which sin inevitably incurs cannot be lessened in the slightest degree. God's holy demands, which are based on His holy character, are as unchangeable as His nature. Christ paid the required ransom. Divine justice is satisfied, and the way of salvation is now open for all. The responsibility imposed on the sinner is that of believing the record God has given concerning this redemption which is in His Son. This record points to the Redeemer as the only One who is able to save, and calls for nothing less or for nothing more than saving trust in Him. It is in Him that we have redemption. He is our redemption. By the shedding of His blood He made possible a perfect ransom; by His resurrection He proved the completeness of His undertaking, and resumed His life by the same authority by which He laid it down. Thus He ever lives as the all-sufficient Redeemer of those for whom He died. It is God who in infinite grace provided a ransom, and it is man who in infinite sin rejects that ransom. The price is paid and the grace of God is the portion of each one

who will receive it, and those who are saved can say with the Apostle: “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.”

Ephesians 2:13. “But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.”

Because of its dispensational import this passage demands special consideration. Having indicated the distinctions which had obtained between Jew and Gentile as set up at the first by God and ever honored by Him—which distinctions were accentuated by human prejudice and hatred—the writer announces a new divine purpose for the present age, a divine purpose specifically revealed to this same Apostle (cf. Eph. 3:1–6). The purpose is realized on the grounds of the death and resurrection of Christ and the advent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. That divine purpose is no less than the forming of a new body of heavenly people drawn from both Jews and Gentiles, each individual in that body perfected in Christ, and the whole company to be to “the praise of the glory of his grace.” Therefore, because it is to the glory of His grace, each individual in this company, whether Jew or Gentile, is called and saved upon that same distinct principle of selection—the sovereign grace of God, apart from all human merit. As a basis for this exercise of sovereign grace apart from human merit, the most startling divine decree was announced, startling, indeed, because never before heard of in the world, and because it is so contrary to the hitherto divinely sanctioned exaltation of Israel over the Gentiles. That decree declares that now there is “no difference” between Jew and Gentile: they are all *under sin* (Rom. 3:9). So, again, there is “no difference” between Jew and Gentile, “for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him” (Rom. 10:12). According to the first declaration, the former distinction between Jews and Gentiles disappears by virtue of the fact that both classes are now, regardless of former relationships to Jehovah, “under sin” (cf. Eph. 2:11–22). According to the second declaration, the way into this highest heavenly glory is open to all who will believe. The estate “under sin” consists in the fact that God now refuses to accept any human merit, national or personal, as a credit or contribution toward that salvation which is offered the individual in and through Christ. God thus strips each human being of all hope in himself and shuts him up to that perfect salvation alone, which is in Christ and which provides the eternal and

infinite perfection of Christ. It might seem unkind to take away what little merit one might be supposed to have before God, but in the end it is not unkind. It is rather, “that he might have mercy upon all” (Rom. 11:32). The grace of God is not a thing which adjusts itself to the greater or less degree of human merit, but it is a *standard* whole; that is, since all merit is excluded, it requires the same degree of grace to save one individual as it does to save another. And the result is not to the glory of man in the slightest degree: rather, it is all to the praise of the glory of His grace (Eph. 1:6; 2:7–9). There was little for the Gentile to unlearn in connection with this new age-purpose and plan of salvation. He had no ground for hope before, and the gospel of salvation by grace became to him as life from the dead. But the Jew stumbled over the way of salvation made available through the cross, so only a few, now that their national preference is set aside for this age (Rom. 11:1–36), have been able to abandon their assumed national standing with God and to accept the exceeding grace of God in Christ. This somewhat lengthy restatement of the present ground of salvation by grace for Jew and Gentile alike may clarify the verses which follow in this Ephesians context. By the words “but now” at the beginning of verse 13, a sharp contrast is drawn between the former estate of these Ephesian Gentiles as that was described in verse 12 and their new position in Christ. Here they are told that they, as Gentiles, who were at a previous time “far off” from God, were right then, because of their new position in Christ, “made nigh,” and not by external ordinances or human virtue, but by the blood of Christ. To be *nigh to God* is one of the exalted positions into which each believer is brought at the moment he is saved. The perfection of this position is seen from the fact that one could not be nearer to God in time or eternity than he is already when in Christ. So perfect is the efficacy of the blood of Christ in providing a righteous ground for divine grace, that every desire on the part of God, though prompted by infinite love, can now be satisfied completely in behalf of those who believe on Christ. Verse 13 is closely related to verse 17 (cf. Isa. 59:17). In the former verse of the Apostle’s only Gentiles are in view, but in the latter both Jews and Gentiles are seen. The Gentiles are identified as those who, because of no former covenant relation to God, were “far off,” while the Jews, because of their covenants, were “nigh,” though not nigh to the same degree in which the

saved Jew and the saved Gentile are now because of being in Christ and redeemed through His precious blood.

Ephesians 5:1–2. "Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour."

In expounding this passage Dr. Charles Hodge states:

> As God has placed us under so great obligation, "be ye, therefore, imitators of God." The exhortation is enlarged. We are not only to imitate God in being forgiving, but also as becomes *dear children, by walking in love.* As God is love, and as we by regeneration and adoption are his children, we are bound to exercise love habitually. Our whole walk should be characterized by it. *As Christ also hath loved us.* This is the reason why we should love one another. We should be like Christ, which is being like God, for Christ is God. The apostle makes no distinction between our being the objects of God's love and our being the objects of the love of Christ. We are to be imitators of God in love, for Christ hath loved us. *And given himself for us.* Here as elsewhere the great evidence of divine love is the death of Christ. See verse 25; chapter 3:19; John 15:13. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Gal. 2:20, "Who loved me and gave himself for me." 1 John 3:16, "Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." Christ's death was *for us* as a sacrifice, and therefore, from the nature of the transaction, in our place. Whether the idea of substitution be expressed by ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν depends on the context rather than on the force of the preposition. To die for any one, may mean either for his benefit or in his stead, as the connection demands. Christ gave himself, *as an offering and a sacrifice*, προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν; the latter term explains the former. Any thing presented to God was a προσφορά, but θυσία was something slain. The addition of that term, therefore, determines the nature of the offering. This is elsewhere determined by the nature of the thing offered, as in Hebrews 10:10, "the offering of the body of Christ"; or, "himself," Heb. 9:14, 25; by the effects ascribed to it, viz. expiation of guilt and the propitiation of God, which are the appropriate effects of a sin-offering; see Heb. 2:17; 10:10, 14; Rom. 3:25; 5:9, 10; by explanatory expressions, "the one offering of Christ" is declared to be μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίαν, Heb. 10:12; "a sacrifice for sin," and προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, Heb. 10:18; ἀντίλυτρον, and λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, as in 1 Tim. 2:6, Matt. 20:28; it is called a propitiation, Rom. 3:25, as well as a ransom. Christ himself, therefore, is called the Lamb of God who bore our sins; his blood is the object of faith or ground of confidence, by which, as the blood of a sacrifice, we are redeemed, 1 Pet. 1:18, 19. He saves us as a priest does, i.e. by a sacrifice. Every victim ever slain on Pagan altars was a declaration of the necessity for such a sacrifice; all the blood shed on Jewish altars was a prophecy and promise of propitiation by the blood of Christ; and the whole New Testament is the record of the Son of God offering himself up as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. This, according to the faith of the church universal, is the sum of the Gospel—the incarnation and death of the eternal Son of God as a propitiation for sin. There can, therefore, be no doubt as to the sense in which the apostle here declares Christ to be an offering and a sacrifice.—*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 277–79

Ephesians 5:25–27. “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.”

The Letter to the Ephesians unfolds the high place to which the Church, the Body of Christ, has been brought and the corresponding responsibility in daily life which rests upon each member of that Body. At this point in the theme, the Apostle reverts to the order of truth which characterized the opening portion of this Epistle. The Church alone is in view as the one for whom Christ gave Himself to die upon the cross. It is true also that His death is a work provisionally even for those who do not claim its gracious blessing, and that His death is the ground on which God will yet do for Israel what He is now doing for the Church (for God will bring that nation into a place of right relation to Himself and purify her dross—Ezek. 16:2–63; 36:25–29; Isa. 1:25); but the fact of His death for the Church is here, properly enough, given the place of supreme importance. Certainly Jehovah’s love for Israel could not be doubted (Jer. 31:3); but the fact that these two great divine purposes—that of Israel’s earthly blessing and that of the out-calling of the Church—have so much in common is no argument that these purposes unite in one divine plan in the past, right now, or ever in the future. It is to be expected that Israel’s portion would be proclaimed in those Old Testament Scriptures which are addressed to her, and that the portion for the Church would be found in the Epistles of the New Testament. Thus a peculiar application of the death of Christ is introduced by Ephesians 5—it becomes the pattern of devotion which the believing husband should maintain toward his wife. It should be noted that this is a new ideal belonging not to the paganism of Paul’s day, but to the Christian home. The high and holy love of Christ for the Church, His Bride, is not degraded by this comparison; rather, the demands upon the husband are exalted to the measure of celestial responsibilities. The message of this passage, which is germane here, is that which is so constantly asserted in the New Testament: it was divine compassion which took Christ to the cross.

Philippians 2:8. “And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”

Christ was *obedient* unto death; He was obedient up to the point of death and He was obedient in death. Redemption originated in the Godhead in eternity past, but was consummated by the obedient death of the theanthropic Son. His obedience is always within the sphere of His humanity. His death is the climax of passing from heaven's glory to a felon's execution (cf. Heb. 10:4–7).

Philippians 3:10. "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death."

The personal attitude of the Apostle toward Christ's death is again a theme of his testimony. The whole doctrine of cosuffering with Christ and conformity to His death is doubtless far beyond the power of comprehension, especially in the case of those little disciplined in the ways of God. With Christ's sufferings and death the Apostle sought a likeness in himself. In the substitutionary aspect of His death no mortal may ever share; it is finished forever. But there is a sense in which the sufferings of Christ and His death call for a similar reality in the believer. The same Apostle writes of filling up that which is left behind of the afflictions of Christ (Col. 1:24). This, it would seem, is to signify not mere persecution for Christ's sake (cf. Phil. 1:29), but a like burden for lost men and a willingness, if it were required, to die for them (cf. Rom. 9:1–3; 1 Cor. 15:31; 2 Cor. 4:10).

Colossians 1:14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

This is practically a word-for-word restatement of Ephesians 1:7, which has already been considered.

Colossians 1:20–23. "And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight: if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister."

The widest scope for the value of Christ's death to be presented anywhere in the Sacred Text is set forth in this great declaration. It is seen as a reconciliation of all things in heaven and upon earth. On this vast theme Dean Alford has written an analysis which is worthy of reproduction, though agreement is not accorded it in every particular:

> It has been a question, in what sense this reconciliation is predicated of the whole universe. Short of this meaning we cannot stop: we cannot hold with Erasmus and others, that it is a reconciliation of the *various portions of creation to one another:* nor, for the same reason, with Schleiermacher, understand that the elements to be reconciled are the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who were at variance about earthly and heavenly things, and were to be set at one in reference to God. The Apostle's meaning clearly is, that by the blood of Christ's Cross, reconciliation with God has passed on *all creation as a whole*, including angelic as well as human beings, unreasoning and lifeless things, as well as organized and intelligent. Now this may be understood in the following ways: 1) creation may be strictly regarded in its entirety, and man's offence viewed as having, by inducing impurity upon one portion of it, alienated the whole from God: and thus "*all things*" may be involved in our fall. Some support may seem to be derived for this by the undeniable fact, that *the whole of man's world* is included in these consequences (see Rom. 8:19 f.). But on the other side, we never find the *angelic beings* thus involved: nay, we are taught to regard them as our model in hallowing God's name, realizing His kingdom, and doing His will (Matt. 6:9, 10). And again the terms here used, "*whether … whether …*" would not suffer this: reconciliation is thus predicated of each portion *separately.* We are thus driven, there being no question about *the things on the earth*, to enquire, how *the things in the heavens* can be said to be reconciled by the blood of the Cross. And here again, 2) we may say that angelic, celestial creation was alienated from God because a portion of it fell from its purity: and, though there is no idea of the reconciliation extending *to that portion*, yet the whole, as a whole, may need thus reconciling, by the final driving into punishment of the fallen, and thus setting the faithful in perfect and undoubted unity with God. But to this I answer, *a*) that such reconciliation (?) though it might be a result of the coming of the Lord Jesus, yet could not in any way be effected by the *blood of His cross: b*) that we have no reason to think that the fall of some angels involved the rest in its consequences, or that angelic being is evolved from any root, as ours is from Adam: nay, in both these particulars, the very contrary is revealed. We must then seek our solution in some meaning which will apply to angelic beings in their essential nature, not as regards the sin of some among them. And as thus applied, no reconciliation must be thought of which shall resemble *ours* in its process—for Christ took not upon Him the seed of angels, nor paid any propitiatory penalty in the root of their nature, as including it in Himself. But, forasmuch as He is their Head as well as ours,—forasmuch as in Him they, as well as ourselves, live and move and have their being, it cannot be but that the great event in which He was glorified through suffering, should also bring them nearer to God, who subsist in Him in common with all creation. And at some such increase of blessedness does our Apostle seem to hint in Ephesians 3:10. That such increase might be described as a *reconciliation*, is manifest. In fact, every such nearer approach to Him may without violence to words be so described, in comparison with that previous greater distance which now seems like alienation;—and in this case even more properly, as one of the consequences of that great propitiation whose first and plainest effect was to reconcile to God, in the literal sense, the things upon earth, polluted and

> hostile in consequence of man's sin. So that our interpretation may be thus summed up: All creation subsists in Christ: all creation therefore is affected by His act of propitiation: sinful creation is, in the strictest sense, *reconciled*, from being at enmity: sinless creation, ever at a distance from his unapproachable purity, is lifted into nearer participation and higher glorification of Him, and is thus *reconciled*, though not in the strictest, yet in a very intelligible and allowable sense.—*Op. cit., in loc.*

The difficulty which this interpretation sets up is to be seen in the fact that there is no revealed reconciliation for fallen angels. These, therefore, cannot be included as having been brought nearer to God. Two distinct points must be kept in mind: (a) The Scriptures declare the ultimate fate of the fallen angels and of unregenerate men. This body of truth respecting the determined destiny of fallen beings must be given its full weight, since it precludes anything which might suggest an ultimate restoration. (b) The word *reconciliation* is too often invested with a meaning which does not belong to it. Its root meaning is that a change has been wrought from the position formerly occupied. A world which is reconciled to God (2 Cor. 5:19) does not mean that all in the world are saved, but rather that their estate before God is changed to the extent that the necessity of condemnation is removed by reason of Christ's death for them. The way is open for their salvation when it was not thus open before (cf. Isa. 14:17; 61:1; Eph. 2:11–12). It is possible that the full effect of Christ's death upon angels has not been revealed and that were it disclosed this matter would be clarified. In this connection it will be admitted by all that little is known of the full meaning of Colossians 2:15, or any other Scripture which deals with the matter of Christ's relationship to the angels (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–28). It is possible that all angels have been greatly influenced in their relation to God by Christ's death and yet without any feature which involved the restoration of those who have sinned. The death of Christ does not necessitate the salvation of every fallen man. It would seem that Colossians 2:15, rather than suggesting a thorough change in the fallen angelic hosts which would serve to give them hope, intimates a change into a sphere wherein all hope is removed forever.

5. The Thessalonian Epistles. Though the Second Thessalonian Epistle does not mention Christ's death, there are two references to it in the First Letter.

1 Thessalonians 1:10; 5:9–10. "And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come. … For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ. Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."

God gave His Son in a sacrificial death (John 3:16) that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish. By reason of Christ's death those who believe are delivered from the wrath to come; the unsaved are not so delivered, but must face that wrath and perish (in the conscious sense that this term as used in the New Testament implies). There is eternal security for those who are delivered. That deliverance is effective in the rapture whether they "wake or sleep."

6. The Pastoral Epistles. This group of Epistles—1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus—presents several references to the death of Christ. Two are implications—2 Timothy 1:10; 2:8—and two are direct doctrinal declarations.

1 Timothy 2:5–6. "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

One God and one Mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus, Himself being man, who gave Himself a ransom for all, which ransom is to be testified to in the appointed age: thus the doctrine of a mediator is clearly stated. He being God is, nevertheless, so identified with man through His humanity that He can mediate beween God and man. To that end He gave Himself a ransom. This statement emphasizes the truth, as done already in John 10:18, that Christ laid down His own life voluntarily, and, as done in Hebrews 9:14, that He offered Himself to God; and this witness respecting Christ's death is to be given in an age appointed thereto. It could not be given before. This time, then, is the appointed age of gospel preaching and that for the realization of the heavenly purpose (cf. Heb. 2:10) of God.

Titus 2:14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Here the same aspect of truth—being redeemed by blood from all iniquity—is set forth. This contemplates the past as something put away and anticipates a people who, because they are redeemed, would be zealous of

good works. The passage has a peculiar value in that it relates the good works which become the child of God to the ground of his salvation. As in Ephesians 2:10, so here salvation imposes an obligation to fulfill the will of God on the one He thus saves.

VI. In Peter's Writings

The Apostle Peter refers to Christ's death once in each of his recorded sermons—Acts 2:23; 3:14; 10:39—but makes no mention of it in his Second Epistle. In each of these sermons to be recorded, the reference is an accusation of the Jews because of their crucifying Christ. In his First Epistle seven references are made to Christ's death, of which four may be classed as less important—1:2; 2:21; 4:1, 13—and three of major import. Attention may well be given to the major passages.

1 Peter 1:18–19. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

As in no other Scripture, the price of redemption is here revealed. The Old Testament type had prepared the way in making it a necessity that the redeeming blood be *shed* and that the lamb be without spot. John the Baptist had identified Christ as the Lamb of God (John 1:29) and now Peter concludes the testimony, which is to the effect that the blood of redemption has been shed and has wrought its immeasurable results in those who have believed. "Without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). This truth is perhaps more central than any other in the gospel which is to be preached. Men afflicted with unwillingness to be amenable to the Scriptures have squrned the doctrine of redemption by shed blood on the ground that it is offensive to all of out esthetic nature; but what of the offense of their sin as seen by a holy God? The offense to Him is very real and can be cured only by the blood of His own Son. The whole Bible teaches this clearly, and to depart from it is to abandon the Sacred Text in all its parts. The new song in heaven—"Thou art worthy … for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood" (Rev. 5:9)—would hardly be sung by those whose esthetic natures have blinded them to their need of remission.

1 Peter 2:24. “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.”

Here once more the exact meaning of the transaction on the cross is restated. Christ “bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” This is God’s disposition of human sin. It is wrought through the greatest sacrifice God could ever make, and thrice blessed is he who receives and believes this precious truth, and thrice condemned is he who in unbelief neglects or rejects this good news.

1 Peter 3:18. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.”

Peter’s final word of soteriological witness is that Christ “suffered for sins, the just for the unjust” and with a view to bringing the unjust to God. There are many theological problems engendered by this declaration, but not one of these jeopardizes the simple truth that, because of the suffering of the just, the unjust may be brought to God (cf. Ex. 19:4; Deut. 1:31). There is nothing to be desired beyond that estate wherein man has reached the heart of God; and God’s provision through the sacrifice of His Son alone secures this wonderful result. “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.”

VII. In the Letter to the Hebrews

The general message and purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews must be understood if the arguments set forth there are to be given their proper weight. Of the message and purpose, Dr. C. I. Scofield in his introductory words to the book as published in his *Reference Bible* says, “The doctrinal passages reveal the purpose of the book. It was written with a twofold intent: (1) To confirm Jewish Christians by showing that Judaism had come to an end through the fulfilment by Christ of the whole purpose of the law; and (2) the hortatory passages show that the writer had in view the danger ever present to Jewish professed believers of either lapsing back into Judaism, or of pausing short of true faith in Jesus Christ. It is clear from the Acts that even the strongest of the believers in Palestine were held to a strange mingling of Judaism and Christianity (e.g. Acts 21:18–24), and that

snare would be especially apt to entangle professed Christians amongst the Jews of the dispersion" (p. 1291). However, as Dr. Scofield would himself contend, the whole argument of this Epistle hangs on the death and resurrection of Christ as the answer to every claim of Judaism as well as to every need of the human heart. The passages bearing on Christ's death are numerous and some too extended for quotation. They are: 2:9–18; 5:7–8; 7:27; 9:12, 14–15, 26, 28; 10:4–7, 10, 12, 19; 12:2; 13:12. Not all of these may be taken up separately here.

Hebrews 2:9–18. This extended portion introduces several features out of the whole doctrine of Christ's suffering and death. First in order is the truth that Christ came into the world to the end that He might suffer, and that He might bring thereby many sons into glory. He did not stop with descent into angelic spheres through which He passed nor did He take on Him the nature of angels. He was made a little lower than the angels that He might die a ransom death, not for angels but for men. The Spirit of God also asserts that Christ "tasted death for every man." The terminology *every man* is not subject to those distortions which some have imposed upon *world*, when they assert that, as found in John 3:16 and in 1 John 2:2, this expression means the world of the elect or the Body of Christ. The words *every man* will not yield to a cramping torture just to save a theory. To the end that He who created all things and for whom they exist (cf. Col. 1:16–18; Rev. 4:11) might populate heaven with those who are alone capable of singing the redemption song (cf. Rev. 5:9–10), He Himself as the Captain of their salvation needed to be a Savior perfected through the things which He suffered. It is not a matter of any moral change in Him; but as redemption could come only by the sacrifice of Himself it was required of Him that He should suffer and thus become a qualified Redeemer. Redemption's price is the blood of the Lamb of God. The work of Redeemer is not complete until His blood is shed. Thus the incarnation and humiliation brought Him into a Redeemer's relationship to those whom He would save, and of this estate He is not ashamed (cf. Heb. 2:11–12; Ps. 22:22). To redeem He must become "like unto his brethren." Three great doctrines are mentioned in rapid succession here—partaking of flesh and blood to become a saving Mediator, partaking of the seed of Abraham to fulfill His part in the Abrahamic Covenant, and partaking of death (one of many reasons for this step) that He might destroy Satan and His hosts. Of a similar tenor is

Hebrews 5:7–9, which reads, “Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” Christ’s own sorrow and anguish of soul as seen in the words “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” arises from His humanity. He appealed unto One who was able to save Him from death, but who did not spare Him—“Remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.” Such was His obedience. He learned obedience experimentally by being obedient unto death. As very God Himself He had no obligation to obedience. As very man, that He might be the perfect man, He was of course perfect in obedience. When about to come into the world it is said of Him, “For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God” (Heb. 10:4–7). Thus He acquired those qualities which belong to a theanthropic Mediator. He has become the source of salvation unto all who obey Him (Heb. 5:9) by responding to His call, “Come unto me” (Matt. 11:28).

Hebrews 7:27; 10:10, 12; 12:2. “Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people’s: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.… By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. … But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. … Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.”

In all His sacrifice there is first the voluntary feature—“He … offered himself without spot to God”—and, second, the fact that His offering is infinitely effective. The Aaronic type was perfectly fulfilled by His offering of Himself. As the sacrifices of old were efficacious to the degree assigned to them, so the Antitype was efficacious, even perfecting forever those who

are set apart unto Him. There was an actuating motive for His sacrifice. The compassion of God moved Him, and, though His suffering was real to the point of anguish and death, there was also a "joy … set before him." His was the most desolate and crushed of human lives and at the same time the embodiment of celestial joy. Thus, too, the believer may live, as illustrated in the experience of the great Apostle who could say: "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow" (Rom. 9:1–3) and "Rejoice … alway" (Phil. 4:4). Such a paradoxical sort of emotional life is not natural to humanity; it belongs to Deity and can be experienced only through having the characteristics imparted by the Holy Spirit.

Hebrews 10:1–39. The closing portion of this theme—but for Hebrews 13:11–12 wherein Christ is seen to fulfill an important type respecting the location of His cross outside the city walls—carries the attentive student into many features of Christ's death: (a) the contrast between Old Testament sacrifices and that of Christ, (b) Christ a willing sacrifice, (c) the far-reaching benefit of His own death (vss. 10–18), and (d) the practical application, especially to Jewish believers, namely, the obligation in daily life which grows out of that benefit. This fourfold division of this extended portion may be contemplated now, point by point. (a) The contrast between the many offerings and the One divine is greatly heightened by the truth that the many served only as a shadow of the one infinitely efficacious sacrifice, and by the truth that in the many sacrifices God had received no final satisfaction though He did have pleasure in the sacrifice of His Son. It was both in the effectiveness of the offering and in the obedience of the Son that the Father took delight. Why should not the Father take delight in that which opened the way for His immeasurable love to express itself in the saving of lost men? From Adam to Moses there had been no complete realization of the Father's perfect will in any human life. In developing the argument respecting the failure of the many sacrifices—evidently meaning those of the Day of Atonement—the writer asserts that, had any one of those offerings been effectual in the complete sense, there would have been no more need of a repetition, since the worshipers once really purged would have had no more a conscience over sin. Note should be made here of the distinction that exists between the unceasing condemnation for sin which rests upon the unsaved and a grieving of the Spirit by sin which may arise on the part of those saved. In either case there is a consciousness of sin

having been committed; but to the unsaved that consciousness is an unceasing sense of condemnation (Isa. 57:21), while of the saved it is said: "There is therefore now no condemnation" (Rom. 8:1). The experience of the saved when they sin is that of being out of fellowship with God (cf. Ps. 32:3–4). Arminianism thrives on the failure to recognize this distinction. These words of Christ spoken when He was about to come into the world are freighted with deepest significance. He looked on to His incarnation, saying, "… but a body hast thou prepared me" (vs. 5). This body capable of a blood-shedding sacrifice is held in contrast over against the blood of all the bulls and goats ever slain. "To do thy will" (vs. 7) has reference to the disposition of that body in death. (b) The voluntary character of His death is a crucial feature of this entire doctrine of sacrifice. Those who claim that it would be immoral for the Father to offer His Son have failed to recognize the sublime and determining truth that the Son was infinitely willing. It is even said repeatedly that He gave Himself. All this was predicted in Psalm 40:6–8. (c) The sacrifice of Christ is the basis of a complete perfecting of each believer forever. Much has already been said on this point—even the righteousness of God is imputed to them on the ground of Christ's death and this establishes their justification forever. (d) It could not be otherwise for the believer than to have an obligation to holiness. Any exalted position creates its corresponding responsibility and so here, as elsewhere in the Epistles, the position is first defined and the appeal to live accordingly is based upon it.

In conclusion, seven salient facts respecting Christ's suffering and death may be observed.

(a) While Christ's death is of inestimable value to men, it is of far greater value to God. None but God Himself could realize what it means to Him to have the way clear whereby He may, without tarnishing His own holiness, save and justify those who do no more than to believe in Jesus (Rom. 3:24–26).

(b) The death of Christ represents a sacrifice of infinite proportions. Nothing within the range of finite things can be drawn upon to illustrate such an immolation. No human mind may hope to trace it in its full extent or to grasp its full significance.

(c) The death of Christ was necessary as the only solution of the problem of evil even within the range of divine possibilities; and there is, therefore,

no substitute for it, no optional choice, nor any salvation apart from it.

(d) Being God's own devised solution of His greatest problem— the sin question—it is, like all His works, efficacious to the point of infinity. Nothing of man's values need be added to it; nor can it be increased in value by any human effort when once it is applied to an individual.

(e) The death of Christ provides a perfect basis for a perfect salvation apart from all judgments upon the sinner. When the sinner comes to God on the ground of that death, God strikes no blow, offers no censure, and requires no compensation.

(f) By Christ's death there is a perfect redemption sinward, a perfect reconciliation manward, and a perfect propitiation Godward.

(g) Because of the extent of the value of Christ's death and the completeness of that value in all its parts, no other obligation rests upon men who would be saved than that they enter into it by receiving Christ, with all that He is and all that He has done, as their sufficient Savior.

Chapter X

The Resurrection of Christ Incarnate

The Death of Christ and the resurrection of Christ are component parts of one stupendous divine undertaking. Had He not died, there would be no basis upon which those mighty realities which His resurrection provides might rest; and had He not been raised from the dead, there would be no fruition in His death—no Savior, no living embodiment of that which was purposed by His death. Both events are thus seen to be essential in the absolute sense, and that which is essential to such a degree is not with respect to its import properly to be compared with any other thing. It is evident, then, that all attempts to estimate the relative values of these two events only tend to useless speculation. As traced by the so-called Covenant theologians, the death of Christ is given a place of large significance but His resurrection is accounted as little more than something for His own personal convenience, His necessary return from the sphere of death back to the place which He occupied before. In other words, as viewed by Covenant theologians, there is practically no doctrinal significance to Christ's resurrection. That Christ by resurrection became what in Himself He had not been before—the federal Head of a wholly new order of beings and these the primary divine objective as this is set forth in the New Testament—cannot be incorporated into a system of which the cherished and distinctive feature is one unchangeable divine purpose from Adam to the end of time. This simple analysis accounts for the otherwise inexplicable fact that systems of theology which follow the one-covenant idea will be searched almost in vain for any explanation of Christ's resurrection. It is not implied that Covenant theologians do not believe that Christ arose from the dead; it is merely indicated that the resurrection of Christ has for them—and of necessity—no vital doctrinal import. These honored men do recognize that God wrought mightily before Christ's death and of course on the basis of that death as an expectation, and that God works mightily now on the basis of the actuality of Christ's death, but then it is averred by these men that God did the same things for His people on the basis of an expectation as He now does on the basis of reality. Thus the death of Christ, if it were a reasonable expectation, was required at some time. The supposition that God did do in past ages what He is doing now, however, will not stand the

test of Scripture. Such views are fanciful and idealistic. This assertion will be demonstrated as this thesis advances. There are certain disuniting events which serve to separate the past Mosaic age from the present age. Conditions and relations between God and man could not be the same after these events have transpired as they were before. The notion of an immutable covenant is rendered void by any one of these determining events, which events may be noted thus. (a) The death of Christ itself. As stated above, Covenant Theology, while magnifying the death of Christ, assumes that His death was just as effective in prospect as it is in retrospect. That He did not do the same work then as now is patent and so indicates a difference, for it is right and reasonable to suppose that God fills to the full the entire field of achievement which at a given time is open to Him. In the old order, sin was covered when animal blood was shed, which sacrifice typified the blood of Christ. The sin was not said to have been "taken away." Accordingly, Hebrews 10:4 asserts, "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (cf. John 1:29; Rom. 3:25). However, at the present time upon believing in Christ sin is taken away (cf. Rom. 8:1; Col. 2:13). The Old Testament saint was forgiven, but only as God was able to deal with sin on the ground of the future death of Christ. Sins forgiven, or covered, is not tantamount to sins being taken away. It is really impossible that animal blood should "take away" sin. When about to come into the world the Savior said, therefore, "… but a body hast thou prepared me" (Heb. 10:5–7), and to this it is added that "by one offering [of Himself] he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" —that is, separated unto God by their salvation received through Christ (Heb. 10:14). "For the law made nothing perfect." Over against this and by the death of Christ, there is the bringing in of a better hope (Heb. 7:19). (b) Christ's resurrection serves also as a demarcation between the old order and the new. If as has been said Covenant Theology ignores the doctrinal aspects of the resurrection of Christ, it is due to the fact that according to that idealism the Church is not a new creation with its headship in the resurrected Christ, but has existed under a supposed uniform covenant from the beginning of human history. Thus for that system the great reality of a heavenly purpose peculiar to this age is ruled out completely. Of this, more anon. (c) The doctrinal aspects of Christ's ascension and present ministry in heaven mean but little to those who are

committed to the theory of an unchanging covenant. According to this assumption, the Church obtained without a headship in heaven, even before Christ came; therefore, the inauguration of that headship as something sprung out of His resurrection could not be of any great moment. The Covenant theory cannot be broadened to allow for Christ's new, priesthood ministry in heaven, nor for His immeasurable ministry as Advocate, and for the same reason. Therefore, all this immeasurable truth is not included in their system by Covenant theologians. (d) The advent of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost constitutes a transformation as vital and far-reaching as any could be. Not only did He take up His residence in the world as definitely as did the Second Person when born of a virgin, but He undertook to form the tabernacle or temple in which He dwells— the whole body of believers, each one of whom is saved to infinite perfection in Christ—and become the indwelling source of life and power in each of those who are saved. By joining each believer to Christ, the Spirit is forming a wholly new thing unforeseen in ages past—a new humanity, a new creation, the realization of a wholly new divine purpose. The advent of the Spirit into the world and His residence in the world cannot be made to conform doctrinally to an unchangeable-covenant theory. Wherever this theory is stressed, there must go along with it a neglect of the most vital truths respecting the present age-characterizing ministries of the Spirit. The same reason may be assigned for this neglect, namely, that if the Church existed and progressed in Old Testament times apart from these ministries of the Spirit they cannot be of vital import in the present dispensation. (e) The disannulling of all Jewish purposes and distinctive features for an age renders a continuous-covenant conception objectionable. The Old Testament history leads on to its consummation in a glorious earthly kingdom in which the elect nation, Israel, will realize her covenants as promises fulfilled. It is, therefore, disruptive to a one-covenant theory to the last degree that a situation should be set up as it has been in this age in which it is said respecting Jew and Gentile that "there is no difference" (Rom. 3:9; 10:12). (f) The opening of the door of privilege to Gentiles as is done in this age introduces a feature wholly foreign to the revealed divine purpose as that was set forth in the Old Testament and renders an immutable, single- covenant idea untenable. (g) The introduction of an age as an intercalation into the midst of the predicted ongoing Jewish and Gentile programs and the new heavenly

purpose which characterizes this age cannot be made to conform to a supposed single covenant. Thus it is seen how, to maintain the basic idea of a covenant theology, much that is vital in the whole divine purpose must be renounced and excluded in the interest of that which at best is only a theory; and among the neglected truths is the resurrection of Christ. However, in spite of an almost universal influence of the Covenant theory upon theological thought, the resurrection of Christ is, when seen in its true Biblical setting, properly recognized as the very ground of all the purpose of this age and the basis upon which the new positions and possessions of those in Christ are made to rest. There is a wide doctrinal difference between those who see no special consequence in Christ's resurrection and those who see its momentous significance. Those who observe this significance are not in error, nor do they need to be rebuked as those who have not followed a man-made theological standard. There is little probability that the theologian who by his training has been run into the restricted mold of a Covenant theory would venture far afield in independent Bible research, nor be sympathetic toward those who through years of untrammeled study of the Sacred Text have come to discover more of its meaning.

The Bible doctrine of resurrection is developed in two widely different divisions, namely, the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of humanity. Being foreign to this discussion the resurrection of humanity, though treated elsewhere in this work, is not included here. In approaching that which is properly germane to this thesis—the resurrection of Christ—the subject will be presented after the following order: (a) the Old Testament doctrine of Christ's resurrection and (b) the New Testament doctrine of Christ's resurrection.

I. The Old Testament Doctrine

As recorded in Luke 24:44, following at once upon His appearance in resurrection and as an explanation of it, Christ said: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." Here, then, is intimation not only that Christ is the theme of all parts of the Old Testament, but that these Scriptures

anticipate to some extent the resurrection of Christ, whether such references are usually recognized or not. Job makes reference to the resurrection of the body. Such recognition of the resurrection of Christ as is to be discerned in the Pentateuch will be found in the types. If Christ had the matter of type in mind when He spoke of His resurrection as being in the "law of Moses," He has placed notable honor upon this neglected phase of doctrine. Direct reference to Christ's resurrection is not discovered until as late as the Psalms of David, which is a millennium before Christ came into the world. The Old Testament contribution to the doctrine of Christ's resurrection may thus be observed in its two parts—the types and the prophecies.

1. The Types. At least four typical foreshadowings of Christ's resurrection are found in the Old Testament and these occur within the Pentateuch. As indicated above, these appear to be the basis for Christ's own words spoken in relation to His resurrection (Luke 24:44). These foreshadowings are:

The Priesthood of Melchizedek (*Gen. 14:18*). "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God."

While the Aaronic priesthood was constantly interrupted by death (Heb. 7:23–24), the priesthood of Christ which is said to be after the order of Melchizedek is wholly upon resurrection ground. Melchizedek himself typified Christ in His eternal character, having, so far as the record goes, no father or mother and no beginning or ending of days. Fulfilling the Aaronic pattern, Christ accomplished a redemption by His death; in the Melchizedek order Christ on resurrection ground looks back upon a finished redemption. This was symbolized in the presentation to Abraham by Melchizedek of bread and wine. The Melchizedek priesthood of Christ begins with Christ's resurrection and continues forever. It is made possible only by Christ's resurrection.

The Two Birds (*Lev. 14:4–7*). "Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: and the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water: as for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the

running water: and he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field."

Of two birds which together present in one type the whole divine undertaking wrought by Christ through His death and resurrection (cf. Rom. 4:25), the second bird, dipped in the blood of the first bird, signifies Christ in resurrection and ascension taking His blood into heaven. The antitype is clear, since there is no other cleansing which God can recognize except the blood of His Son and that presented in heaven (Heb. 9:11–28).

First-Fruits (*Lev. 23:10–11*). "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the LORD, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it."

As the sheaf of grain represented all the harvest when waved before Jehovah, so Christ as the First-Fruits in resurrection (1 Cor. 15:23) represents by His resurrected and glorified body all those whom He has saved and who are to follow Him into heaven.

Aaron's Rod that Budded (*Num. 17:8*). "And it came to pass, that on the morrow Moses went into the tabernacle of witness; and, behold, the rod of Aaron for the house of Levi was budded, and brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds."

Writing on this particular type in Numbers 17, Dr. C. I. Scofield declares, "Aaron's rod that budded: Type of Christ in resurrection, owned of God as High Priest. Aaron's priesthood had been questioned in the rebellion of Korah, so God Himself will confirm it (v. 5). Each of the tribe-heads brought a perfectly dead rod; God put life into Aaron's only. So all the authors of religions have died, Christ among them, but only Christ was raised from the dead, and exalted to be a high priest (Heb. 4:14; 5:4–10)" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 190).

2. THE PROPHECIES. While there is much intimation in the Old Testament respecting the resurrection of the human body (cf. Job 14:13–15; 19:25–26; Ps. 16:9–10; 17:15; 49:15; Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2; Hos. 5:15–6:2; 13:14; Heb. 11:17–19), there are but three direct predictions in the Old Testament of Christ's resurrection. These are:

Psalm 16:9–10. “Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.”

No more conspicuous example will be found in the Bible of a truth which concerns one person and is at the same time applicable to two persons than is presented in this portion. It is clear that, as the passage reads, David is anticipating his own resurrection; but both the Apostle Peter and the Apostle Paul quote this Scripture as referring to the resurrection of Christ (cf. Acts 2:24–31; 13:34–37). It will be noted that both apostles emphasize the predicted truth that Christ would see no corruption. This He did not see, though in a state of complete death for the period between His death and resurrection. According to the Apostle’s distinction recorded in 1 Corinthians 15:42–57, those caught away at the coming of the Lord, though changed from the mortal to the immortal state in the “twinkling of an eye,” do not see corruption. Christ is thus classed, in spite of the period in which His body was subject to absolute death, as one who now has immortality (1 Tim. 6:16)—not incorruption, which will be the estate of those who because of death have seen corruption. As it was predicted of Him that not a bone of His should be broken (cf. John 19:36), in like manner it was declared prophetically that He should not see corruption.

Psalm 22:22–31. Writing on the 22nd Psalm, Erling C. Olsen in his commendable *Meditations in the Psalms* states:

> The 22nd verse of the 22nd Psalm contains the first words of the risen Christ, “I will declare thy name unto my brethren …” From the 17th chapter of John’s Gospel, we learn that one of the ministries committed to our Lord was this manifestation of the Father’s name. In the sixth verse of that chapter it is written, “I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world.” … But this is not all that is in this 22nd Psalm. Note that our Lord calls us “My brethren.” What condescension that He is willing to call us “brethren,” and indeed, to say He is not *ashamed* to call us brethren. … Now let us look at the last half of verse 22, which reads: “ … in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.” Have you considered our Lord Jesus Christ as leading a great congregation in songs of praise? That is what this Psalm presents. And it is in harmony with what we learn from the 2nd chapter of Hebrews. You who sing in choruses or lead congregational singing, may it be an added incentive to you, to know that the Lord is the chief Singer, the great choir director. Indeed, no worship, no praise could possibly be acceptable to God unless it went through our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the center of all God’s revelation, the center of Christianity. In the 23rd verse we have the various sections of the great choir which our Lord directs. He seems to stand in the midst, instructing each section to render its praise unto God. In the 24th verse we have the substance of the song of praise, as well as the reason for so much singing at Easter time. “For

> he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted; neither hath he hid his face from him; but when he cried unto him, he heard." He sings and we sing because of His death and His resurrection. Who wouldn't sing upon experiencing the grace of God in their hearts and the assurance that they have been redeemed from sin?—I, 148, 150

Psalm 118:22–24. "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the LORD's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

The divine commentary on this portion of the 118th Psalm is found in Acts 4:10–11, which reads: "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." The truth that God raised Christ from the dead is illustrated by the rejected stone becoming the headstone of the corner. Such a reversal of the decision of the builders in rejecting the stone is indeed a work of Jehovah. Israel—here said to be the builders who rejected the stone, as the nation did in the crucifixion—found by the resurrection that their deed was reversed. The day of Christ's resurrection—the first day of the week—is peculiarly ordained of God, therefore, as a day in which believers may rejoice and serve. The first word spoken on that morning by the resurrected Christ was χαίρετε (Matt. 28:9), which is translated *All hail*, but, as all will agree, may more literally be translated *Rejoice*. Out of forty-five times as used in the New Testament, in all but six —where it is employed as a salutation—the word is translated in the Authorized Version *rejoice* or *gladness.* The salutation is plainly, therefore, one of rejoicing. Thus the Lord Himself, in compliance with Psalm 118:22–24, is said to have begun the first celebration of His resurrection with rejoicing. Respecting the celebration of the first day of the week, much has been presented already under Ecclesiology and more will be said anon.

It will be observed that, aside from the expectation which the types and predictions present, the Old Testament assigns no specific meaning to the resurrection of Christ as an act related to Israel. David reasoned that, though death was determined for his Greater Son, the Son would be raised to sit on the Davidic throne (Acts 2:23–31). The necessity was not lodged in the resurrection itself, but in the unalterable, oath-bound covenant respecting an

unfailing occupant of that throne (cf. 2 Sam. 7:16; Jer. 33:17). The resurrection of Christ in its doctrinal significance, then, belongs alone to the Church, the New Creation.

II. The New Testament Doctrine

The New Testament doctrine of Christ's resurrection may be divided into seven parts: (a) Christ's own predictions respecting His resurrection, (b) His resurrection as subject to valid proof, (c) His an actual resurrection, (d) His resurrection as resulting in a new order of beings, (e) seven reasons for His resurrection, (f) His resurrection as the present standard of divine power, and (g) the Lord's Day as a commemoration of His resurrection.

1. Christ's Predictions. Unbelieving men have contended it is unreasonable to suppose that with so many direct declarations regarding His own resurrection the disciples could have been so utterly unprepared for it as they were. However, in this connection it should be remembered that up to the time of His death and rising again, a resurrection, being quite supernatural, was not easily expected; but above and beyond this, it is evident that, for important reasons not difficult to recognize, the ability to grasp what Christ said of both His death and resurrection was really withheld from the disciples, though specifically and repeatedly announced. His death and resurrection had no immediate place in the kingdom program to which these disciples were called to give sole attention. Their sincere proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom would have been greatly influenced had they been faced with a certain belief that Christ would be rejected, put to death, and then raised from the dead. Even John the Baptist, as has been noted before, was given no clear comprehension of the oncoming death and resurrection of Christ. On the other hand, as asserted before, it was needful that by the transfiguration exhibition of glory these disciples—especially those appointed to write Scripture, namely, Peter and John—should be encouraged to retain the certainty of His "power and coming" (2 Pet. 1:16) in spite of the disarrangement of the kingdom expectation which the death and resurrection would create. They must know that the kingdom program is not abandoned, but that its realization from that time forth must be associated with His return to the earth in power and

great glory. Until their doctrinal significance could be disclosed—and such could not possibly be until these events had actually transpired—the death and resurrection of Christ could have been interpreted by the disciples as only a hopeless cancellation of all they had been taught and all they had proclaimed respecting Messiah's earthly kingdom. The offer of an earthly kingdom, its rejection, the death and resurrection of the King, a new unforeseen age with a new divine purpose, and the return of the King to fulfill all His promises may be comprehended by some as they view it more or less in retrospect, whereas but slight contemplation would convince one of the complexity of all this in the minds of those who passed through its actual outworking. Due thought should be given to the need of divine wisdom in introducing to earnest men the successive steps in the greatest transition the world has ever experienced, namely, one from Judaism to Christianity. The stupendous change which demands the new birth of Nicodemus and the regeneration of Saul of Tarsus is not clarified or even approached by a Covenant theology which, while embracing a unifying idealism respecting a supposed single divine purpose, can ride unconsciously over these mighty changes as though they did not exist. It was required by existing conditions that the disciples should not know of Christ's oncoming death and resurrection until those age-transforming events were experienced and the time had arrived when they should enter into the new values secured for them by these events; yet it was also essential that Christ should predict both His death and His resurrection. Bearing on the inability of the disciples to remember Christ's predictions is John 2:22, which reads: "When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said," but it is also observed how after His resurrection Christ opened their understanding to the Scriptures and that particularly in respect to His death and resurrection. It is written of this: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day" (Luke 24:45–46). Of the greatest importance, likewise, is the express declaration of Luke 18:31–34 —wherein Christ's declaration regarding His oncoming death and resurrection is recorded—and especially the disclosure in verse 34, which reads, "And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid

from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." Divine power thus purposely veiled the death and resurrection from their eyes. It is to be noted that, though the disciples were unable to receive Christ's predictions respecting His death and resurrection, the unbelieving Jews did understand and remember. Of them it is recorded that they said to Pilate after Christ's death: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first" (Matt. 27:63–64). Incidentally, it will be seen that this Scripture sheds light on the problem of the time between Christ's death and resurrection. Some have made much of the phrase "after three days," while others have emphasized the phrase "until the third day," but this one passage indicates that these two phrases mean one and the same thing.

Dr. Everett F. Harrison, writing on the resurrection and this point, states:

> This much is clear from the whole discussion, that Jesus, both in His predictions and in His teaching following the resurrection, laid great stress upon the time element, and the early church sought to impress the same thing in its witness (Acts 10:40; 1 Cor. 15:4). Yet it must be acknowledged as a singular insistence if the sole basis for it is the necessity of fulfilling the sign of Jonah. That is the only sure link with the Old Testament as far as the three days are concerned. An incident in connection with the raising of Lazarus may shed some light on this problem. When Jesus commanded the removal of the stone, Martha interposed, "Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days." Why should she be so explicit in stating the period of time? The answer is that among many of the peoples of antiquity, Israel included, it was supposed that corruption began on the fourth day, when all possibility of reanimation by the soul was at an end. This accounts for Jesus' purposeful delay in coming to Bethany (John 11:6, 17) and also for the inability of the Pharisees to deny the reality of the miracle (vs. 47). It accounts also for the emphasis in apostolic preaching upon the fact that Jesus did not see corruption (Acts 2:31; 13:37). Our conclusion, then, is that our Lord deliberately announced a time for His resurrection which would meet every demand of popular understanding—long enough after the death to certify to the reality of the death, yet not so long as to permit corruption to take place.—*The Christian Doctrine of Resurrection*, unpublished ms., p. 55

The passages which record Christ's predictions of His death and resurrection are: Matthew 16:21; 17:23; 20:17–19; 26:12, 28, 31; Mark 9:30–32; 14:8, 24, 27; Luke 9:22, 44–45; 18:31–34; 22:20; John 2:19–21; 10:17–18; 12:7.

2. Subject to Valid Proof. Dr. Harrison's introduction to his own treatment of the evidence for Christ's resurrection along with the outline appended is, because of its satisfactory statement, introduced here:

> The crucial importance of the resurrection for the demonstration of the divine origin and full authority of the Christian religion has long been recognized, both by friends and foes, perhaps by the latter even more than by the former, since they are on the alert to detect that portion of the foundation which will involve the collapse of the whole edifice in case it can be successfully removed. Though the method of attack has changed through the years and consequently, to a degree, the method of defense, yet the basic facts remain as they have from the very beginning, and to them we make our appeal. The three prominent lines of evidence for Jesus' resurrection are the empty tomb, His appearances to the disciples, and the transformation wrought in them by those appearances. In the background, but no less deserving of consideration as historical evidence, are the very existence of the church and the literature which emanated from it, our New Testament. Finally, though not lying properly within the category of evidence, there is a congruity between His resurrection and all else that we know about Him. The consistent supernaturalism that belongs to Him makes the resurrection a virtual necessity and creates in one who starts from the fact the increasing realization that it was inevitable.—*Ibid.*, p. 56

This sixfold division of the evidences—three major and three minor—though not entering into many details does present the salient features of proof. All evidence functioning through human channels is naturally subject to human limitations. Men are fallible. Their impressions can be erroneous. On the other hand, the honest testimony of a witness must be received and weighed for all it purports to be. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established" (Matt. 18:16). No greater line of proof could exist than the fact that Christ did rise. The whole scene was suddenly changed when He appeared and promptly was identified by those who saw Him. The effect produced indicates that there was a sufficient cause and that cause was none other than the truth that He was alive from the dead. His followers were unprepared for His death. That death was not softened by the slightest expectation that He might rise from the dead. They were unprepared for His resurrection and when He arose they responded normally to so great a surprise and joy. They were without a design or plan in acting so. To them the tomb was empty beyond a doubt and the Savior was alive and in their midst again. Angel messengers as well as human witnesses testified to the empty tomb and several hundred testified to His living presence. The apostles began at once to proclaim the resurrection in Jerusalem and to those who had caused His crucifixion. Had there been any

proof which men could produce that would demonstrate that Christ was still in the state of death, it would have been forthcoming; but none could be found.

The appearances of Christ were duly recorded by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 15:5–8, which states: “And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once: of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.” They who knew Him best and could apply uncounted tests to establish His identity were convinced, not so much by the empty tomb as by His actual presence with them. On that confidence which His living presence engendered they preached with all boldness, and Christianity, grounded on the death and resurrection of Christ, was launched with never a recorded doubt on the part of those to whom He appeared. The removal of one man’s doubt by a visible appearing of Christ is especially significant. He who had said “Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe” (John 20:25) saw the actual scars and declared, “My Lord and my God” (John 20:28). Likewise the great Apostle was transformed from the unbeliever he was to the Apostle of divine grace by seeing Christ, and not only risen but enthroned in glory. The men who knew most about Him believed most respecting Christ’s resurrection. The entire event bore investigation and it may be assumed that inquest was pursued alike by believers and unbelievers. James Denney in his volume *Jesus and the Gospel* asserts: “The real historical evidence for the resurrection is the fact that it was believed, preached, propagated, and produced its fruit and effect in the new phenomenon of the Christian Church, long before any of our gospels was written” (p. 111, cited by Harrison, *ibid.*, p. 82). Beyond all this —especially for those who have spiritual discernment—is the New Creation reality which is built, not on a mere belief in the resurrection of Christ, but on Him who arose from the grave. A new creation which represents the supreme divine effort and incorporates the interests of heaven and earth is not built on a mere fiction or misguided idealism. The entire Second Testament which proclaims, defends, and stands upon the resurrection of Christ is itself worthy of its claim to be the inspired Word of God. In the

course of its message the resurrection of Christ is an essential feature. The greatest divine purpose is being executed upon the reality of Christ's return from the tomb.

3. Actual Resurrection. By this caption attention is directed to the truth that Christ really died and that, had He not been raised, He would, so far as His human body is concerned, have remained in the state of death. It is this truth which is misconstrued by unsuitable illustrations. It is probable that nature provides no comparable reality. Sincere men have, without due thought, sought to elucidate the doctrine of Christ's resurrection by comparing it to the hatching of an egg, the manifestation of life in the form of a lily when a dry bulb is planted, or the breaking of the cocoon by the chrysalis and the appearance of a gorgeous butterfly. A moment's consideration suggests the inaptness of all these figures. The egg will not hatch unless it enfolds a germ of life. No dry bulb presents a lily unless it is alive. No chrysalis ever broke its cocoon that was not animated; but there was no life in Christ's tomb. No greater distinction exists than that which obtains between life and death, and it is tragic indeed when, even by implication—which an ill-considered illustration may very well adumbrate—it is intimated that Christ did not really die, or that even a spark of life was continued in the tomb as the basis of a mere resuscitation. Let it be restated: there is nothing in nature capable of representing a true resurrection from death. Christ went down in despotic death and came up with unimpoverished and inexhaustible life. In the Melchizedek form of His priesthood it is rightly said of Christ: "Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life" (Heb. 7:16). Finite computations can never comprehend that which is in the passage termed "the power of an endless life." Death does not end the consciousness of the human soul and spirit. Death did not end the consciousness of Christ's human soul and spirit, nor did it affect His Deity. Physical death is an experience of the body and only resurrection will restore its life again. Christ entered completely into the state of physical death and from it He came forth by an actual resurrection. Since there is so little upon which to base doctrine at this point, the question of Christ's relation to spiritual death is not discussed at all in this work.

4. A New Order of Being. A sharp contrast exists and should be recognized between the glory of the preincarnate Christ on the one hand and that of Christ in resurrection on the other hand. In other words, His resurrection was vastly more than a reversal of His death. Such reversals, indeed, were the rule for all other so-called resurrections recorded in the Bible. They were, to be strictly accurate, only restorations or resuscitations from the state of complete death. The difference is seen in the fact that other so-called resurrections were a return to the former life and estate wherein those thus revived were subject to a second dying, while of Christ it is said He arose into a sphere of being never occupied or exhibited before. It is not contended that any change was wrought in His Deity other than that which is possible in the realm of association or incarnation. The humanity of Christ—His body, soul, and spirit—instantly became that which had been anticipated throughout all eternity, namely, perfect humanity glorified and exalted to the point that it was not only meet for heaven, but meet as well to be an integral part of the glorified theanthropic Person. It is no small requirement upon that which was itself only perfect humanity that it should become an integral part of the all-glorious, exalted, resurrected Son of God. In other words, Christ is the first and only one of all earth dwellers thus far to put on immortality. The Apostle announces respecting Him: "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen" (1 Tim. 6:16); "Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10). Immortality is wholly of the body, never of the soul or spirit, and since no other one from this sphere has yet received the glorified resurrection body, He only hath immortality. That immortal body with a glorified soul and spirit united to Deity becomes the incomparable theanthropic Person, the exalted Savior.

5. Seven Reasons. In a section of Soteriology, presented earlier (Vol. III), fourteen reasons for the death of Christ have been listed and examined. In this division of Christology seven reasons for the resurrection of Christ are now to be considered. These, it is believed, will be found to be somewhat comprehensive and are as follows: (1) Christ arose because of who He is, (2) Christ arose that He might fulfill the Davidic covenant, (3)

Christ arose that He might become the source of resurrection life, (4) Christ arose that He might become the source of resurrection power, (5) Christ arose to be Head over all things to the Church, (6) Christ arose on account of justification, and (7) Christ arose to be the First-Fruits. These may well be considered separately.

a. Because of Who He is. It is recorded of Peter that in his Pentecostal sermon he said, “Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it” (Acts 2:24). No situation conceivable could be more abnormal than that the theanthropic Person should enter the realms of death. He is the source of all life. “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself” (John 5:26). This is not a reference to human life, which begins with human generation, but to that life which God is, from everlasting to everlasting. Apart from the experience of animals, this universe knows nothing of death other than as the judgment which it is from God upon a fallen race, and the hour is fast drawing near when that judgment will be lifted and death banished forever. Why, indeed, should the eternal Second Person, even though He took upon Him deathless, unfallen humanity, be found within the shades of death? The question has but one answer and that one answer is the only one given in the Bible, namely, that in infinite love He died for others, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring the unjust to God; but when satisfaction had been rendered on account of those for whom He died, there was no more occasion for the deathless One to continue in the realms of death. It is, therefore, because of who He is that He arose from the tomb.

b. To Fulfill the Davidic Covenant. To the attentive, believing Bible student it is clear that vast issues are contained in the covenant God made with David as recorded in 2 Samuel, chapter 7. To Abraham God covenanted an earthly seed and a land (Gen. 12:1–3; 13:14–17; 15:5–7), and to David God covenanted an everlasting throne, an everlasting King, and an everlasting kingdom. The precise character of that throne and kingdom was revealed to David. His own response to Jehovah’s covenant and his impression respecting it (cf. 2 Sam. 7:18–29; Ps. 89:20–37) indicate clearly that it was, as covenanted, none other than the perpetuation of David’s earthly throne and earthly kingdom. The student will search in vain for any point in

subsequent revelation wherein it is revealed that this throne and kingdom underwent a metamorphosis by which a literal, earthly throne and kingdom, as were promised to David by the oath of Jehovah (cf. Acts 2:30), became the spiritual kingdom which modern theologians fancy exists, and which is so changed that David himself is no longer essential to it. In truth, no subject is more baffling within the range of prophetic themes to those who spiritualize the kingdom than the question why it was prerequisite for Christ to be born of the line of David. If His is a spiritual kingdom, He need be born of no particular human line. The Bible does not follow a program adapted to human ideals. The Davidic covenant promised with an oath of Jehovah's that out of the fruit of David's loins, according to the flesh, God would raise up Christ to sit on David's throne (Acts 2:30). David believed the covenant which Jehovah made respecting his earthly throne and kingdom—what right had he to doubt?—and that is why he spoke of the fact, as recorded in Psalm 16:10, that Christ would not be left in the grave. In the Sacred Text the whole Davidic covenant program moves majestically on with subsequent revelations regarding it quite confirmatory (cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:31–33; Acts 2:25–31; 15:16–18), and continues in certain prospect until it is consummated at the return of Christ when He will sit on David's throne in Jerusalem. This is the kingdom proffered by Christ in His earth ministry and preached by His disciples. The same kingdom was rejected by the nation when they rejected their King. In the purpose of God and to the end that redemption might be achieved, the Messiah must die. Of the various reasons here assigned for Christ's resurrection, it is now asserted that He arose because of God's oath to David, lest that be violated—as it would have been had Christ remained in the sphere of death. An oath given to David from Jehovah respecting Messiah as the One to sit on David's throne in Jerusalem bears no relation to a supposed spiritual kingdom. If the kingdom be spiritual rather than literal, what then becomes of Jehovah's oath? And of what import is the Davidic covenant?

C. To Become the Source of Resurrection Life. Of the major factor which constitutes a Christian what he is, much has already been written. It was after His resurrection, however, that Christ breathed on the disciples and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22). In like manner every Christian has been born from above and received the divine nature when he believed.

Thereafter Christ is Himself in the heart as the hope of glory (cf. Col. 1:27). “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep” (John 10:10–11); “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life” (1 John 5:11–12). It remains only to declare again that the life which is thus imparted is the life of Christ in resurrection and not the preresurrection life of Christ. It is on the ground of this truth that the Christian is contemplated, as he is in the New Testament, as already raised from the dead. Colossians 3:1–4 is direct and conclusive: “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory.” In fact the believer is now blessed with all the values of cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection with Christ. These great realities are his as completely as they were Christ’s, since Christ wrought them as a Substitute for the one who believes. In the most actual sense the child of God has been raised up and seated with Christ in heavenly spheres. Thus it is written: “And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (Eph. 2:6).

d. To Be the Source of Resurrection Power. After His resurrection Christ said to His disciples, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth” (Matt. 28:18). It is His power to “us-ward” who believe, that is measured only by the exceeding greatness of God’s power which was wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead. Naturally the mind dwells first upon the power that achieved the resurrection of Christ, and that of course is the essential thing to be apprehended; yet the message of Ephesians 1:19–21 presents rather the glorious truth that the power which wrought in Christ is the power that is engaged in behalf of the believer. That power may be directed in various channels, but it is the portion of all who believe. In Romans 6:4 the resurrection of Christ is the measurement of power available for the Christian’s walk in “newness of life,” or upon a new life principle, namely, the walk in dependence upon the Holy Spirit.

e. To Be Head Over All Things to the Church. When the resurrected Christ is combined with the Church—they who have been raised with Him and seated with Him (Eph. 2:6)—into one entity, the result is known as the New Creation. It is true that, because of the vital relation to Christ which each believer sustains through the baptizing ministry of the Holy Spirit, each one thus related is himself a new creation. Thus it is said, “Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new” (2 Cor. 5:17); but the whole company of the saved ones joined to the resurrected Head and including Him constitute the New Creation of God. This entity is altogether different from any other existing company whether it be composed of angels or men, and its realization constitutes the supreme purpose of God in the present age. As all that enters into the New Creation is established on resurrection ground and is derived directly from the resurrected Christ, it is clear that He Himself was for this cause raised and seated far above angelic spheres and made Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body (Eph. 1:20–23).

f. On Account of Justification. It will be recognized that this aspect of resurrection truth is drawn from one text of Scripture (Rom. 4:25), which reads: “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” Above and beyond what has been written previously on this somewhat difficult passage, it may be indicated that, having completed the ground of justification by and through His death and His body having remained the prescribed time in the tomb, Christ arose. Judging from that (the proper) sense of the passage, it is not according to sound doctrine to declare that justification is based upon Christ’s resurrection. It, rather, is certain from the testimony of the New Testament that justification is based upon the death of Christ. It is written: “Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 3:24); “Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him” (5:9). Yet there is a sense in which it may be said too that, since imputed righteousness is the divine reason for that divine pronouncement which justification is and since imputed righteousness accrues to the believer on the sole basis of His union to the resurrected Christ, the believer’s justification does rest perfectly on the resurrection of

the Lord. It is therefore true that justification is made possible both by the death of Christ and by His resurrection, and so both are essential.

g. To Be the First-Fruits. In this, another instance the theme under consideration has been previously treated in part. However, that the outline of doctrine may be as nearly complete as possible, this wonderful feature of Christ's resurrection should reappear. The term *first-fruits* is used of Israel (Jer. 2:3), of the Spirit's blessing (Rom. 8:23), of the first believers in a given locality (Rom. 16:5; 1 Cor. 16:15), of the saints of this age (James 1:18), of the 144,000 (Rev. 14:4), and of Christ in resurrection. One passage, in which the term is twice applied to Christ, is especially clear as evidence for this last usage: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming" (1 Cor. 15:20–23). That glorified humanity which is to constitute the highest feature of heaven next to the Godhead—they who even in this life being saved have received the πλήρωμα of the Godhead (Col. 2:9–10) and will yet receive resurrection bodies like unto Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21)—are perfectly represented in heaven by the resurrected, glorified man, Christ Jesus. Angels know the estate which will characterize each individual who comprises that unnumbered company which, having received their resurrection bodies, will throng the spacious vaults of heaven. The angels thus know before they appear what each believer will be like, having seen Christ who is to the hosts of heaven a preliminary demonstration of the glorious estate that awaits those who are Christ's. He is thus the "firstfruits." The wave sheaf of the Old Testament anticipated the appearing of Christ in heaven as the Preview or Forerunner of those who were to follow.

6. The Present Standard of Divine Power. The Bible discloses a standard of divine power for each of the three major ages—past, present, and future. When in the past age God sought to impress His people concerning His mighty power, He reminded them of the demonstration which He made when delivering them from Egypt. The oftrepeated phrase is, "I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt"

(Ex. 20:2). In the coming age the standard of divine power is to be that regathering of Israel to be accomplished when Christ returns. Of this Jeremiah writes, "Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that they shall no more say, The LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, the LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land" (Jer. 23:7–8). Of this same event Christ said that Israel's regathering would be by angelic ministration. Accordingly it is written: "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matt. 24:31; cf. Isa. 60:8–9). But the measurement of divine power in the present age, between the two advents of Christ, is that of Christ's resurrection from the dead. The Apostle states in Ephesians 1:19–21: "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." There is no means by which a human mind may grasp what is involved in the exercise of the power of God, and this text employs the extreme phrase, "the exceeding greatness of his power." It was power immeasurable which raised Christ from the dead, which took Him into the highest heaven far above angelic hosts, which seated Him on the Father's throne, and gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church. In considering the order of events in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ as here stated, it should be remembered that all that is set forth in this description is stated primarily to the end that the believer may be properly impressed with the *greatness* of the power—the same power which wrought in Christ—which is engaged to accomplish for him everything that God has purposed according to His work of election, predestination, and sovereign adoption. True, the Redeemer and His redemption will be provided, as well as the enabling power to believe; but beyond these issues which are within the boundaries of time the divine, eternal purpose will yet be realized to its full fruition, and is certain because of the "exceeding greatness of his power" which is engaged to that end. Nor should it be forgotten that all this

disclosure is but a part of the Apostle's oft-repeated prayer wherein he makes request that, through the teaching work of the Spirit, these marvels which demonstrate the divine sufficiency might be comprehended by those who are the objects of the divine riches of grace and glory. Often in the Scriptures does the Spirit of God bring to one's attention the *certainty* of all things which God hath purposed, and happy indeed is the one who, by divine illumination, enters into the heart-understanding of these things. But what, after all, is the measure of this exceeding great power which is "to us-ward who believe"? The record of it is given for all to understand—if so be that they are taught of the Spirit. Second only in importance is this theme to that of election and predestination with which the Epistle opened. What God hath purposed He will realize, and to an absolute degree. What He hath begun He will complete with that perfection which belongs to infinity. This exceeding great power which is "to us-ward who believe" has already been manifest in four ways in behalf of Christ:

First, *Christ was raised from the dead*, not from a dormant state but from the estate of death. From this estate He was raised to a sphere far above that which He occupied on the earth before His death. As above stated, the resurrection of Christ is more than the reversal of His death, and more, indeed, than a restoration such as characterized all previous so-called resurrections. Christ became a new order of Being. The Second Person of the Trinity was always present in Christ from the moment of His gestation in the virgin's womb to His exaltation in glory; but His humanity presented ever changing aspects. As a child He "grew, and waxed strong in spirit" (Luke 2:40). He who was "from everlasting to everlasting" (Ps. 90:2) came to be "thirty years of age" (Luke 3:23); and that body which was mortal, being subject to death, became immortal and He who was dead is now alive forevermore. He who alone has immortality (1 Tim. 6:16) is now the First-Fruits of resurrection—the only present representation in glory of that host of redeemed ones who will soon be with Him and be like Him. Every power of Satan and man had combined to retain Christ's body in the tomb. The keys of death apparently were in Satan's hands until the resurrection of Christ (cf. Heb. 2:14 with Rev. 1:18). The greatest earthly power had set its seal upon the tomb but none could loose the "pains of death" (Acts 2:24) other than God. Though, in the mystery of the Trinity, it is declared that Christ came forth from the tomb by His own will and power (John 2:19;

10:17–18) and that He was quickened by the Spirit (1 Pet. 3:18), it is stated upwards of twenty-five times that Christ was raised by the power of God the Father. Thus, in this Ephesians passage (vs. 20) it is revealed that the resurrection was due to the exercise of the Father's mighty power which "he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead." This same mighty power, we are assured, is not only engaged to raise the believer from the dead, but is engaged to accomplish *all* that has been divinely predetermined for him unto eternal glory.

Second, *the ascension of Christ* is a measurement of divine power "to us-ward who believe." Though directly presented but three times (Mark 16:19; Luke 24:49–52; Acts 1:9), the ascension of Christ is often referred to in the Acts and Epistles as an important aspect of divine power (Acts 2:33; 3:21; 5:31; 7:55; Rom. 8:34; Phil. 2:9; 3:20; Col. 3:1; 1 Thess. 1:10; 4:16; 2 Thess. 1:7; Heb. 1:3; 1 Pet. 3:22; Rev. 3:21). This body of truth, which is of great importance as evidence of the ascension and present position of Christ, is introduced at this point in the Ephesian Letter as a ground of confidence that what God has purposed for the believer He is abundantly *able* to accomplish. The present exaltation of Christ to a sphere far above all principalities and powers is a theme which transcends the range of unaided human understanding. The Spirit alone can impress the heart with that revelation which is here intended to create assurance in the child of God that he will himself realize all that God has purposed for him. This purpose includes no less than a partaking with Christ of that exalted glory of His. Concerning His own, Christ said, "Where I am, there ye may be also" (John 14:3) and "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them" (John 17:22).

Third, "And hath put all things under his feet" (Eph. 1:22). It was in this same connection that Christ said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18; contr. Luke 4:5–6); and by Him shall all things be subdued (1 Cor. 15:25–26). Great, indeed, is the power "to us-ward who believe"; for such ones are destined to reign with Christ and share with Him His authority. The Christian experiences little of the exercise of this authority now. At the present time he rather shares the rejection of his Lord; for all who will live godly shall suffer persecution (2 Tim. 3:12).

Fourth, "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church" (Eph. 1:22). Returning thus at the close of the first chapter to the subject

which was in view at the beginning—that which has been previously mentioned in this thesis (Vol. IV)—the Apostle makes mention of that group of humanity which, because of being *called out* from both Jews and Gentiles into a heavenly association in Christ, is properly called an ἐκκλησία or Church. The fact which is uppermost here is that Christ, by divine appointment and power, is now Head over all things to the Church. The term *Head* combines two important aspects of truth: (1) Christ now presides over the Church as the One who directs every moment of life and every act of service in those who comprise this heavenly company. He is the bestower of gifts (4:8), and, by the Spirit, directs the exercise of those gifts (1 Cor. 12:4–7). (2) Christ is now Head over the Church in the sense also that from Him she draws all spiritual vitality. Because He lives, the members of His Body live also. He is to the Church as the vine is to the branches, as the shepherd is to the sheep, as the cornerstone is to the building, and as the bridegroom is to the bride.

Special attention should be given to the fact that all the stupendous benefits enumerated in the first chapter of the Ephesian Letter are, on the human side, secured upon the one condition of believing. It is stated that the power of God is “to us-ward who believe.” In accordance with the plan of salvation by divine grace, no other condition could be imposed. Not only does God undertake for such all this measureless benefit, but the very faith by which it is received is itself a gift of God.

7. The Lord’s Day a Commemoration. It was to be expected, when Covenant Theology has so neglected the fact and meaning of Christ’s resurrection, that there would arise much misunderstanding about the reason for the celebration of the first day of the week rather than the seventh. A recent article in a reputable religious journal is entitled, “The Sabbath Permanent but Moveable.” By this caption the writer intends to draw attention by stating what after all is a contradiction. The impossible task to which he has appointed himself is to prove that the Jewish Sabbath idea remains intact even though the precise day of the week is changed. His thesis, as for all Covenant theologians, is that the structure of the Jewish Sabbath remains in force—for there is but one covenant—whether it be observed on one day or another. Such blindness respecting the discriminating teaching of the Bible can be accounted for only on the

ground that a man-made scheme of supposed continuity is embraced and followed without an unprejudiced examination of the Scriptures. Under the general division of Ecclesiology the entire Sabbath and Lord's day problem has been given extended consideration; but since that issue is of so great import because of its inherent character, because of its doctrinal significance, and because of the existing misunderstanding respecting it, another extended treatment of the whole theme is introduced here, and with a view to establishing the truth respecting the meaning of the Lord's day celebration as that which is in force now and as wholly unrelated to the Jewish Sabbath as grace is unrelated to law or the New Creation is unrelated to the old creation. Beginning with His own work in creation, God has chosen to sanctify, or set apart, one-seventh of all time. He commanded Israel to observe the seventh day as a day of rest (Ex. 20:8–11), likewise the seventh, or sabbatic year, as a time in which the land was to rest (Ex. 23:10–11; Lev. 25:2–7) and the fiftieth year as a time of jubilee in recognition of seven times seven years (Lev. 25:8–24). In various details both the sabbatic year and the year of jubilee were typically prophetic of the kingdom age, which is the seventh and last of the dispensations and which is characterized by the enjoyment of a sabbatic rest for all creation. Though in the present age the day to be celebrated is divinely changed from the seventh to the first day of the week because of the New Creation's beginning then, the same proportion in the division of time—one day in seven—is perpetuated. The Hebrew word *sabbath* means cessation, or perfect rest, from activity. Apart from the continual burnt offerings and the feasts which might fall on Saturday, the day was in no sense one of worship or service.

A degree of clarity is gained when the Sabbath is considered in its relation to various periods of time:

a. The Sabbath from Adam to Moses. It is recorded that God rested at the close of His six creative days (Gen. 2:2–3; Ex. 20:10–11; Heb. 4:4); but there is no intimation in the Word of God that man was appointed to observe, or ever did observe, a Sabbath until Israel came out of Egypt. The Book of Job discloses the religious life and experience of the patriarchs, and though their various responsibilities to God are therein discussed, there is never a reference to a Sabbath day obligation. On the other hand, it is distinctly

stated that the giving of the Sabbath to Israel by the hand of Moses was the beginning of Sabbath observance among men (Ex. 16:29; Neh. 9:13–14; Ezek. 20:11–13). Likewise, it is evident from the records of the first imposition of the Sabbath (Ex. 16:1–35) that on the particular day which was one week, or seven days, previous to the first recorded Sabbath observed by man the children of Israel finished a Sabbath-breaking journey of many miles from Elim to the wilderness of Sin. There they murmured against Jehovah, and on that day the supply of food from heaven began which was to be gathered for six days, but was not to be gathered on the seventh day. It is evident, therefore, that the day of their journeying which would have been a Sabbath, had a Sabbath obligation been in force, was not observed as a Sabbath.

b. The Sabbath from Moses to Christ. In this period the Sabbath was rightfully in force. It was embedded in the law (Ex. 20:8–11) and the divine cure for its nonobservance was likewise provided in the law of the offerings. In this connection, it is important to observe that the Sabbath was never imposed on the Gentiles, but was peculiarly a sign between Jehovah and Israel (Ex. 31:12–17). Among Israel's sins, her failure to keep the Sabbath and to give the land its rest are especially emphasized. In the midst of this period of the law, Hosea predicted that, as a part of the judgments which were to come upon Israel, her Sabbaths would cease (Hos. 2:11). This prophecy must at some time be fulfilled, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. As the Mosaic age continued to the death of Christ, His earth-life and ministry were under the law, expounding the law and applying the law. Finding the Sabbath law obscured by the traditions and teachings of men, He pointed out that the Sabbath was given as a benefit to man and man was not to be made a sacrifice for the Sabbath (Mark 2:27). Christ was faithful to the whole Mosaic system, which included the Sabbath, because that system was in force during His earth-life; but that obvious fact is no basis for the claim that a Christian is appointed to follow Christ in His Sabbath observance either in example or precept.

c. The Church Age. Following the resurrection of Christ, there is no record in the New Testament that the Sabbath was observed by any believer, even in error. Doubtless the multitude of Judaized Christians did observe the Sabbath; but no record of such observance was permitted to appear in the

Word of God. In like manner, following the resurrection of Christ, there is no injunction given to Jew, Gentile, or Christian to observe the Sabbath, nor is Sabbath-breaking once mentioned among the numerous lists of possible sins. On the contrary, there are warnings against Sabbath observance on the part of those who are the children of God under grace. Galatians 4:9–10 condemns the observance of "days, and months, and times, and years." These were usually observed with a view to meriting the favor of God and by those who would likely be thoughtful of God at one time and careless at another. Hebrews 4:1–13 contemplates the Sabbath as a type of the rest (from his own works) into which the believer enters when he is saved. Colossians 2:16–17 plainly instructs the child of God *not* to be judged with respect to a Sabbath day, and implies that such an independent attitude toward the Sabbath is reasonable in view of all that Christ has become to one who is now of the New Creation (Col. 2:9–17). In this passage, most evidently reference is made to the weekly Sabbaths, rather than to those special or extra Sabbaths which were a part of the ceremonial law. Romans 14:5 declares that when the believer is "persuaded in his own mind" he may esteem all days alike. This does not imply a neglect of faithful worship, but rather suggests that, to such a one, *all* days are full of devotion to God. Because of the fact that in the New Testament the Sabbath is never included as any part of the Christian's life and service, the term *Christian Sabbath* is a misnomer. In this connection it may be noted that in place of the Sabbath of the law there is provided the Lord's day of the New Creation, which far exceeds the Sabbath in its glory, its privileges, and its blessings.

d. The Sabbath in the Coming Age. In full harmony with the New Testament doctrine that the new Lord's day is related only to the Church, it is prophesied that the Sabbath will be reinstated—thus superseding the Lord's day—immediately upon the completion of the outcalling of the Church and her removal from the world. Even in the brief period of the tribulation which must intervene between the end of this age and the age of the kingdom, the Sabbath is again in view (Matt. 24:20); but prophecy especially anticipates the Sabbath as a vital feature of the coming kingdom age (Isa. 66:23; Ezek. 46:1).

The first day of the week has been celebrated by the church from the resurrection of Christ to the present time. This fact is proved by the New

Testament records, the writings of the early Fathers, and the history of the church. There have been those in nearly every century who, not comprehending the present purpose of God in the New Creation, have earnestly contended for the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. At the present time, those who specialize in urging the observance of the seventh day combine these appeals with other unscriptural doctrines. Since the believer is appointed of God to observe the first day of the week under the new relationships of grace, confusion arises when that day is invested with the character of, and is governed by, the seventh-day Sabbath laws. All such teachings ignore the New Testament doctrine of the New Creation.

e. The New Creation. The New Testament reveals that the purpose of God in the present, unforeseen dispensation is the outcalling of the Church (Acts 15:13–18), and this redeemed company is the New Creation, a heavenly people. While it is indicated that there are marvelous glories and perfections which are to be accomplished for this company as a whole (Eph. 5:25–27), it is also revealed that they *individually* are the objects of the greatest divine undertakings and transformations. Likewise, as the corporate Body is organically related to Christ (1 Cor. 12:12), so the individual believer is vitally joined to the Lord (1 Cor. 6:17; Rom. 6:5; 1 Cor. 12:13). Concerning the individual believer, the Bible teaches that (a) as for sin, each one in this company has been cleansed, forgiven, and justified, (b) as for their possessions, each one has been given the indwelling Spirit and the gift of God which is eternal life, has become a legal heir of God and a joint-heir with Christ, (c) as for their positions, each one has been made the righteousness of God by which he is accepted in the Beloved forever (2 Cor. 5:21; Eph. 1:6), a member of Christ's mystical Body, a part of His glorious Bride, and a living partaker in the New Creation of which Christ is the Federal Head. We read: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature [creation]: old things [as respects positions, not experience] are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all [these positional] things are of God" (2 Cor. 5:17–18; Eph. 2:10; 4:25; Gal. 6:15). Peter, writing of this company of believers, states: "But ye are a chosen generation" (1 Pet. 2:9), which means a distinct heaven-born race or nationality— a stock or kind—which has been directly created by the power of God. As the first Adam begat a race which partook of his own human life and imperfections,

so Christ, the Last Adam, is now begetting by the Spirit a new race which partakes of His eternal life and perfection. “The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening [life-giving] spirit” (1 Cor. 15:45). Having partaken of the resurrection life of Christ and being in Christ, the believer is said to be raised already (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12–13; 3:1–4). However, as for his body, the believer is yet to receive a glorious body like unto the resurrection body of Christ (Phil. 3:21). In confirmation of this we also read that, when Christ appeared in heaven immediately following His resurrection, it was as the “firstfruits,” implying that the whole company that are to follow will be like Him (1 John 3:2), even to their glorified bodies. In the Word of God the New Creation—which began with the resurrection of Christ and consists of a born-again, heavenly company who are in Christ—is everywhere held in contrast to the old creation, and it is from that old and ruined creation that the believer is said to have been saved and delivered. As the Sabbath was instituted to celebrate the old creation (Ex. 20:10–11; 31:12–17; Heb. 4:4), so the Lord’s day celebrates the New Creation. Likewise, as the Sabbath was limited in its application to Israel as the earthly people of God, so also the Lord’s day is limited in its application to the Church as the heavenly people of God.

f. The Lord’s Day. In addition to the fact that the Sabbath is nowhere imposed on the children of God under grace, there are abundant reasons for their observance of the first day of the week.

(1) *A New Day Prophesied and Appointed.* According to Psalm 118:22–24 and Acts 4:10–11, Christ in His crucifixion was the Stone rejected by Israel—the “builders”—but, through His resurrection, He has been made the Headstone of the corner. This marvelous thing is of God, and the day of its accomplishment is divinely appointed as a day of rejoicing and of gladness. In accord with this, Christ’s greeting on the resurrection morn was “All hail” (Matt. 28:9, which is more literally, “O have joy!”), and being “the day which the LORD hath made,” it is rightfully termed “the Lord’s day.”

(2) *Observance Indicated by Various Events.* On the first day Christ arose from the dead (Matt. 28:1), on that day He first met His disciples in the new intimacy of fellowship (John 20:19), on that day He gave them instruction (Luke 24:36–49), on that day He ascended into heaven as the

“firstfruits” or wave sheaf (John 20:17; 1 Cor. 15:20, 23; Lev. 23:10–12), on that day He breathed the Spirit on them (John 20:22), on that day the Spirit descended from heaven (Acts 2:1–4), on that day the Apostle Paul preached in Troas (Acts 20:6–7), on that day the believers came together to break bread (Acts 20:6–7), on that day they were to “lay by in store” as God had prospered them (1 Cor. 16:2).

(3) *The Day of Circumcision.* The rite of circumcision, which was performed on the eighth day, typified the believer’s separation from the flesh and the old order by the death of Christ (Col. 2:11), and the eighth day, being the first day after a completed week, is symbolical of a new beginning.

(4) *The Day of Grace.* At the end of a week of toil, a day of rest was granted to the people who were related to God by law-works, whereas to the people under grace, whose works are finished in Christ, a day of worship is appointed which, being the first day of the week, precedes all days of work. In the blessing of the first day the believer lives and serves the following six days. A day of rest belongs to a people who are related to God by works needing to be accomplished; a day of ceaseless worship and service belongs to a people who are related to God by the finished work of Christ. The seventh day was characterized by unyielding law; the first day is characterized by the latitude and liberty belonging to grace. The seventh day was observed with the hope that by it one might prove acceptable to God. The first day is observed with the assurance that one is already accepted of God. The keeping of the seventh day was fostered by the flesh; the keeping of the first day is fostered by the indwelling Spirit.

(5) *The Day Blessed of God.* Throughout this age Spirit-filled, devout believers, to whom no doubt the will of God has been clearly revealed, have kept the Lord’s day apart from any sense of responsibility to observe the seventh day. It is reasonable to suppose that had they been guilty of Sabbath-breaking they would have been convicted of that sin.

(6) *The Day Committed Only to the Individual.* First, notice it is not committed to the unsaved. It is certainly most misleading to the unsaved to give them grounds for supposing that they will be more acceptable to God if they observe a day; for apart from the salvation which is in Christ all men are utterly and equally lost. For social or physical reasons a day of rest may

be secured to the benefit of all; but the unregenerate should understand that the observance of such a day adds nothing to their merit before God.

Second, note it is not committed to the Church as a body. The responsibility relative to the observance of the first day is of necessity committed to the individual believer only, and not to the Church as a whole, and the manner of its celebration by the individual is suggested in the two sayings of Christ on the morning of His resurrection: “O rejoice!” and “Go … tell.” This calls for ceaseless activity in all forms of worship and service; and such activity is in contrast to the seventh-day rest.

(7) *No Command to Keep the Day.* Since it is all of grace, a written requirement for the keeping of the Lord’s day is not imposed, nor is the manner of its observance prescribed. By this wise provision, none are encouraged to keep the day as a mere duty; it is to be kept from the heart. Israel stood before God as immature children under tutors and governors and needing the commandments which are given to a child (Gal. 4:1–3), whereas the Church stands before God as adult sons (4:4–7). Their life under grace is clearly defined, indeed, but it is presented only as the beseechings of God with the expectation that all shall be done *willingly* (Eph. 4:1–3; Rom. 12:1–2). There is little question over how a well-instructed, Spirit-filled believer (and the Scripture presupposes a normal Christian to be such) should be occupied on the day which commemorates Christ’s resurrection and the New Creation. If perchance the child of God is not yielded to Him, no unwilling observance of a day will correct his carnal heart nor would such observance be pleasing to God. The issue between God and the carnal Christian is not one of outward actions, but of a yielded life.

In terminating this discussion respecting the truth that a new day has been divinely introduced which is in harmony with the New Creation and that this day celebrates the event which ushered in the new order, namely, the resurrection of Christ, it is further to be asserted that, as the New Creation is the one divine objective in this age and as Israel’s covenants are in abeyance until this objective is realized, it is not only reasonable but imperative that the Sabbath with all its own significance as the celebration of the old order should be abrogated and supplanted by the day which belongs to the present divine purpose. This, indeed, is what has been divinely ordered, and the new day obtains whether a Judaized church

comprehends it or not. At no point are the distinctions between Judaism and Christianity brought more into juxtaposition than in the different days they celebrate. The Jews never made choice of the seventh day; it was Jehovah's choice for them. Christians never made choice of the first day; it, too, is the appointment of God and is observed by the church in spite of her confused mind regarding it. In fact, the Covenant theologian's problem is not whether the first or the seventh day should be observed; his problem is to account for the fact that the church does observe the first day. Not allowed to recognize the heaven-high New Creation lest it disrupt the theory of one unchangeable covenant, the best that he can do is to invest the new day with the features of the old day and assign to the new day the inappropriate, antithetical, antipodal term, *Christian Sabbath.* Happy are they who understand and do the will of God for the day they observe!

Conclusion

Every effort to set forth the doctrinal import of Christ's resurrection must prove inadequate. When the human mind grasps the truth respecting the exalted position to which the believer is brought through his vital union with the resurrected Christ, that mind may then hope to penetrate somewhat into the significance of Christ's glorious *anastasis.*

Chapter XI

The Ascension and Session of Christ Incarnate

Again the attentive student of the Sacred Text is confronted with major doctrines and age-characterizing ministries of Christ which by theologians generally are neglected to the point of dishonor to Christ; especially is this true of those of a Covenant school who in defense of a man-made theory must avoid all that is distinctive in this age of God's supreme achievements, lest the dead level of a supposed immutable covenant should be brought to disorder and confusion. Why, indeed, should any emphasis be placed on the limitless achievements of Christ's present ministry when, according to this theory, saints of former ages were equally blessed with the saints of this age? Nevertheless, and with no support for a man-made theory, the age-characterizing ministries are recorded on the pages of the Word of God. It is no small issue that the present ministries of Christ which are of the greatest consequence should be disregarded by theological writers. The unfortunate effect of such neglect is that the majority of students accept without question or investigation the doctrinal position and emphasis of their teachers. Even the teachers themselves are run into the mold of their own instructors. For this reason, there is little hope of a new and worthy reconsideration of the interpretation of the Bible. Naturally the student looks upon any truth which was neglected by his teacher as of no great moment or even as dangerous. To many the only body of interpretation which is orthodox is that which was recovered by the Reformers, or that contained in an ancient doctrinal statement. There is, however, a great body of truth which the Reformers were unable to consider and which is lacking in ancient creeds. It is this which worthy expositors have brought to light in subsequent days. Since these expositors are as capable in the field of analysis of revealed truth as were the Reformers, the results of their labors should at least have some consideration. Two schools are developing among orthodox men: one which restricts all doctrine to the findings of men from the very early days of Protestantism, and one which, while accepting the sound teaching of the Reformers, recognizes that much added light has

fallen (by reason of the Spirit and His continued ministry) upon the Word of God in later days and that this is as worthy of consideration as the findings of men of former times. Of these two schools, the first-named has too often looked upon the vital truth presented by the other as speculative, precarious, or perilous. The present ministries of Christ, like His resurrection and the Pauline doctrine of the Church, however, must be recognized, weighed, and given a full place regardless of the theories or prejudices of men in any work on theology which purports to be at all complete. As suggested by the caption by which this chapter is designated, there are two aspects of truth relative to Christ to be considered, namely, His ascension and His session. These are sufficiently related to be combined in one general division.

I. The Ascension

The doctrinal importance of Christ's ascension lies not so much in His departure from the world as it does in His arrival in heaven. Yet some attention should be given to His departure from this world, since it occupies a prominent place in the historical narrative. The whole theme of Christ's ascension is divided with reference to two events: the ascension on the resurrection morn and the final ascension after forty days.

1. The Ascension on the Resurrection Morn. While it is probable that Christ was resident in heaven from the resurrection day onward and only visited the earth as contact with His followers dictated (cf. John 17:16)—in which case there were a number of ascensions—it is generally believed, perhaps without due consideration, that Christ remained in residence on the earth until His final departure on the clouds of heaven (Acts 1:9–11). To many, therefore, the suggestion that Christ ascended on the resurrection morn may cause surprise. That there was an immediate ascension following the resurrection is well indicated in the Scriptures, and that it was at the time of one antitype fulfillment is a certainty. The doctrine of an immediate ascension appears when two passages of Scripture are compared. It is recorded that when Christ came out of the tomb He was met by Mary, who in ecstatic devotion would have embraced His feet and held her Lord. Christ's loving declaration to her was, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend

unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20:17). Yet in Luke's account of the resurrection it is asserted that the same day in which He arose and at evening He not only appeared in the midst of the frightened disciples, but said unto them, "Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet" (Luke 24:38–40). As no intimation is given why He should not be touched before His ascension, speculation will achieve but little. It is enough to know that He was not to make contact with things of the earth, at least until the exact demands involved in His great redemptive mission were completed and His efficacious sacrifice had been presented in heaven. It is difficult not to believe that there was a sacred continuity to be guarded between His death and the presentation in heaven, which continuity would not permit any contact. Having abandoned the former sphere of relationship with His followers by His death and resurrection, the new and final relationship could not be entered into until He had completed it all by the presentation in heaven. The implication is clear that, since He could not be touched in the morning until He ascended and yet He could be "handled" at evening of the same day, He had ascended during the day. He ascended at once from the tomb and returned for such manifestations as were appointed for that day. "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father" means that He was about to ascend. Had He made reference in this message to His final ascension, there was no need that Mary carry the message of that to His disciples, since He Himself had before Him the entire forty days in which to deliver the news Himself. Of the two recorded ascensions, that of the resurrection morn holds the greater doctrinal significance. He had said to His Father in His final priestly prayer, "And now come I to thee" (John 17:13), and this return is not only momentous in the whole history of the universe, but it is the natural sequence after Calvary. He had come forth from the Father for the purpose of securing man's redemption (Heb. 10:4–7) and now He returned to the Father where He belonged by all right and title. His ascension was no penetration into unexplored regions—it was a going home in triumph, and helpless indeed is the human imagination to picture that welcome, that reunion, and that heavenly ecstasy. The Beloved was returning who was ever the Father's

delight; but how much more is He welcome at the end of so great an achievement in which all the Father's desire is realized and the Son's perfect obedience is actualized!

Certain achievements were wrought by the Son of God at the time of His first ascension. These fashion the doctrinal meaning of this event. In so far as human sentiment may be attributed to Deity, it may be recognized as true that there was great celestial joy in heaven when the Son returned from the earth. This would have its fullest manifestation when He first returned directly from the tomb. His appearance—marvelous above anything angels had ever seen—was, as it ever will be, the central glory of heaven itself; but from the doctrinal viewpoint the first ascension accounts for the long-anticipated fulfilling of two foreshadowings of the Old Testament as well as their becoming the eternal reality which the antitypes are.

a. Christ Entered the Heavenly Sanctuary. Bearing only on the antitypical meaning of the Day of Atonement when all things were purified by blood and especially on the meaning of the high priest entering into the holy of holies and not without blood, the writer to the Hebrews asserts: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:23–24). No great difficulty arises in connection with the disclosure that mundane things were purified by blood. Of this it is written by the same author: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission" (9:19–22). It is evident that, as the typical blood of beasts served to purify all things of the earthly sanctuary, Christ's entrance into heaven itself—typified by the high priest entering the holy of holies and sprinkling the mercy seat—was in some way, not fully revealed, a purifying of "heavenly things" by "better sacrifices." The widest range of interpretations is advanced

respecting this heavenly purification. Though extended, the analysis of the passage made by F. W. Grant in *The Numerical Bible* clarifies the issues in several particulars. He writes:

> The things to which the Levitical system pointed are now fulfilled, the true Day of Atonement, the Great High Priest of a better tabernacle, who has entered the sanctuary, "not by the blood of bulls and goats, but by His own blood," having found, not an atonement which would last a year, but "*eternal* redemption." Thus the worshiper has at last his conscience purified from dead works, from that which had in it no savor of life; would not satisfy, therefore, the living God. The legalism of the old covenant has been replaced by the grace of the new. The eternal inheritance is secured to those who are called by the grace of the gospel. Christ is thus the High Priest of those good things which were typified in Judaism, things still to come, which its shadows pointed to, but nothing more. The tabernacle is a better and more perfect one, "not made with hands," not belonging to the old creation. The blood of goats and bulls has been replaced by the value of His own blood, in virtue of which He has entered in once for all into the holy places, having found an "eternal redemption." He entered in in the triumph of having done this. There may be need of some additional clearing of the old types which are here interpreted for us, as well as of their application to the things of which they speak. The mercy-seat in the holiest, as being the "propitiatory," or place of propitiation, propitiation or atonement (for the word is the same in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in its translation in the Septuagint Greek) being made upon it once a year, the question cannot but be raised, How does this affect the question of propitiation for us being really made in heaven, in some sense at least, when our High Priest entered in? It is evident that for Israel the blood upon the mercy-seat was the fundamental condition of all their blessing. Atonement, or propitiation, was then made "for the holy sanctuary, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation" (Lev. 16:33). Insomuch that this and this alone was the "day of atonement," apart from which no other sacrifice could legally have been offered, or God have remained in their midst at all. Is there nothing, then, in the substance that answers to these shadows, that answers just to this putting of the blood upon the mercy-seat, equally fundamental, that the throne may be for us that "throne of grace" which we know it to be? Or, can this speak simply of the Cross, and what was done there? and was not the blood, in any sense, carried in so as to be presented for acceptance before God in heaven? Now, there is another question that may be asked in return, which, simple as it is, deserves yet serious consideration. Does any one conceive of our blessed Lord carrying in literally His blood into heaven? That will, of course, be denied at once, and wonder expressed even at the suggestion of it. These are figures, it will be rightly said, and must be figuratively conceived; and we may add, as the apostle declares of them, that they are not even "the very image" of what they represent. This must not be taken as license for any avoidance of honest, consistent observance of the very terms in which it has pleased God to reveal things to us, as has many times been said, yet it has to be considered and reckoned with none the less. What could the application of the blood to the various objects to which it was applied in the Levitical ritual mean with reference to us now? When the high priest had completed his work in the tabernacle, he went out to the altar (of burnt-offering) to apply the blood similarly there. Are we to conceive of this as some further presentation of it for acceptance in relation to what the altar typifies? It is plain that this cannot be. The altar was that from which the daily sacrifices went up for Israel, and the blood put upon it for propitiation simply set forth the

> righteousness of God in accepting what was done there. Just so by that upon the mercy-seat God's righteousness was set forth in continuing to dwell among a sinful people. In each case it was the blood that made the propitiation (Lev. 17:11); and the application of it gave it no new efficacy, but simply revealed its efficacy in particular relations. It was one of those object-lessons of which the ritualistic service consisted, and which may be easily strained in the endeavor to find in them a kind of exactness which does not belong to them. Thus, because the burning upon the altar followed the slaying of the victim, it was made by many to speak of atoning sufferings on the Lord's part *after* death. It has been forgotten in all such cases that "no parable can teach doctrine." We must find elsewhere the doctrine which the type illustrates, before we can find the ground for a just application. Now it is here that the doctrine thought to be found in Scripture as to this fails so absolutely. Where shall we expect to find it if not in Hebrews, where confessedly the Day of Atonement is the text upon which the apostle is dwelling in all this part? And where is it to be found in Hebrews, or anywhere else in the New Testament, that Christ went into heaven to make propitiation there? to present His work to God for its acceptance, or in any sense to sprinkle the blood upon the Eternal Throne? Quite another thing is, in fact, taught there,—namely, that Christ entered in once into the holy places, *having obtained* eternal redemption. As risen from the dead, raised up by the glory of the Father, He entered once, not the second time, propitiation therefore already accomplished, the resurrection the evidence of the ransom accepted, nothing remaining in this way to be done. The virtue of the blood revealed itself all the way, even as the typical veil of the sanctuary had been rent at the Cross already, before a step had been taken on the triumphant journey. All is as consistent as possible, and as plain as need be. And if it be said, Have we, then, nothing that answers more closely to this priestly action at the Throne? the answer is abundant, that the reality far transcends the type; for not only has the Throne been acting in power thus all along the road, but the Great High Priest, "having made by Himself purification of sins, He seated Himself" *upon* the Throne, "at the right hand of the Majesty on high." No blood is needed further to assure us that the Throne whereon He sits who shed it is a Throne of triumphant, glorious grace. *Christ there* is, as we are told in the epistle to the Romans (chap. 3:25), "set forth a propitiatory" (or mercy-seat) "through faith, by His blood." Christ is HIMSELF, in heaven, the blood-sprinkled mercy-seat. The New Testament, while confirming and interpreting the Old, goes yet far beyond it; and this is an important principle for its interpretation. Where should we find this more than in the light which thus streams out through these opened heavens?—*Heb. to Rev.*, 2nd ed., pp. 50–52

Mr. Grant, it would seem, has hardly considered all that is implied in the problem respecting the taking of Christ's blood into heaven, for the terminology—heavenly things purified by a better sacrifice—indicates a cleansing by blood. Is it only the historical fact that Christ's blood was shed which is accepted as the ground of heaven's cleansing, or is it the actual blood taken into heaven? It is probable that not enough is revealed to help one to a clear understanding and solution of the problem. The two types involved are specific enough: (a) that of the two birds, the second of which is dipped in the blood of the first bird and released, all of this a type of Christ rising and ascending into heaven and taking His blood with Him; (b)

the high priest on the Day of Atonement going into the holiest and there applying the blood to the mercy seat. The blood, it is true, becomes the ground of propitiation; but that is hardly the issue here. The fact remains that in both types the blood is carried either into the sky by the bird or into the typical earthly sanctuary by the high priest. In the latter instance, it is plain how an awful throne of judgment becomes a throne of grace.

b. Christ the First-Fruits. With reference to Leviticus 23:9–14, C. H. Mackintosh writes:

> The beautiful ordinance of the presentation of the sheaf of first-fruits typified the resurrection of Christ, who, "at the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," rose triumphant from the tomb, having accomplished the glorious work of redemption. His was a "resurrection *from among* the dead"; and in it we have at once the earnest and the type of the resurrection of His people. "Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming." When Christ comes, His people will be raised "from among the dead [ἐκ νεκρῶν]," that is, those of them that sleep in Jesus; "but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished" (Rev. 20:5). When, immediately after the transfiguration, our blessed Lord spoke of His rising "*from among the dead,* " the disciples questioned among themselves what that could mean (cf. Mark 9). Every orthodox Jew believed in the doctrine of the "resurrection of the dead [ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν]," but the idea of a "resurrection from among the dead [ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν]" was what the disciples were unable to grasp; and no doubt many disciples since then have felt considerable difficulty with respect to a mystery so profound. However, if my reader will prayerfully study and compare 1 Corinthians 15 with 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18, he will get much precious instruction upon this most interesting and practical truth. He can also look at Romans 8:11 in connection.—"But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead [ἐκ νεκρῶν] dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." From all these passages it will be seen that the resurrection of the Church will be upon precisely the same principle as the resurrection of Christ. Both the Head and the body are shown to be raised "from among the dead." The first sheaf and all the sheaves that follow after are morally connected. … "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven Sabbaths shall be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat-offering unto the Lord. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave-loaves of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baken with leaven; they are the first-fruits unto the Lord" (Lev. 23:15–17). This is the feast of Pentecost—the type of God's people, gathered by the Holy Ghost, and presented before Him, in connection with all the preciousness of Christ. In the passover we have the death of Christ, in the sheaf of first-fruits we have the resurrection of Christ, and in the feast of Pentecost we have the descent of the Holy Ghost to form the Church. All this is divinely perfect. The death and resurrection of Christ had to be accomplished ere the Church could be formed. The sheaf was offered and then the loaves were baked. And, observe, "they shall be baken *with leaven.*" Why was this? Because they were intended to foreshadow those who, though filled with the Holy Ghost, and adorned with His gifts and graces, had, nevertheless, *evil* dwelling in them. The assembly, on the day of Pentecost, stood in the full value of the blood of Christ, was

> crowned with the gifts of the Holy Ghost; but there was leaven there also. No power of the Spirit could do away with the fact that there was evil dwelling in the people of God. It might be suppressed and kept out of view, but it was there. This fact is foreshadowed in the type by the leaven in the two loaves, and it is set forth in the actual history of the Church; for albeit God the Holy Ghost was present in the assembly, the flesh was there likewise to lie unto Him. Flesh is flesh, nor can it ever be made aught else than flesh. The Holy Ghost did not come down on the day of Pentecost to improve nature or do away with the fact of its incurable evil, but to baptize believers into one body, and connect them with their living Head in heaven.—*Notes on Leviticus*, Amer. ed., pp. 337–39, 341–42

Thus in His first ascension Christ appeared at once in heaven, having finished the work of redemption. The first type fulfilled in that first ascension is that of the high priest entering the holy of holies, while the second type fulfilled is that of the wave sheaf, the first-fruits of harvest.

2. The Final Ascension on the Clouds of Heaven. It is true that the two recognized ascensions of Christ may be, as they often are, contemplated as one event by the Scripture. The first, nevertheless, as indicated above, is the time of the formal presentation and the fulfilling of typical expectation, while the second represents the visible, final departure from earth to heaven and the seating of Christ on His Father’s throne. As quoted above, F. W. Grant relates the seating with His presentation in heaven. Doubtless there is a sense in which Christ was hailed as the occupant of the throne when He entered heaven at the time of the first ascension, yet that could hardly have been the moment of His final and permanent occupancy of that throne. His missions to the earth during the succeeding forty days would preclude this.

The pertinent question is raised whether Christ’s glory was veiled to any extent during the forty-day appearances, as it had been veiled during His precross ministry. As throwing light upon this, it may be remembered that the Apostle John had seen Christ in His baptism, His earth ministry, His transfiguration, His death, His resurrection, and in His postresurrection appearances; yet when he saw the Christ in heaven, in His present glory and as all will see Him, he fell at His feet as one dead. Of this experience he relates: “And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death” (Rev. 1:17–18). It would follow that, as all who saw Christ after the resurrection were able to recognize Him, to

relate Him to His former appearance, and to endure the sight, His forty-day appearances were also veiled to a large degree.

While, according to the twofold approach to the whole revelation respecting Christ's ascension being followed, each event is characterized by achievements and occurrences peculiar to itself, there are Scriptures which contemplate the ascension as one complete event. In this connection, it is instructive to consider:

Psalm 68:18. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them."

This passage, quoted by the Apostle in Ephesians 4:8, draws out the following comment from Erling C. Olsen:

> Observe that the 8th verse of the 4th chapter of Ephesians is a direct quotation from the 18th verse of the 68th Psalm. David said in that verse: "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men …" Of whom was David speaking? The Apostle Paul, through the Holy Spirit, tells us it is the Lord Jesus, for he declares: "(Now he that ascended is he also that first descended into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)" In other words, the Jehovah of the Old Testament is the Lord Jesus of the New Testament! It is He who first descended into the lower parts of the earth, in order to deliver those who were held captive. Then He *ascended*, taking with Him the spoils of His triumph. Now from that high, exalted place in the heavens He has given gifts to men. To some He has given the gift of apostleship; to some, that of evangelist; to some, pastors; and to others, teachers. For what purpose? For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.—*Meditations in the Psalms*, I, 494

Proverbs 30:4. "Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?"

Dr. H. A. Ironside writes the following bearing on this passage:

> How vast the ignorance of the most learned man, when confronted with questions like these! We are at once reminded of the Lord's challenge to Job, in the 38th and 39th chapters of the wonderful book that bears his name. At the best, human knowledge is most circumscribed and contracted. No man, apart from divine revelation, could reply to the questions here asked. The first never found an answer until the words of our Lord concerning Himself, as recorded in John 3:13: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." He it was who descended likewise, as it is written. "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things" (Eph. 4:9, 10). How much

there is for the believer in the precious truth connected with the Lord's descent and ascension! Because of our sins He died upon the cross, bearing the righteous judgment of God. There He drank the dreadful cup of wrath which we could never have completely drained to all eternity. But because of who He was, He could drink the cup, and exhaust the wrath, leaving naught but blessing for all who trust in Him. He died, and was buried, but God raised Him from the dead, and in triumph He ascended to glory. Enoch was translated that he should not see death. Elijah was caught up in a flaming chariot, and carried by a whirlwind to heaven. But neither of these went up in his own power. Jesus, His work finished, and His ministry on earth accomplished, ascended of His own volition, passing through the upper air as easily as He had walked upon the water. The fact of His having gone up and having been received by the Shekinah—the cloud of divine Majesty—testifies to the perfection of His work in putting away forever the believer's sins. When on the tree, "Jehovah laid on Him the iniquity of us all." He could not be now in the presence of God if one sin remained upon Him. But all have been righteously settled for and put away, never to come up again: therefore He has gone in, in the power of His own blood, having accomplished eternal redemption. "Wherefore He saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men" (Eph. 4:8). He had "destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," that He might "deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:14, 15). The trembling, anxious sinner is pointed by the Holy Ghost, not to Church or sacraments, not to ordinances or legal enactments, not to frames or feelings, but to a risen and ascended Christ seated in highest glory! "The righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above:) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach; that, if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:6–10). Christ bore our sins on the cross. He died for them. He has been raised from the dead in token of God's infinite satisfaction in His work. He has ascended up to heaven, and His place on the throne of God as a Man in glory, is proof positive, that our sins are gone forever. This it is that, believed, gives deep and lasting peace. When the believer realizes that all has been done in a way that suits God; that He who accomplished it is one with the Father; that man as a fallen creature had no part in that work save to commit the sins for which the Saviour died: then, and not till then, does the majesty of the work of the cross dawn upon the soul. The question, "What is His name, and what is His Son's name?" followed by the challenge, "Declare, if thou canst tell," finds its answer in the New Testament revelation of the Father and the Son.—*Notes on Proverbs*, pp. 435–39

John 3:13. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven."

While this passage is not directly on the ascension of Christ, there is much in it about Christ's rightful place in heaven and an anticipation of His return to heaven from whence He came. Dean Alford states here:

The whole verse seems to have intimate connexion with and reference to Proverbs 30:4, "Who hath ascended up to heaven, or descended?" and as spoken to a learned doctor of the

law, would recall that verse,—especially as the further question is there asked, “Who hath gathered *the wind* in His fists?” and “What is His name, and what is His Son’s name?” See also Deuteronomy 30:12, and the citation, Romans 10:6–8. All attempts to explain away the plain sense of this verse are futile and ridiculous. The Son of Man, the Lord Jesus, the Word made Flesh, *was in, came down from,* heaven,—and was *in heaven* (heaven about Him, heaven dwelling on earth, ch. 1:52), *while here,* and ascended up into heaven when He left this earth;—and by all these proofs, speaking in the prophetic language of accomplished Redemption, does the Lord establish, that *He alone* can speak of *heavenly things* to men, or convey the blessing of the new birth to them. Be it remembered, that He is here speaking *by anticipation,* of *results* of His course and sufferings on earth,—of the way of regeneration and salvation which God has appointed by Him. He regards therefore throughout the passage, the great facts of redemption *as accomplished,* and makes announcements which could not be literally acted upon till they had been so accomplished. See vv. 14 ff., whose sense will be altogether lost, unless this **hath ascended up** be understood of His exaltation to be a Prince and a Saviour, **which is in heaven**. See ch. 1:18 and note. Doubtless the meaning involves “*whose place is in heaven*”; but it also asserts the being in heaven of the *time then present:* see ch. 1:52. Thus majestically does the Lord characterize His whole life of humiliation in the flesh, between His descent and His ascent. As uniting in Himself God, whose dwelling is Heaven, with man, whose dwelling is on earth, He ever was in heaven. And nearly connected with this fact is the transition to His being the fountain of eternal life, in vv. 14 ff.: cf. 1 Cor. 15:47–50, where the same connexion is strikingly set forth. To explain such expressions as “*to ascend up into heaven,* ” etc., as mere *Hebrew metaphors* (Lücke, De Wette, etc.) is no more than saying that Hebrew metaphors were founded on deep insight into divine truth:—these words in fact express *the truths on which Hebrew metaphors were constructed.* Socinus is quite right, when he says that *those who take* “hath ascended up into heaven” *metaphorically, must in all consistency take* “he that came down from heaven” *metaphorically also*; “the descent and ascent must be both of the same kind.”—*New Testament for English Readers,* I, 484

Ephesians 1:20–23. “Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”

The span of the ascension of Christ is measured in this Scripture. Not only has He left the tomb and returned to His native place, but He is exalted above all others, with all authority in heaven and on earth committed to Him; yet His humanity is present too. There is a *man* in the glory. His glorified humanity is retained forever.

Ephesians 4:8–10. “Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended,

what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)”

Reference to this portion has been made by the writers quoted above. The text contemplates the whole movement down to the earth and to death and the movement back again with the immeasurable fruits of His conquest. Much emphasis is placed in the New Testament upon the exceeding greatness of the occasion on which the eternal Son of God came into the world. Here, as elsewhere, an equally great achievement is indicated, namely, Christ’s return or ascension back to His former place and glory. It is written that He prayed as He was about to leave this world: “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5).

Acts 1:9–11. “And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.”

The historical facts related to Christ’s final ascension are here set forth in simple terms. Having indicated the divinely arranged delay in the realization of Israel’s earthly kingdom (Acts 1:6–7) and having defined the scope of the responsibility of His own in the world in this age together with the provided power of the enabling Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8), Christ departs into heaven. This Scripture traces His movement no further than that He was removed from human sight. That He ascended above all authorities and powers in angelic realms, that He assumed vast authority, and that He is seated upon His Father’s throne must be understood from other portions of the New Testament. Of great significance is the fact that, as His last words in the world, He gives a comprehensive statement respecting Israel’s kingdom to the effect that—though it is in no way abandoned—its time of realization is left indefinite relative to human understanding but fully determined in the mind and purpose of God, and a statement that the present age, if wholly indefinite with respect to duration, is to be characterized by a believing witness unto Himself in the power of the Holy Spirit. Such themes are eminently fitting—and they alone would be—for the final word

He has left this world. As a theme, Christ's activity and responsibility in heaven belong to the next division of the chapter.

II. The Session

The present ministry of Christ in heaven, known as His session, is far-reaching both in consequence and import. It, too, has not been treated even with a passing consideration by Covenant theologians, doubtless due to their inability—because of being confronted with their one-covenant theory—to introduce features and ministries which indicate a new divine purpose in the Church and by so much tend to disrupt the unity of a supposed immutable purpose and covenant of God's. Since, as will be seen, certain vital ministries of Christ in heaven provide completely for the believer's security, the present session of Christ has been eschewed by Arminians in a manner equally unpardonable. This neglect accounts very well for the emphasis of their pulpit ministrations. The Christian public, because deprived of the knowledge of Christ's present ministry, are unaware of its vast realities, though they are able from childhood itself to relate the mere historical facts and activities of Christ during His three and one-half years of service on earth. That Christ is doing anything now is not recognized by Christians generally and for this a part-truth kind of preaching is wholly responsible. It yet remains true, whether neglected by one or the other kind of theologian, that Christ is now engaged in a ministry which determines the service and destiny of all those who have put their trust in Him. Various aspects of His present ministry are here indicated.

1. The Exercise of Universal Authority. An inscrutable mystery is present in the fact that all authority is committed by the Father to the Son. In the light of the complete evidence that the Son is equal in His Person with the Father, it is difficult to understand how authority could be committed to the Son which was not properly His in His own right. Whatever may be the solution of that problem, it is certain that "all power" is given unto Christ (Matt. 28:18). And that power, while it was used in the beginning for the creation of all things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, including thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, is exercised now to the end that all things may hold together (Col. 1:16–17).

The very seating of Christ far above all intelligences (Eph. 1:20–21) implies that He is over them in complete authority. Thus, in a similar way, it is written that the Father hath put all things under the feet of the Son, excepting of course Himself (1 Cor. 15:27). This power will be exercised in the coming kingdom age to the end that all rule, authority, power, and every enemy—even death—shall be subdued (1 Cor. 15:24–28); but that same authority is possessed by the Son inherently and then is exercised in those ways in which it is required. It is, therefore, essential that when drawing a picture of the exalted Christ and in contemplating His Person and present activity He should be seen as the One who, under the Father, is above and over all things in the universe in the sense that they owe their very existence to Him, are held together by Him, and are governed by Him.

2. Head Over All Things to the Church. Unavoidably, this theme recurs in this chapter, though considered already under Christ's resurrection. Much, indeed, is made in the prophetic Scriptures of the future relation Christ will sustain as King to Israel and the nations at that time when He shall have returned to the earth; but now in the present age Christ is, through the same exaltation by the Father which placed Him above all intelligences, made to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body (cf. Eph. 1:22–23; Col. 1:18). Out of this Headship various responsibilities arise which will, because of their vital import, be traced as major divisions of this theme. The point of present emphasis is the essential fact of Christ's Headship over the one Church, which is His Body. That it is termed *the Church, which is His Body* differentiates it from every form of the organized or visible church, which organized church at best is no more than an outward representation (with wheat and tares) in one locality and in one generation of that larger company of all believers in every locality and every generation who, being individually joined to Christ and perfected in Him, are one Body. This Headship is organic and real. Into Him are all the saved ones placed by the baptism of the Spirit and He is over them as the Head to that Body which they thus form. It is certain that Christ was not Head over all things to the Church until He ascended into heaven. The Church was not yet formed during His earthly ministry (cf. Matt. 16:18), nor until the descent of the Spirit on Pentecost. This assertion is not only sustained by uncomplicated, direct teaching of the New Testament but by

the types as well. It was precisely fifty days after the wave sheaf—the type of Christ in resurrection—when the two loaves were waved which are a type of the Church, yet to be raised also and presented in glory. The loaf represents an uncounted number of particles sealed into one unit. Thus, also, the Church is one though formed out of a multitude of people from every kindred, tongue, and tribe. The Church is the supreme heavenly purpose of God and Christ's Headship over it is as exalted as that which is pre-eminent in the mind of the eternal God could be. The teaching ministry of Christ may well serve as an illustration of His Headship relation to every member of His Body. In John 16:13 it is recorded that complete instruction is ever being given to each yielded believer by the indwelling Spirit. It is clearly pointed out that the Spirit does not originate the message which He imparts, but rather speaks in the believer's heart whatsoever He hears. The One to whom the Spirit listens and whose message the Spirit transmits is none other than Christ, who stated "I have yet many things to say unto you" (vs. 12). It is thus the wonderful privilege of each member of the Body of Christ to receive direct messages of instruction and comfort from his exalted Head up in glory.

3. The Bestower of Gifts. According to the New Testament, a gift is a divine enablement wrought in and through the believer by the Spirit who indwells him. It is the Spirit working thereby to accomplish certain divine purposes and using the one whom He indwells to that end. It is in no sense a human undertaking aided by the Spirit. Though certain general gifts are mentioned in the Scriptures (Rom. 12:3–8; 1 Cor. 12:4–11), the possible variety is unlimited since no two lives are lived under exactly the same conditions. However, to each believer some gift is given, although the blessing and power of the gift will be experienced only when the life is wholly yielded to God. (In Romans 12, then, the truth of verses 1 and 2 precedes that of verses 6–8.) There will be little need of exhortation to God-honoring service for the one who is filled with the Spirit; for the Spirit will be working in that one both to will and to do of His good pleasure (Phil. 2:13). In like manner, certain men who are called His "gifts unto men" are provided and locally placed in their service by the ascended Christ (Eph. 4:7–11). The Lord did not leave this work to the uncertain and insufficient judgment of men (1 Cor. 12:11, 18). The bestowment of gifts is but another

instance in which the personal and individual supervision of the exalted Christ over each member of His Body is disclosed. Each one is appointed to the exercise of a spiritual gift and that "as he will" (1 Cor. 12:11).

4. The Intercessor. This ministry of prayer began before He left the earth (John 17:1–26), is carried on for the saved rather than the unsaved (John 17:9), and will be continued in heaven as long as His own are in the world (John 17:20). As Intercessor, His work has to do with the weakness, the helplessness, and the immaturity of the saints who are on the earth—things over which they have no control. He who knows the limitations of His own and the power and strategy of the foe with whom they have to contend, has become unto them the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls. His care of Peter is somewhat an illustration of this truth (Luke 22:31–32). The priestly intercession of Christ is not only effectual, but is unending. The priests of old failed partly because of death; but Christ, because He ever liveth, hath an unchanging priesthood: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost [hence, without end] that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb. 7:25). David recognized the same divine shepherding care and its guarantee of eternal safety, when he said "The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Ps. 23:1). One of the four reasons assigned in Romans 8:34 for the believer's safekeeping is that Christ now "maketh intercession for us." The effectiveness of the intercession of Christ in the preservation of each believer is declared to be absolute. As quoted above, "He is able also to save them to the uttermost," that is, to save and keep saved forever those who come unto God by Him and this on the ground of His ministry of intercession.

5. The Advocate. The child of God is often guilty of actual sin which would separate him from God were it not for his Advocate and what He wrought in His death. The effect of the Christian's sin upon himself is that he loses his fellowship with God, his joy, his peace, and his power. On the other hand, these experiences are restored in infinite grace on the sole ground that he *confess* his sin (1 John 1:9); but it is still more important to consider the Christian's sin in relation to the holy character of God. Through the present priestly advocacy of Christ in heaven there is absolute

safety and security for the Father's child even while he is sinning. An advocate is one who espouses and pleads the cause of another in the open courts. As Advocate, therefore, Christ is now appearing in heaven for His own (Heb. 9:24) when they sin. It is written: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1). His pleading is said to be with the Father, and Satan is there also, ceasing not to accuse the brethren night and day before God (Rev. 12:10). To the Christian, the sin may seem insignificant; but a holy God can never treat it lightly. It may be a secret sin on earth, but it is open scandal in heaven. The Psalmist wrote: "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance" (Ps. 90:8). In marvelous grace and without solicitation from men, the Advocate pleads the cause of the guilty child of God. What the Advocate does in thus securing the safety of the believer is so in accordance with infinite justice that He is mentioned in this connection as "Jesus Christ the righteous." He pleads His own efficacious blood and the Father is free to preserve His child against every accusation from Satan or men and from the very judgments which sin would otherwise impose, since Christ through His death became "the propitiation for our [Christians'] sins" (1 John 2:2). The truth concerning the priestly ministry of Christ in heaven does not make it easy for the Christian to sin. On the contrary, these very things are written that *we be not sinning* (1 John 2:1, Greek); for no one can sin carelessly who considers the necessary pleading which his sin imposes upon the Advocate. The priestly ministries of Christ as Intercessor and as Advocate are directed unto the eternal security of those who are saved (Rom. 8:34).

6. The Builder. One passage of great significance bears upon Christ's present undertaking in heaven as a Builder. He said "I go to prepare a place for you," and this in connection with the statement that in His Father's house, or universe, there are many abodes (John 14:1–3). Evidently not one of those abodes is in His estimation suitable for His Bride. Thus it comes about that He is preparing an abode which will be even more glorious than all within God's creation at present. He is now thus engaged.

7. Christ Expecting. Over and above all the stupendous present ministry of the resurrected, exalted Savior already noted is the attitude which He is said to maintain toward the day when, coming back to the earth, He will defeat all enemies and take the throne to reign. Important, indeed, is the revelation which discloses the fact that Christ is now in the attitude of expectation toward the oncoming day when, returning on the clouds of heaven, He will vanquish every foe (cf. Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; 2 Thess. 1:7–10; Rev. 19:15). Hebrews 10:13 records His expectation, which reads: "From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." This will be realized in connection with His return to the earth in power and great glory, which return is the theme of the next chapter in this treatment of Christology.

In concluding this chapter on the ascension and session of the resurrected Christ, attention is again called to the immensity of His undertakings—some accomplished when He ascended from the tomb and others when He ascended visibly on the clouds of heaven. To this may be added the continued saving of souls, even all who come unto Him (Matt. 11:28; John 6:37). As High Priest over the true tabernacle on high, the Lord Jesus Christ has entered into heaven itself there to minister as Priest in behalf of those who are His own in the world (Heb. 8:1–2). The fact that He, when ascending, was received of His Father in heaven is evidence that His earth-ministry was accepted. The fact that He sat down there indicated that His work for the world was completed. The fact that He sat down on His Father's throne and not on His own throne reveals the truth, so constantly and consistently taught in the Scriptures, that He did not set up a kingdom on the earth at His first advent into the world, but that He is now "expecting" until the time when His kingdom shall come in the earth and the divine will shall be done on earth as it is done in heaven. "The kingdoms of this world" are yet to become "the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:15), and the kingly Son will yet ask of His Father and He will give Him the nations for His inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession (Ps. 2:8). However, Scripture clearly indicates too that He is not now establishing that kingdom rule in the earth (Matt. 25:31–46), but that rather He is calling out from both Jews and Gentiles a heavenly people who are related to Him as His Body and Bride. After the present purpose is

accomplished He will return and “build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down” (Acts 15:13–18). Though He is a King-Priest according to the Melchizedek type (Heb. 5:10; 7:1–3), He is now serving as Priest and not as King. He who is coming again and will then be King of kings is now ascended on high to be “head over all things to the church, which is his body” (Eph. 1:22–23).

Chapter XII

The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate

Since Christ is the center of all Biblical prediction, there is properly an eschatology to be included in Christology. It contemplates the return of Christ to the earth, the kingdom which He will then set up on the earth, and His eternal reign. The first of these is now to be considered, the second in the chapter following, while the last forms the theme of the closing main division of Christology or chapter XIV.

Though theologians differ about the time and the manner of Christ's second advent, all who receive the Bible seriously do agree that He will return to this earth. The Scriptures clearly teach that Christ will come for judgment and for the setting up of His kingdom on the earth. Over this kingdom He with His Bride shall rule forever. No apology is entered or entertained for taking this vast body of Scripture which presents Christ's coming again and His kingdom in other than its natural, literal, and grammatical sense. All predictions due to be fulfilled before the present time, and they are many indeed, have been fulfilled after this manner and without exception; it is therefore reasonable to believe that unfulfilled predictions will be accomplished as faithfully and as definitely. It is possible that for want of faith some men of the past age of law who were confronted with predictions respecting the first advent when it was yet future were inclined to place some so-called spiritualizing interpretation upon these great prophecies; but it remained true, and would have remained so though no living man had taken God at His Word, that the inspired predictions moved on majestically in their natural, literal, and grammatical fulfillment. For those who have not done so, it may be the introduction into almost limitless fields of divine revelation and into overwhelming demonstrations of divine faithfulness to follow through an investigation which pursues this specific method of interpretation—such, anyway, is this division of Christology designed to be. The theme is as august, majestic, and consequential as the consummation of all divine purposes in mundane spheres must be. If matters of present world crises arrest the attention and spread consternation among all civilized inhabitants of the earth, how much

more should believing men be aroused to unprecedented attention by the portrayal of those stupendous realities which constitute the closing scenes—the final disposition of evil and the final enthronement of righteousness and peace unto all eternity to come! However vividly expressed, comparison between any event in the history of the world—unless it be the creation of the universe—and that program which is yet to come is, so far as that which is sublunary is concerned, more an antithesis than a parallel. With reference to the literal fulfillment of prophecy related to the first advent and the probability of literal fulfillment of prophecy related to the second advent, George N. H. Peters writes:

> If we were to adopt this principle of spiritualizing the [Second] Coming and the language employed in its usage, *then*, if consistently applied to the whole Bible, it would ignore the *literal, personal First Advent.* This is no caricature, but sober argument. Suppose our opponents are correct in their interpretation; let us then transplant ourselves to a period *before* the First Advent and apply their system to prophecies relating to that Advent and see the result. Let us, taking such an imaginative position, select e.g. Isa. 40:3, "the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness," etc., and according to the system just adopted, this would denote that divine truth would be heard in the earth even in the most abandoned parts of it, etc. Or, select e.g. Isa. 53, and we would have a representation of truth, its treatment, rejection, and final triumph. But what are the facts *as evidenced* by fulfilment? Have we not a literal voice, literal wilderness, literal address to Jews, a literal Coming, humiliation, sufferings, and death of Jesus Christ, etc.? According to the system of our opponents no such literal, personal fulfilment was intended, for if the predictions relating to the Sec. Advent, which are *far clearer, distinctive, and decisive* than those referring to the First, are to be understood as portraying a spiritual or providential Coming, *then surely*, if this measurer of prophecy is applied to the less distinct ones of the First Advent, they too only mean a spiritual or providential Coming. If the rule of interpretation holds good now, it ought to cover all time; for we know of no rules that were applicable to one age and not to another. If it be answered, that fulfilment shows that such and such language must be literally understood, *then* our reply is ready: the fulfilment is evidence that the spiritualistic interpretation on this point is *utterly untrustworthy*, while it gives decisive proof of *the consistency* of that adopted by the early Church.—*The Theocratic Kingdom*, II, 169

There could be no more decisive reason for giving a literal interpretation to the prophecies of the second advent than is set up by the fact that the prophecies of the first advent were thus fulfilled. Those who persist in a change of plan for the interpretation of that which is future have assigned to themselves the unenviable task of explaining why so violent a variation is introduced. At this point candor is challenged. If, perchance, the variation be interposed merely to defend a man-made idealism or to relieve a feeble credence, it deserves only the censure which belongs to unbelief. A

phenomenon exists, namely, that men who are conscientious and meticulous to observe the exact teaching of the Scripture in the fields of inspiration and the divine character of the Sacred Text, the ruin of the race through Adam's sin, the Deity and Saviorhood of Christ, are found introducing methods of spiritualizing and vamping the clear declarations of the Bible in the one field of Eschatology. So much has this tendency prevailed in the past two or three centuries that, as respecting theologians, they are almost wholly of this bold class. So great an effect calls for an adequate cause, and the cause is not difficult to identify. As previously indicated, when one is bound to a man-made covenant theory there is no room within that assumption for a restoration of Israel, that nation with all her earthly covenants and glory having been merged into the church. There is but one logical consummation —that advanced by Whitby with all its reckless disregard for the Biblical testimony, namely, that a hypothetical grace covenant will eventuate in a transformed social order, and not by the power of the returning Messiah but by the preaching of the gospel. In the present time there are those who, misapprehending the prediction that the gospel of the kingdom must be preached in all the world (Matt. 24:14), assert that Christ cannot return until the missionary enterprise has reached to all the inhabited earth, not recognizing that the passage in question is found in a context belonging to the future great tribulation and that because of the unending cycle of birth and death there could not be a set time in this age when the missionary enterprise would be completed.

The truth that Christ is coming to the earth again is so emphatically and repeatedly asserted in the Sacred Text that nearly all creeds have included it in their declarations, and only those who are lacking in respect for the verity of the Bible text fail to acknowledge that Christ is to return; however, a wide variation in belief has existed about how and when He will return. A woeful lack of attention to the precise testimony of the Word of God is revealed in these conflicting sentiments more than is found in connection with any other one doctrine. Human notions and fancies have run riot with little apparent attempt to harmonize these ideas with the Scriptures. The assumption must arise that men either do not read the text of the Bible carefully, or, reading it, they are not admonished by it. An example of the human imagination's straying when making no reference to the extended testimony of Scripture is furnished—and similar quotations might be made

from various theologians—by Dr. William Newton Clarke, late Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, in his book *An Outline of Christian Theology* (5th ed., pp. 443–46). Having written at some length on certain points and having implied that Christ's second advent is fulfilled in the death of the believer—using John 14:1–3 as the proof-text, by the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost, and by the destruction of Jerusalem, he summarizes as follows:

> Christ foretold a coming in his kingdom; the prediction was understood by his disciples to promise a visible coming at an early day, with startling manifestations of visible glory; but the prediction was fulfilled in the spiritual and invisible coming by means of which his spiritual work in the world has been carried forward. Or, to state more fully the view of Christ's coming that the Scriptures seem to warrant:—*a*. When he left the world, the work of Christ for the world, far from being finished, was only begun, and he was expecting still to carry it on toward completion. His prediction of a return, and an early return, was a true prediction, not destined to fail. *b.* Christ came again, in that spiritual presence with his people and the world by which his kingdom was constituted and his work upon mankind was done. This presence is such that his friends are not in orphanage, deprived of him (John 14:18); or, to use a figure frequent in the Scriptures, his Church is not a widow but a bride (Rev. 21:2–4). The New Jerusalem pictured at the end of the Apocalypse as the bride of Christ is not the symbol of the future life, but, as a careful reading is enough to show, represents the ideal Church of Christ in this world. To the production of this ideal state the spiritual coming of Christ tends, and is essential. *c.* Christ's coming was not accomplished in any one event. In reality, the event in which it was announced and introduced was the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost; and its first great providential accompaniment in history was the overthrow at Jerusalem. But his coming is not an event, it is a process that includes innumerable events, a perpetual advance of Christ in the activity of his kingdom. It has continued until now, and is still moving on. Christ came long ago, but he is truly the Coming One, for he is still coming, and is yet to come. *d.* No visible return of Christ to the earth is to be expected, but rather the long and steady advance of his spiritual kingdom. The expectation of a single dramatic advent corresponds to the Jewish doctrine of the nature of the kingdom, but not to the Christian. Jews, supposing the kingdom of the Messiah to be an earthly reign, would naturally look for the bodily presence of the king: but Christians who know the spiritual nature of his reign may well be satisfied with a spiritual presence, mightier than if it were seen. If our Lord will but complete the spiritual coming that he has begun, there will be no need of visible advent to make perfect his glory on the earth. The picturing of Christ's coming as a single event dramatic in its splendors and terrors, attended by resurrection and judgment, has served a useful purpose in keeping the thought of the unseen Christ fresh and vivid to the Church, in times when no other presentation of him, probably, would have been so effective. But at the same time it has been hurtful. It has led multitudes even of Christian people to regard the advent of their Saviour with more of terror than of desire. That great but terrible hymn, the "Dies Irae," has been only too true an expression of the common feeling. The Church has been led to regard herself as the widow and not the bride of Christ, and prevented from perceiving the power and love that were already abiding with her. This misapprehension has made it common for Christians to speak of the absent Lord; whereas he

> is the present Lord, reigning now in his spiritual kingdom. It has also led to a habitual underestimate of the intrinsic value of the present life and its common interests. Placing the reign of Christ mainly in the future, it has drawn attention away from his desire to fill all life now with the fulness of his holy dominion. Christianity has by no means been the friend to the family, to the nation, to commerce, to education, and to the common social life of man that it might have been if Christ had been recognized as the present reigning Lord, whose kingdom is a present reign of spiritual forces for the promotion of holiness and love. The present need is the need of living faith and love, to perceive the present Lord. It has long been common to call him the absent Lord: but after so long quoting his word of power, "Lo, I am with you alway," it is high time that the Church heard her own voice of testimony, and came to believe in him as the present Lord. The prevailing non-recognition of the present Christ amounts to unbelief. What is needed in order to awaken a worthier activity in the Church is a faith that discerns him as actually here in his kingdom, and appreciates the spiritual glory of his presence in the world. This view of the coming of Christ implies that the apostles grasped the spiritual idea of his kingdom but imperfectly, and that they expected what did not come to pass; and to many this seems inadmissible. Misapprehension on their part was of course a constant thing during his lifetime, but many think it cannot have existed after the Day of Pentecost, when they were taught by the Spirit of God. But it must be remembered that the Master told his disciples that "the times and seasons" were not for them to know (Acts 1:7), and that no man knew the time of his coming save that it would fall within the life of that generation (Mark 13:32). In this matter they were not to be helped by revelation. But apart from all theories of what the apostles were, we have to deal with the plain fact that the writers of the New Testament did expect an advent that did not occur. Wonderful indeed was the clearness of vision, and the trueness of perception, to which Christ's influence raised the disciples who knew him best; but we do not understand them if we overlook the fact that they were men of their own age, who received his truth into minds in which the thoughts of their age had influence. Here indeed was their power: for this enabled them to influence their own age, and send the influence on to ours. The glory of the first disciples lay not in the infallible correctness of their conceptions, but in their spiritual fellowship with Christ their Master.

This work of fiction which does not even draw its material from the Bible—though for remote identification it must introduce Christ and His disciples—is one mass of impossible error in doctrine from its beginning to its end; yet this work on theology has had acceptance with, and commendation from, an unusually large company of ministers and professors of note. Its fallacies should be noted briefly: (a) The entire assumption that Christ's coming is fulfilled by a "spiritual and invisible" program ignores every event connected with His return. These are too numerous to recount; but where, indeed, is the resurrection and translation of saints, the coming as lightning from the east which shines even unto the west, the taking of His earthly throne, the judgment of Israel and the nations, and why should anyone "watch" or "wait" for His coming? (b) The

writer confuses Christ's personal coming with His omnipresence. He is in the midst when two or three are gathered unto Him, but that fact does not imply that His promise to come as Bridegroom and Judge has been, or is now, being fulfilled. (c) Dr. Clarke's assertion that Christ's promise to return at an early time was not fulfilled—hence the disciples misunderstood Him on that point—is a restriction on the word γενεά (*generation*, cf. Matt. 24:34, etc.) which a man of Dr. Clarke's scholarship should never have tolerated. When he declares that the disciples expected what did not come to pass, he implies that the writers of the New Testament were misinformed and were permitted to incorporate their misunderstandings into the Sacred Text itself. (d) As for the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse by "a careful reading" being seen to be "the ideal Church" now in the world, the pertinent questions may be asked, what of its coming down from God out of heaven, its light as a jasper stone, its great wall, its twelve angels, its gates of pearl, its foundation of jasper and other gems, and the city itself being of pure gold like unto clear glass, its freedom from need of the sun as its light, and the lighting of it by the glory of God and the Lamb? (e) As for Christ's coming at the death of the believer, this point, too, lacks any semblance of the eschatological events predicted and confuses "the last enemy" with the "blessed hope." This is almost to transform death, the hideous, divine judgment upon the sin of man, into Christ Himself, and teaches that the blessings that await those who "fall asleep … in Jesus" are bestowed by death rather than by Christ. (f) That Christ came at Pentecost is Dr. Clarke's central claim; yet he has overlooked the facts, that his theory confuses two Persons of the Godhead, and that at the time of Pentecost no New Testament book had been written but still all the New Testament writers treat the coming of Christ as a future event. (g) That Christ came back in the destruction of Jerusalem is an unpardonable confounding of Matthew 24:15–22 with Luke 21:20–24. Here Dr. Clarke might with profit have undertaken one of those "careful readings," referred to above. It is true that he sees a "negative" aspect of Christ's coming at this point—a clearing away of the rubbish which Israel represented and a preparation for the setting up of His proposed new order; but the fact remains that a Roman army is not the Person of Christ, nor is the death of a million Jews the "blessed hope." (h) As for the declaration—"If our Lord will but complete the spiritual coming that he has begun, there will be no need of visible

advent to make perfect his glory on the earth”—it is to be wondered just what would have become of Dr. Clarke’s dream had he lived to see the second World War and a time when careless, inattentive preachers were having more and more trouble to find some reality that would take the place of such phantasms of a perfected social order.

Not a moment’s attention would be given to such sentimentalism had it been found in the works of Jules Verne, but when it is advanced by a theologian of repute in all seriousness and acknowledged by contemporary men of influence, there can be no passing over it as mere child’s play. The statement previously made is repeated, namely, that good and great men who comprehend much truth are, without a right interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures, given to impossible errors, and are often driven, as Dr. Clarke was driven, to refute the very words of Scripture merely to save a grotesque fancy. How different would have been the history of theology in the past three centuries and its fruits today, had theologians accepted the chiliasm of the apostles and the early church instead of the Federal or Covenant theories introduced by Johannes Cocceius and the postmillennialism of Daniel Whitby—both living a century after the Reformation! The insolvable mystery is that these theological theories, so evidently unsustained by Scripture, were not revalued and judged by sincere men in later generations. The mystery is not relieved at all when it is observed that men of the present day are determined to continue the same errors. Those inclined to “scoff,” saying “Where is the promise of his coming?” (2 Pet. 3:3–4), have seized upon two utterly unworthy arguments as a defense for their unbelief—yet arguments accepted by good men who apparently have not weighed the issues involved, namely: (1) that Christ, according to the New Testament writers, promised to return within their own generation, but since He did not so return the writers were mistaken and (2) that the Apostle Paul believed and taught in his early ministry the soon coming of Christ, but that, since the doctrine, they say, does not appear in his later writings, he must have “changed his mind.” But then what of the doctrine of inspiration? and what under such treatment of the Scriptures remains of any authority on the part of any New Testament writer? Attention has been called earlier to the generic meaning of γενεά, translated *generation,* showing that it refers to the race or stock and not necessarily just to the people then living; and it is certain from the very last words

written by the Apostle that he believed in Christ's imminent return to the very day of his martyr death. He plainly declared: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing" (2 Tim. 4:8). To claim that New Testament writers were mistaken and that Paul changed his mind is the traditional and all but universal apology of the school of Whitby—better known as postmillennialism. As incredible as it may seem, such subterfuges were indulged by men who with their next breath sought honestly to defend the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures. Daniel Whitby—never cleared from the charge of holding Socinian views—did not object to such dishonest treatment of the Sacred Text; but such inconsistency is deplorable in worthy men who, having embraced the notion of Whitby that Christ would not return until after a man-made millennium, have no other argument to offer in their efforts to counter the plain assurance of the impending return of Christ. Henry Ward Beecher, who was father of a rationalism which has all but wrecked the denomination to which he belonged, said: "He (Paul) expected to see Christ in this world before he departed; and all the apostles believed that they should; and there are some in our day who believe that they shall. I think that you will see Christ; but you will see Him on the other side. You will go to Him, He will not come to you. And your going to Christ will be spiritual, and not carnal. But the faith of the apostles, and of others, was that they should see Christ in their day. In this matter, however, they were *mistaken.* They believed that which facts and time overthrew. Their conviction was founded on a misinterpretation of the language of our Master" ("The Future Life," a sermon in *Christian Union*, Sept. 5, 1877, cited by Peters, *op. cit.*, I, 475). This challenge of many good men would not need to be made had they evidenced a candid investigation of the Scriptures on these specific themes.

In every Bible doctrine, the truths which make it what it is are contained in the Scriptures which set it forth. No attentive, spiritual mind need be uninformed respecting the teaching of the Bible; however, two other requisites are apparent, namely, an extended, painstaking induction of all the Scripture bearing on a given theme and an unprejudiced mind. Even colossal errors will not be corrected where prejudice exists and imposes human theories upon God's Word. How, indeed, may the Scriptures fulfill

their prescribed purpose as a “correction” and a “reproof” in doctrine (2 Tim. 3:16) if, as seen in the experience of Dr. Clarke and with him a multitude of theologians, the apostles are charged with ignorance and error and the Sacred Text itself is arraigned as misleading and untrue, only because their theory will not conform to the truth revealed? The analysis of these conditions is entered at this point as an attempt to discover the true reason why the whole field of prophecy and especially the doctrine of the second advent are so strangely neglected. That doctrine stands whether or not it is ever recognized and accepted by the followers of a Cocceius, Whitby, or Clarke. When the doctrine is rightly attended, a vast array of Scripture arises for consideration and each passage demands that it be viewed in the light of its own precise declaration, in the light of its context, and in the light of all other Scripture bearing upon the same theme (cf. 2 Pet. 1:20–21).

A clear distinction should be observed between the Scriptures which announce the coming of Christ into the air to receive His Bride, the Church, unto Himself thus to end her pilgrim journey in the world and those Scriptures which announce the coming of Christ to the earth in power and great glory, to judge Israel and the nations and to reign on David’s throne from Jerusalem. The first event is in no way whatsoever a part of the second event; it is Christ’s way of delivering His people from the *cosmos* world before the divine judgments fall upon it. It is true that in this connection He said, “I will come again,” but that coming He declared was only to receive His own unto Himself (John 14:1–3). Terms often employed, such as “two phases,” “two aspects,” or “two parts of His coming,” are misleading. Much has appeared earlier in this work on this distinction; and no more need be added here other than to reaffirm that in the first event the movement is upward from earth to heaven, as in 1 Thessalonians 4:16–17: “For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord,” and that in the second advent the movement is downward from heaven to earth, as in Revelation 19:11–16. These events, though not always clearly distinguished in every Scripture, are naturally classified by the character of the conditions and incidents accompanying them. As previously

tabulated, there is a very extended list of passages bearing on the second coming of Christ. The important features of that stupendous, consummating event are directly stated in what may be termed the major passages bearing upon it. These are to be indicated with some comment on each.

Jude 1:14–15. "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

Notable indeed is the fact that the first recorded prophecy by man—though the report of it is reserved until the next to the last book of the Bible—and the last prophecy (cf. Rev. 22:20) proclaim the second advent of Christ. There is much to consider in Enoch's prediction both respecting the features of the event itself and the knowledge that was accorded to the man who was "the seventh from Adam." The statement that he "walked with God" (Gen. 5:24) doubtless indicates that, as was the case with patriarchs who lived before the writing of the Scriptures, he received direct revelation from God including some of that which was yet future in its reference. God would withhold nothing from Abraham (Gen. 18:17). It is certain from Genesis 26:5 that God had revealed much to him. The passage reads: "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (cf. Gen. 18:19; Rom. 5:13). Enoch's prediction anticipates the wickedness of humanity at the time of the second advent and the divine judgment that shall fall upon the world at that time. Little of this could have been comprehended by the people of Enoch's time; but it should not pass unnoticed that this the consummation of the ages—the restoration of God's unchallenged authority in angelic and human spheres—is the first theme of prophecy on the lips of man. Great intervening events were yet to be predicted and fulfilled; but the return of Christ, this prediction indicates, is of supreme import.

Deuteronomy 30:1–8. "And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the LORD thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; that then the LORD

thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the LORD thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: and the LORD thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the LORD thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies, and on them that hate thee, which persecuted thee. And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the LORD, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day."

The regathering of Israel, the final possession of the land, and the obedience and blessing they are yet to experience are here said to be accomplished divinely when Christ returns. This is the first reference in the text of the Bible to the second advent, itself uttered, as in the case of Enoch, long before any clear understanding of prophecy was disclosed relative to a second advent. It is also indicated in this passage that Christ's second coming will be preceded by Israel's national repentance, when under the mighty hand of God they call to mind the covenant promises of God while they are yet scattered abroad among the nations. This repentance is deep and real, for they shall return unto Jehovah their God with all their heart and soul (cf. Job. 42:10). Their captivity to which this prophecy refers is that of their present estate, dispossessed of their land and unassimilated by the nations among whom they are scattered. The words "Thy God … will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee" not only assert the fact of His return—which return implies a previous advent—but dates the time when Israel will return to their land and the Palestinian covenant will be fulfilled in their behalf. As they were dispersed because of disobedience, so, in their return, they will be obedient. This is the order in grace. They are not returned because they are obedient, but they are obedient because of their return. The regathering of Israel into her own land is the theme of at least twelve major Old Testament prophecies, and that event, since it is an important feature connected with the second advent, will reappear in passages to be considered. Next in importance to the promise of Christ's return and the restoration of Israel to

her land, according to this prediction, is the assurance of their obedience and the law which they will obey. In Jeremiah 31:31–34 it is asserted that the rule of life contained in the law covenant (cf. Ex. 19:5)—which covenant was given to Israel when they came out of Egypt and which covenant they broke—will be superseded by another covenant which will serve as a rule of life in their kingdom; but according to the Palestinian covenant they will, in addition to what constitutes the features of the new covenant, keep the very laws which Moses gave them before he was taken from them. It is probable that the new will incorporate the righteous requirements set forth in the Mosaic system, much, indeed, as those same righteous principles have been incorporated, though wholly readapted, into the teachings of grace which are now addressed to the perfected (in position) people who comprise the Church.

Psalm 2:6–9. "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

Here the scene changes from Christ's relation to Israel at His second advent over to His relation to the Gentile nations. The time of these judgments upon the nations is indicated in verse 6, in which it is said that Jehovah places His King upon the holy hill of Zion. The hill or mountain, according to Old Testament imagery, is the throne of government (cf. Isa. 2:1–5), and Zion because a part of the city stands for Jerusalem. Thus the prediction is of Jehovah placing His King (Messiah) on David's throne in Jerusalem. This anticipation is often declared in the prophetic Scriptures. The king is enthroned in spite of the opposition of the nations who are led on by demon-possessed kings and rulers (cf. Rev. 16:13–14). The term *heathen* as employed in the Old Testament is better rendered (as in R.V.) *nations*, since it refers to all peoples who are not Jews. It is equivalent to *Gentiles* as that terminology is used in the New Testament. There is no hint here of Christ returning to a converted world; rather He returns to a world in one supreme rebellion against Jehovah and His Messiah. The Judgment of God must fall upon them in tribulation, which is described by the words here (vss. 4–5) "the LORD shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak

unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure." When taking the throne by divine determination—which determination is well indicated by the word "yet" of verse 6—the Messiah, now King upon the throne, proclaims that by Jehovah's decree He undertakes that which follows. A similar decree came from heaven when Christ was set apart unto the office of Priest at His baptism and again when He was proclaimed from heaven as Prophet at the transfiguration. Thus, as stated in Psalm 2, again will He be attested and that as King, when He takes the Davidic throne in Jerusalem. Other passages—notably Isaiah 63:1–6; Matthew 25:31–46; 2 Thessalonians 1:7–10; Revelation 19:11–16, yet to be considered—declare the despotic, demolishing judgments which fall upon the nations when the King returns. These opposing, raging nations of Psalm 2:1 are, in the end, made a gift from Jehovah to the Messiah. In an undated past the Father gave each and every believer of this age to the Son (John 17:2, 6, 9, 11–12, 24) and that for the infinite blessing of the Son to rest upon them forever; but in the gift of the raging nations, the objective is that their rebellion against Jehovah and His Messiah may be put down completely. The subduing of angelic antagonists follows the second advent and occupies the entire period of the millennium (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–26). The strongest expressions are employed in this portion of the Psalm to describe the manner in which the Messiah will act. He breaks them with a rod of iron and dashes them in pieces like a potter's vessel. They are His inheritance and when thus vanquished a portion of them, divinely chosen to that end, will inherit the kingdom prepared for them and be subject to the King (Matt. 25:31–46). Seldom in the Old Testament does God address the kings of the earth, but as this Psalm closes they are admonished to "serve Jehovah with fear, and … trembling" and to "kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." His wrath will be released as is described in the following passages.

Isaiah 63:1–6. "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain

all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth."

This most realistic description of Christ coming in judgment upon the nations is presented in a questionnaire form and, though the identity of the one who propounds the inquiry is not disclosed, the returning Messiah Himself supplies the answers. He styles Himself as the one who speaks in righteousness, mighty to save. His salvation is for true Israel; they, accordingly, are those to whom He refers when He says, "The year of my redeemed is come" (cf. Rom. 11:26–27). "The day of vengeance" is the day of His outpoured judgments upon the nations because of their rejection of Him and their persecutions of His elect people, Israel. The imagery employed in this passage is the strongest of any or all used in the Bible to describe these events. In vengeance He treads the wine press of His anger and fury. He declares that He will make those whom He afflicts to be drunk in His fury; He will bring down their strength to the earth. His garments are stained with the blood of His foes as are the garments stained of the one who treadeth the wine press. Such are the judgments which the King imposes when He returns to the earth. If perchance this scene is a shock to those who have contemplated Christ only as the meek and lowly Savior, the Babe of Bethlehem, it should be remembered that the marvel is not that He thus comes as an outraged, destroying monarch to judge the nations that have rejected Him; rather the wonder is that He ever came in lowly guise enduring the scorn of men and crucifixion.

2 Thessalonians 1:7–10. "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day."

Again language is strained beyond all bounds in the effort to describe that which cannot really be expressed to the full. Accompanied by the angels of His might, the Lord of Glory is revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that, without excuse (cf. Rom. 1:19–32), know not God and who have refused to obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. These shall be punished with everlasting destruction. Little comment is needed respecting this important passage. Its language is certain and the event is rightly identified as the second advent of Christ.

Daniel 2:34–35. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

These words, taken from Daniel's reconstruction of the king's dream, describe the destruction that shall fall upon the fabric which the great monarchies have woven. The specific contribution which this prediction makes (cf. also vss. 44–45) is the fact that Christ in His second advent as the Smiting Stone will demolish and dismiss every vestige of Gentilism, with all of its principles and factors from the beginning of Gentile times (cf. Luke 21:24) to the hour of His return. These principles and factors which have characterized the whole period of nearly 2,500 years thus far will have their fullest expression in that tribulation period which is terminated by the glorious return of Christ. Dr. H. A. Ironside has the following comment to offer respecting the falling of the Stone:

> I desire to trace out a little of what Scripture has to tell us elsewhere about this Stone. It is undoubtedly a figure of the Lord Jesus Christ. Ps. 118:22 tells us, long before He came into this scene, that He would be the Stone set at naught by the builders, and become the head of the corner; and in the New Testament this verse is declared to be prophetic of Christ. When He came to earth He was indeed the Stone set at naught by the builders, the rulers of the Jews; but mark, He did not come as the Stone falling from heaven. That is the way He will come when He returns the second time. He came before to His own; but His own received Him not. He came here as the Foundation Stone, the Head Stone of the corner; but they who should have owned His claims, cried in their unbelief and hatred, "Away with Him; crucify Him; crucify Him!" Now God has taken Him up to heaven. Yonder, in the Father's glory, the eye of faith beholds that exalted Stone. The day is coming when it is going to fall upon His enemies; and when it falls, it will grind to powder all Gentile dominion, and all those who

have rejected the precious grace of God. In Isa. 8:14 Christ is prophetically described as a Stone of stumbling and a Rock of offence; and we are told that many will stumble and fall. Thus it was when He came in lowly grace: "They stumbled at the stumbling Stone, as it is written." They were looking for a great world-monarch; and when He came in humiliation, Israel nationally stumbled over Him; and they were broken—and they remain broken to this day. Whenever you see a Jew walking the streets of a Gentile city, you may say in your heart. There is a proof of the truth of what the Lord Jesus has said: "Whosoever shall fall on this Stone shall be broken." Broken, and scattered, and peeled, they have wandered in all the lands of the earth, hardly welcome anywhere, until, in these last days, God has been turning the hearts of the nations toward them, preparatory to their being taken back to their own land. By and by a remnant will return to the Lord; so Isa. 28:16 says, "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a Stone, a tried Stone, a precious corner Stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste." He then goes on depicting Israel's deliverance at the second appearing of this Stone of salvation. He it is who is described by Zechariah—chap. 3:9—as the Stone engraved with the engraving of a signet, upon which shall be seven eyes. But what about the nations in that day? The message of grace has gone out to them; and what has been the result? God has been taking out from among them a people for His name, but the mass have deliberately rejected the Christ of God; and that rejected Lord Jesus is soon going to fall upon them in judgment. Then will the rest of His word be fulfilled, "On whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder." Israel stumbled over Him, and they were broken. He is going to fall upon the Gentiles in His wrath and indignation, and they will be ground to powder, and driven away from before His face like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor. Do you ask, "When is the Stone going to fall?" It will be when the countries once occupied by the Roman empire in Europe will make a ten-kingdom coalition, electing one of their number to be their supreme arbiter. We have him set forth in chapter 7 as the little horn rising out of the Roman empire—a passage which has been often applied to the Pope, but which we shall see has no application to him at all. In that day the iron of imperial power will be mixed with the brittle pottery of socialism and democracy; but they will not cleave together. We see this preparing at the present time. When, for instance, I read the account of the Peace Conferences, and similar conventions, I have no thought that lasting universal peace is going to be brought about in that way, while the Prince of Peace is still rejected. But I think I see the shadow on the wall of this revived Roman empire. From my study of the word of God, I quite expect one of two things: either universal war, or universal arbitration; and, as a result of either of these methods, the ten-kingdomed form of the Roman empire brought about.—*Lectures on Daniel*, pp. 39–42

Zechariah 14:1–4. "Behold, the day of the LORD cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. Then shall the LORD go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be

a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south."

By this prediction the truth is established that Jerusalem shall again be besieged by the nations and the returning Christ will then go forth to fight against them. It is then that His feet shall stand on the Mount of Olives—perhaps on the same spot from which He ascended into heaven—and the Mount of Olives shall be divided in the midst, forming a great valley. In various respects, nature passes through convulsions and changes when Christ returns. "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory" (Luke 21:25–27); "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken" (Matt. 24:29); "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom. 8:19–22). It is at the time of the manifestation of the sons of God that creation shall be delivered.

2 Thessalonians 2:8–12. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Thus is revealed the important truth that the man of sin, the "lawless one" (R.V.), shall be revealed after (not, before) the removal of the Restrainer, the Holy Spirit, and—it is right to believe—the Church will be

removed when the Spirit departs (cf. John 14:16). The “lawless one” is destroyed by the coming of Christ and in the midst of his greatest corruption in the earth. Again, as always, the Word of God testifies that Christ will not come to a converted world. He comes into the midst of the greatest manifestation of evil.

Matthew 23:37–25:46. This particular Scripture—far too prolonged for quotation—has had extended consideration as one of Christ’s major discourses. It is His farewell word to Israel in which He informs them of conditions which will obtain before His return. Its several parts include: the time-word to Israel, 23:37–39; the occasion of this address, 24:1–4; the course of this unforeseen age, 24:5–8; the great tribulation, 24:9–22; warnings of impostors, 24:23–28; the description of His return and Israel’s supernatural regathering, 24:29–31; assurance of His predicted coming and due warnings to Israel that when they see certain things coming to pass (cf. Luke 21:28) they are to “watch,” 24:32–25:30; the judgment of the nations, 25:31–46. The greatest emphasis falls upon Israel’s responsibility in that day to *watch.* The people in Noah’s day did not watch, the evil servant did not look for his master, the five unwise virgins lacked the preparation they would have made had they really expected the bridegroom’s return. This entire section, that is, 24:37–25:30, anticipates Israel’s coming judgments. As there are evil servants and good servants in a household, as there are prepared and unprepared virgins awaiting the wedding feast, as there are those who employ talents and those who do not, so Israel will be called into judgment when her Messiah comes (cf. Ezek. 20:33–44). This doctrinally formative discourse closes with one central prediction regarding the judgment of the nations then living on the earth (25:31–46), which judgment, like that of Israel, will occur when the King returns and takes the Davidic throne in Jerusalem.

Out of the above outline, four major features may be selected for special consideration: (a) the great tribulation, (b) the fact of Christ’s second coming, (c) the judgment of Israel, and (d) the judgment of the nations then living.

In the present discussion attention is first to be centered upon the fact of Christ’s coming again. There can be no confusion here respecting the manner of His coming in each Messianic advent. Coming as lightning from the east that shines unto the west has no resemblance to being born of a

virgin in a manger. Again, the manner of His coming in the second advent should create no wonder, but the manner of His coming in the first advent is freighted with mystery, condescension, and simplicity which are not at all the natural rôle of the King of Glory. As He went on the clouds of heaven, so He will return (cf. Acts 1:9–11). Every tribe of Israel will see Him and mourn because of Him. Prophecy anticipates this mourning. He comes with power and great glory and by the ministration of angels Israel is regathered "from the four winds, from one end of heaven [horizon] to the other." As formerly indicated, upon taking the Davidic throne, the King enters upon Israel's judgments. This final judgment for Israel is not only an extended theme of prophecy, but is vitally important in the whole progress of doctrine relative to that elect nation. Though no specific time is set, it seems necessary to believe that there will have been a resurrection of the whole house of Israel and all to appear thus before this judgment. It would be woefully incomplete for this judgment to be restricted to the one generation of Israel then living. Men of Israel in all generations have lived and served with the glorious kingdom in view. Those who have attained to it by their faithfulness will not be deprived of it, and those who by carelessness and sin have failed must be judged and excluded. The entire context of Ezekiel 20:33–44, as before stated, should be considered in this connection (cf. Ezek. 37:1–14; Dan. 12:1–3). That which bears immediately upon the present theme and which completes the history of the times of the Gentiles is the judgment of the nations (Matt. 25:31–46), which judgment, since it precedes the millennial kingdom and involves only the nations then living who will have had their part in the great tribulation, should not be confused with the judgment of the great white throne (Rev. 20:12–15), which assize follows the millennial kingdom and involves the wicked dead of all human history. In the judgment of the living nations, these are first seen in utter subjection standing, after Christ has conquered them, before the throne of His glory. The rod of iron of Psalm 2:9 and the trampling in fury of Isaiah 63:3 will have accomplished its perfect end. The issue in this judgment is not the evil that has characterized all past generations of Gentiles; it is rather the one vital question, namely, the treatment that they will have accorded Israel during the great tribulation, i.e., those whom the King terms "my brethren." No reference is made here to Christians, though they are "joint heirs with Christ" and of the household of God. Christ is not ashamed

to call them also His brethren (cf. Heb. 2:11). The Christian is never left in dependence upon the world for his support as in the case of dispersed Israel, nor is there any Scripture which would hold the Gentiles responsible for ministering to the Christians; however, dispossessed Israel is cast upon the world and subject to its bounty for survival. They are Christ's brethren in the most literal physical sense. During the great tribulation some Gentile nations will have proved themselves to have been favorable toward Israel and some will have withheld their aid. Some are thereby qualified to enter with Israel into their millennial kingdom and some are disqualified. Even those who enter with Israel into the kingdom must, as was seen before, take a subordinate position (cf. Isa. 14:1–2; 60:12, 14). It seems incredible to those uninstructed in the Word of God that there is such a thing as an elect nation favored with eternal covenants and a specific glory above all the other nations of the earth, that the treatment accorded this people in the time of their greatest affliction should be the basis upon which the destiny of these living nations will be determined. In the hour of Israel's beginning Jehovah said to Abraham respecting his physical seed that those who blessed that people should be blessed and those who cursed that people should be cursed. It is significant, then, that at the end of Gentile times it should be said to those who have blessed Israel: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," and to those who curse Israel: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." It makes little difference whether men accept and profit by the King's predictions in their Bible respecting the future; the determined program of God must be, and will be, executed to all completeness anyway.

Acts 1:9–11. "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

This passage, already contemplated when considering the ascension, is also a definite promise of the return of Christ. Not another, but *this same Jesus* which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven, that is, visibly, bodily, and on the

clouds of heaven. He said of Himself "I will come again," not that death will, the Roman army under Titus, nor even the Holy Spirit (although He came for the *first* time on Pentecost). Thus also the Apostle declares: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout." The very fact that He appears the second time (Heb. 9:28) links His identity with the one who came the first time. In the former treatment of this Scripture it has been pointed out that in this context great issues are passing in rapid succession. In verses 6 and 7, Christ answers the covenant expectation respecting Judaism and the hope of Israel. He declared that the realization of Israel's promises awaits the times and seasons which the Father hath kept in His own power. In verse 8 the primary occupation of the believer in this age is announced, namely, witnessing to the ends of the earth. The next and final great event in this program is His own return, which return will end the proclamation of the evangel commanded.

Acts 15:16–18. "After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

As recorded in this Scripture, the early church met for its first council with the chief aim in view of determining what the new order of things could mean which, according to Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, had reached as fully and as effectively to the Gentiles as it had to the Jews. What had become of the agelong advantages which Jehovah had bestowed upon Israel, which had continued until the time of Christ's death and resurrection; in other words, what had become of Judaism? The fact that God was doing a wholly new thing, with Gentile now securing equal benefits, was the complete evidence that mighty changes had been accomplished. This council, guided by the Spirit, concluded that the new thing into which Gentiles were freely admitted was a visitation of God's grace in calling out from them, as well as from Jews, a people for His name or Person (vs. 14). The name of Deity is equivalent to the Person, of course, and no more endearing recognition of the Bride of Christ can be set up than to declare that she is for His own Person. A moment's reflection will disclose how utterly foreign to Judaism this new order is. The context, however, goes on with the assurance that Christ will come again and that, at His coming, He

will restore the Davidic government which has collapsed or fallen down, which means that the Davidic covenant will then be fulfilled, and Judaism restored thence to continue on to the realization of all that is predicted concerning it. This means that the millennial kingdom will be set up and those Gentiles "upon whom my name is called" will share in that kingdom. That a new order is divinely established is indicated in the context which immediately follows the passage under consideration.

Isaiah 59:20; 60:1–5. "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the LORD. … Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the LORD is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but the LORD shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about, and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee: thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee."

The Apostle's restatement of Isaiah 59:20 is as follows: "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins" (Rom. 11:26–27). In their experience of Christ's return, Israel is to arise and shine, for her light will have come. "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob." The glory of Jehovah shall rise upon them. Preceding this arising of Jehovah upon Israel, darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness the people. Thus is described the great tribulation that must cover the whole earth. In the time of kingdom blessing, "Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." The forces of the Gentiles shall come thus unto Israel. All of this, as in unnumbered predictions, will occur when the Messiah returns.

Daniel 7:13–14. "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should

serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

The particular emphasis in this description of the second advent is on the truth that by it Gentile world dominion is brought to its end. It will be remembered that, in both chapter 2 and chapter 7 of Daniel, there is prediction respecting the great empires that were to arise in succession beginning with Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar, continuing to Media-Persia and Greece, and ending with Rome, which last-named empire was in power when Christ lived here on earth. The intercalation of the Church age, then, began with Christ's death and continues until the Church is removed from the earth. As this intercalary period began before the Roman empire had quite finished the part predicted of her, she has yet to be revived and to fulfill all that is written regarding her. The feet and toes of the colossal image composed of both iron and clay represent that part of the Roman empire yet to be completed. The same is indicated in Daniel 7 by the ten horns of the fourth beast. All this governmental history must, and will, run its course during the momentous seventieth week, or seven years of tribulation yet to come upon the earth which Daniel foresaw. This brief period not only serves to complete Jewish times reaching up to their kingdom, but serves as well to conclude Gentile times on the earth. All things of responsibility both for Israel and the Gentiles are terminated by the glorious appearing of Christ. Specifically, the passage under consideration, along with Revelation 5:1–7, describes the investiture of the King with His kingdom rule. As King upon His throne—the throne of David in Jerusalem—He will render His judgments upon Israel and upon the nations before the kingdom begins. Daniel 2:34–35, already considered, is a description of the crushing blow that the King will administer to the nations, while Daniel 7:13–14, now being examined, presents the assumption of His authority in connection with which He renders His awful judgments upon the Gentiles.

Malachi 3:1–3. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver:

and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness."

This passage reveals the inability, true of all Old Testament prophets, to recognize the time period intervening between the two advents of Christ. Thus it is confirmed that, as later revealed in the New Testament, the present age must be reckoned a divine "mystery" or sacred secret before Christ came. The prophets of old foresaw both a suffering Lamb and a world-ruling King. They were perplexed about the time relationships for these. The Apostle Peter writes of it after this manner: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow" (1 Pet. 1:10–11). On this passage—Malachi 3:1–3—Dr. C. I. Scofield in his *Reference Bible* writes: "The f.c. of verse 1 is quoted of John the Baptist (Mt. 11:10; Mk. 1:2; Lk. 7:27), but the second clause, 'the Lord whom ye seek,' etc., is *nowhere quoted* in the N.T. The reason is obvious: in everything save the fact of Christ's first advent, the latter clause awaits fulfilment (Hab. 2:20). Verses 2–5 speak of judgment, not of grace. Malachi, in common with other O.T. prophets, saw both advents of Messiah blended in one horizon, but did not see the separating interval described in Mt. 13 consequent upon the rejection of the King (Mt. 13:16, 17). Still less was the Church-age in his vision (Eph. 3:3–6; Col. 1:25–27). 'My messenger' (vs. 1) is John the Baptist; the 'messenger of the covenant' is Christ in both of His advents, but with especial reference to the events which are to follow His return" (p. 982).

Mark 9:1–9. "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power. And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them. And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them. And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. And Peter answered and said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. For he wist not what to say; for they

were sore afraid. And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him. And suddenly, when they had looked round about, they saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves. And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead."

Whether all theologians recognize it or not, the transfiguration scene is as important as the great emphasis given to it in the New Testament indicates. Each of the three Synoptic writers describes it at length and it is said by them to be a setting forth of the power and coming of Christ, that is, His coming in His kingdom (Matt. 16:28; Mark 9:1; Luke 9:27; 2 Pet. 1:16). Peter, one of those chosen to be present at this great event, writes: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts" (2 Pet. 1:16–19). The transfiguration occurred prior to the death of Christ. The disciples were about to face the utter surprise and shock of that death, which death, though plainly predicted by Christ, was divinely withheld from their understanding. Most emphatic and absolute is the divine veiling of the disciples' minds on this fact of Christ's oncoming death and resurrection. Luke writes in his Gospel: "Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: and they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again. And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken" (18:31–34). No clearer prediction of Christ's death was made than the one with which this passage is associated. All of this is a challenge to the thoughtful student. Why, indeed, should they not comprehend such a clear prediction? During the period of

Christ's earthly ministry they had preached by divine authority and with personal sincerity the message regarding the Messianic, earthly kingdom with Christ as King on David's throne—the national hope of Israel. It is most evident that they could not have preached a gospel based on Christ's death and resurrection when they had no understanding of these oncoming events. That which had so engaged them, into which they had invested their lives, was about to be shattered by the violent death of the King at the hands of the very men over whom He was expected to rule. A vision of the coming of Christ in power and in His kingdom was given to Peter, James, and John—two of whom were appointed to write doctrinal portions of the New Testament, the other its first apostolic martyr—that they might the more readily accept the unforeseen delay which the age of grace would require and be assured that the plan and purpose of God respecting the kingdom for Israel was not abrogated. The vision of the transfiguration with all it connoted was not given to John the Baptist. He was allowed to face what seemed to him to be complete defeat. That into which his whole life had been poured, his divine commission as the forerunner of the Messiah, and the early success of his preaching were all swept aside thus, without explanation. Here many have failed to comprehend the situation, however, and have turned on John with the declaration that he was mistaken in all his ministry. Such is not the solution of the problem. At any rate, Peter, James, and John—representatives of the whole apostolic company—were saved from that greater distress which fell upon John the Baptist. It is not probable that the assurance which the transfiguration provided was of much import to the disciples in the hour of Christ's death; but after His death and resurrection it served its purpose in clarifying their minds on the truth that, though a new and wonderful, unforeseen, divine purpose was introduced through the death and resurrection of Christ, the earthly purpose was not abandoned but would, when the new age objective is accomplished, be fulfilled by Christ at His second coming, and not in weakness and humility as in His first advent, but in the power and glory which was previewed at the transfiguration. It is clear then that the transfiguration was not an unveiling of heaven, but of Christ's coming in His kingdom.

Luke 12:35–40. "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto

him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not."

Out of very much which Luke records bearing on the second advent of Christ, this one passage may serve as a good representation. The address is to Israel and, like the larger report of the Olivet Discourse which is given by Matthew, it enjoins the attitude of watching for Christ's return. Watching is the responsibility which will rest on Israel at the time "when ye see these things come to pass" (Luke 21:28, 31; Matt. 24:33). Again an appeal is in order that Israel's obligation to watch for the glorious appearing of Christ when they will be delivered and their covenants fulfilled should not be confused with the agelong obligation resting upon the Church to be waiting for Christ's appearing when He will receive them unto Himself. As in Matthew 25:1–13 where Israel is likened to ten virgins and their need of burning individual lights is the symbol of preparedness, so in the passage under contemplation they are told to have their loins girded and their lights burning. The specific contribution of this passage to the whole body of doctrine is found in verse 36, wherein it is stated that watching Israel will be awaiting the return of Christ "from the wedding." Too often it has been supposed that Christ's return is to participate in the wedding and that the ten virgins are His Bride. The comment on this same situation which Psalm 45:8–15 supplies is of vital import. Having pictured the millennial palace and those within including the King and His Bride, who is identified throughout as "daughter," it is said that she, the Bride, "shall be brought unto the king in raiment of needlework" and that "the virgins her companions that follow her shall be brought unto thee. With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought: they shall enter into the king's palace." This description of the millennial scene clearly distinguishes between the Bride and the virgins. The Bride is with the King from the hour of the wedding in heaven. She returns to earth with Him (Rev. 19:11–16), and for His return

with His Bride Israel, likened to the virgins, watches upon the earth; later, both the Bride and the five accepted virgins enter the palace with the King and join in the marriage feast (cf. Matt. 25:10, R.V.).

2 Peter 3:3–4, 8, 10–13. "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. … But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. … But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

This Scripture introduces several distinctive features which contribute to the whole doctrine of Christ's second advent. In the first instance, prediction is made that scoffers will arise who reject the truth respecting Christ's return and on the basis of the claim that all things continue from the beginning without change. Therefore, it is asserted, no change need be expected in the future; but this "they willingly are ignorant of," that there has been a world-renovating judgment from God in the form of the flood, and too it is certain, whether believed by them or not, that the heavens and the earth which now are await destruction by fire and at the precise time when God shall accomplish the judgment and perdition of ungodly men (cf. Rev. 20:11–15). The Day of the Lord, the period of a thousand years which begins with the second advent of Christ and ends with the passing of the old heavens and earth, comes by virtue of Christ's return, which is as unexpected as a thief in the night (cf. Matt. 24:43; 1 Thess. 5:4). When verse 9, which presents the faithfulness of God and is therefore parenthetic to the argument, is omitted to the end that the direct statement of prophecy may be noted here, there is more than accidental relation between the fact that a day with Jehovah is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one

day (vs. 8) and the reference to the Day of the Lord which follows (vs. 10). It has been claimed that the only time measurement of the Day of the Lord, which is a reference to the millennial kingdom on the earth, is the one found in Revelation 20:1–6; but while the Revelation passage definitely makes the kingdom reign to be a thousand years, this reference in 2 Peter is evidently a time indication of the same Day of the Lord, for Peter states it will begin "as a thief in the night" and end with the passing of the heavens and the earth. The passage includes also a reference to the manner of life which those who believe such things should maintain. All this program is moving on to that final day, the Day of God, which is eternity to come (cf. 1 Cor. 15:28). The new heavens and the new earth are, alike, to be the abode of divine righteousness—the earth that will be inhabited by the elect people whose covenants respecting their land and the earth are everlasting. The earth will then be as suitable a place for God to dwell upon as heaven has ever been or ever will be.

Revelation 19:11–16. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

This is the final description of the second coming of Christ in the Bible and the only description to be found in the Book of Revelation. This account serves to open the stupendous scenes which follow in rapid succession and which constitute God's revealed program reaching on into eternity to come. These events are: the battle of Armageddon (19:17–21), the binding of Satan (20:1–3), the first of humanity's resurrections in relation to the kingdom age (20:4–6), the loosing of Satan and the doom of Gog and Magog (20:7–9), the final disposition of Satan (20:10), the setting of the great white throne (20:11), the resurrection (cf. vs. 5) and disposition

of the wicked dead (20:12–15), creation of the new heavens and the new earth (21:1–2), God's abode on the earth as in heaven (21:3), the estate of men in eternity to come (21:4–8), the city from heaven (21:9–22:7), the closing message and appeal (22:8–19), the closing promise and its corresponding prayer (22:20–21). Heaven was opened it was declared in 4:1, and a voice called the Apostle John—who as forerunner of the Church is appointed to see and experience all that awaits the Church upon her entrance into heaven and to write these things for the encouragement and edification of those he represented —to come up hither. Since, from that point on (4:1), the Church is not again seen upon the earth but is seen in heaven and since what follows her removal is all of Daniel's seventieth prophetic week in which the Church could have no part whatsoever, it is made clear that the Church is married to her Bridegroom and enjoys the marriage supper of the Lamb in heaven (Rev. 19:7–10) before heaven is opened again, as the text under consideration describes the time when Christ, accompanied by His saints, returns as Messiah to the earth. The order has been preserved precisely: in the 4th chapter the movement is upwards, while in the 19th chapter the movement is downwards. As it should be, the description of chapter 19 centers on the glorious Person of the returning King. It has been predicted that He would thus return accompanied by the hosts of heaven and with power and great glory (Matt. 24:30). His return, it is declared, will be as lightning that cometh out of the east and shineth unto the west (Matt. 24:27) and with the clouds of heaven (Dan. 7:13). He will be revealed from heaven in flaming fire (2 Thess. 1:7–8). The "great glory" is resident in the four titles under which He comes —"The Word of God," "Faithful and True," "a name written, that no man knew," and "King of kings and Lord of lords." Notable is the fact that the King returns not only to judge but to make war. He embodies the immeasurable holy indignation of God against evil in the day when His offers of grace have finally been withdrawn. None could comprehend or in any way anticipate the "fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." It is "the wrath of the Lamb." Kings and judges have been admonished to kiss the Son "lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." Fully a thousand years before the first advent of Christ, David saw that the King when taking His throne in Zion would receive the nations as a gift from Jehovah and break them with a rod of iron and dash

them in pieces as if a potter's vessel. About seven hundred years before Christ's birth, Isaiah prophesied that the returning Messiah would tread down the nations in His anger and trample them in His fury. Both the rod of iron of Psalm 2:9 and the treading of the wine press of Isaiah 63:3 are reasserted in Revelation 19:15, which reads: "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God" (cf. Rev. 1:16; 2 Thess. 2:8). As the Lord of Glory returns thus to the earth to judge and make war it should be observed also that, in this display of infinite power with its destruction exercised upon every enemy of God, that which is indigenous or inherent in Him—that which pertains properly to Deity as the correlative of infinite holiness—will be released and manifested. Right thinking respecting the Christ of God will lead to the recognition of the fact that the great departure from that which is essentially God was achieved in His first advent, when He came as a helpless child, an unresisting man, an afflicted, dying sacrifice. For this He laid aside His rightful robes of glory and so restrained His powers—such as created all things visible and invisible—that He became the unantagonizing Lamb. All this may well incite awe and wonder in man as it must also have affected the angels. That He should come as the embodiment of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God should cause no bewilderment when it is remembered that this world has rejected God and His saving grace as exhibited and proffered to it in the first advent of Christ. Infinite love in its adjustments with infinite holiness provided a substitute to bear the immeasurable judgments of divine indignation against those who now elect to stand under the shadow of the cross, but for a rebellious, fallen, Christ-rejecting world which has cast in its lot with Satan and embraced his philosophy of independence of God, there can be nothing else but wrath and indignation as the portion of those who obey not the gospel.

In his excellent exposition of the book of Revelation entitled *The Unfolding of the Ages*, the late Ford C. Ottman presents a graphic picture of this last description in the Bible to portray the second advent. Though unusually extended, it is reproduced here as a fitting close to this chapter on Christ's return:

Christ is coming, and that glorious truth is now to engage our attention. The events connected with it can be discovered only through a thorough and patient examination of Scripture. Our attention is first turned to the opened heavens from which He comes. There can be no possibility of mistake as to the identity of the glorious Rider of the white horse. There is One, and only One, to whom the description could apply. He is "Faithful and True." So was He called at the beginning: so is He called at the last. He is now coming forth to judge the world in righteousness. His eyes are like fire, and nothing shall escape the searching flame. He is crowned with many diadems, and this testifies to other sovereignties than that over the world. He has also an incommunicable name, and He is clothed with a vesture dipped in blood. He is girded with a sword for personal conflict, and He has come to tread the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. "He hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords." The armies that follow Him are composed of saints both Jewish and Christian. Hitherto they have been seen as the occupants of the four and twenty thrones. The elders, after ratifying the song of the heavenly host, are no longer seen as elders. They now appear as "the armies of heaven" following their Victorious Commander. The mark of their identification is the "white and pure linen" in which they are clothed. To this one point all the beams of prophetic light have steadily and unwaveringly converged. One of these shines forth from the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah. The Hebrew prophet, in the dim ages of the past, stands on one of the hills of Judah. He is, perhaps, on the Mount of Olives where the vision is clear to the Jordan valley. He is looking down towards Edom and he sees coming up through one of the deep ravines a solitary warrior. There is so much of majesty about him that the prophet rings out the challenge: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength?" There comes sounding back the answer: "I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save." With the *identity* of the warrior dawning upon him the prophet cries: "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat?" To this cry is given the solemn and glorious response: "I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth. I will mention the lovingkindnesses of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed on them according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his lovingkindnesses" (Isa. 63:1–7). This, according to the modern critics, is poetry. Yes, poetry of the loftiest strain, but in that poetry is embedded the Hebrew's conception of the coming Messiah. In this vision of Isaiah there is given only the return of the Warrior from the conflict. Of his journey *to* Bozrah there is nothing revealed. Isaiah has before him the conquering, and not the suffering, Messiah. We look back through the centuries to see the one commanding figure that rises above all others, and, Who can answer to the vision? Edom, lying on the border of Judah, was but a faint reflection of the awful cloud that hung over all men: evil, inveterate, uncompromising, on every hand; against which man could only struggle in utter helplessness. Into this stronghold of the enemy came the Son of God. He had none to help Him. He descended alone into the darkness, suffering what no human mind can ever know; but through it He passed to a glorious victory over sin and death. He is gathering

the fruit of that victory now. His acquired glory is increased by every soul that puts its trust in Him, and this also shall add another voice to swell the music of redemption-song. When Jesus ascended to heaven, the conflict was not over. When he entered there, Jehovah said: "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Ps. 110:1). The Messiah of Isaiah's vision is the Messiah of the Second Advent, and not of the First. Christ has been to the cross, but the prostration by the conquering Messiah of all of Israel's enemies, which is foretold in this prophecy, has never yet come to pass. This shall be accomplished when Christ comes again, and not before. The armies that follow Him are robed in white. He is distinguished from them by His being clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and we shall know Him, not merely by the marks of His suffering, but by the royal robes, which proclaim His universal sovereignty. He has also, "upon his garment and upon his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords." When the Magi came to Jerusalem they said: "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Pilate's superscription for the cross was: "Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews." Whether born in a manger, or dying on the cross, or riding the white horse of universal conquest, Jesus of Nazareth is a *King.* One very significant variation in the title needs to be noted. The Magi and Pontius Pilate call Him the King of the *Jews.* There is no such limitation in the apocalyptic inscription, for the scepter has been extended over all the surrounding nations, and He is now become, not only the King of the Jews, but "*King of kings, and Lord of lords.*" The prostration of the kingdoms of this world shall demonstrate His right to the title. He at once proceeds to judgment,—"Out of his mouth goeth a sharp [two-edged] sword, that with it he may smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the indignation of the wrath of God the Almighty." The two-edged sword is the *word*, now to be used as the instrument of judgment. For the overthrow of the world-kingdoms there is needed but a word. That word is to be now spoken, and these kingdoms are to fall. "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked" (Isa. 11:4). The Coming of Christ is followed by the utter prostration of the world-powers, and by summary judgment upon the leaders of man's rebellion. In solemn contrast with the invitation given to the marriage supper of the Lamb, an angel is seen standing in the sun, and summoning with a loud voice the birds of heaven to come and feast at the great supper of God. The word translated *fowls* in the common version is the same word used in the second verse of the eighteenth chapter, where Babylon is said to have become the habitation of demons, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful *bird.* The same word is used in the twenty-first verse, where the fowls, after the slaughter of the opposing armies, are said to be filled with their flesh. These appear to be the only passages in which this particular word for "bird" is used. It well may represent the literal vultures that shall fatten on the bodies of the slain. In His great prophecy Jesus says: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together" (Matt. 24:27–28). The eagles referred to are doubtless identical with the carnivorous birds "flying in mid-heaven." Of the awful horrors of this day Isaiah thus speaks: "The indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcases, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. The sword of the Lord is filled with blood, it is made fat with fatness, and with the

blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea" (Isa. 34:2–6). Solemnly enough this is called the Lord's "sacrifice in Bozrah." In Revelation it is called "the great supper of God." This means the destruction, for the time being, of all of God's enemies; and over their desolation heaven rejoices. As soon as these vultures are gathered together, the beast appears, and he has with him the allied kings of the earth, and their armies. These kings and their armies, as we have already seen, are brought together by spirits of demons. The purpose of their assemblage is made known in the declaration that they are about to make war against Him that sat upon the horse, and against His army. In this daring attempt to rush against the bucklers of the Almighty, they illustrate the last extreme to which Satan shall drive his infatuated victims. How vain and fatuous a thing it is for a man to contend with his Maker! "Who hath hardened himself against him, and hath prospered? Behold, he taketh away, who can hinder him? who will say unto him, What doest thou? If God will not withdraw his anger, the proud helpers do stoop under him" (Job 9:4, 12–13). This confederation against Christ and His armies is the literal fulfillment of the second Psalm. "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us" (Ps. 2:2–3). The gathering point here is undoubtedly the battlefield of Har-Magedon. This battlefield, or its immediate vicinity, was famous in Old Testament history by reason of two great victories: Barak over the Moabites, and Gideon over the Midianites. It was famous also for what was considered two national disasters: the death of Saul, and the death of Josiah. If we are to spiritualize this battlefield into some indefinite region of never-ending conflict between the Church and her enemies, it is useless to speculate about the meaning of John's vision. If Christ when He comes is to find the kings of the earth in banded rebellion against Him, what possible objection can there be to a literal location of this rebel host? That He shall find them in such rebellion is the positive declaration of Scripture; and, without occasioning any confusion of mind, we can conceive of them as brought together literally on this ancient battlefield of Israel. There they are found at the last in royal council. They have passed a resolution to break asunder the bands of God, and to cast away His cords from them; but over against this resolution the voice of God is heard saying: "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." The struggle between good and evil is now to be fought out in the open. There is no longer any disguise of the combatants. At last the kingdoms of this world stand arrayed for direct battle with God and His Christ. The conflict is short and decisive. The beast and the false prophet are taken in red-handed rebellion, and are cast into the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone; and there, after the thousand years of Christ's Millennial reign, they are still. Just and equal are the ways of God. In the beginning He put questions to man who had sinned, but to the serpent that was the instrument of Satan in effecting the ruin He put none. Without any interrogation whatever the serpent was doomed. In like manner, to these willing tools of Satan in the last outburst of their impious wrath God gives no opportunity of self-defense. In their case there are no mitigating circumstances. They have lent themselves to an evil from the consequences of which there is no escape. They are permitted no defense, and in their behalf no word is spoken. Their sin has been deliberate; their alliance with Satan open and undisguised. Now, speechless before Him with whom they have contended in vain, they are taken and judged without mercy, for with such as they no mercy could avail. After this summary judgment of the beast and the false prophet, the rest of the rebels are dealt with in strict accord with the judicial code of the court of God. They are slain with the sword. Judged according to the Word of God, they are found worthy of death. Under the blast of His breath they are swept down, and the vultures strip the battlefield of the slain. Such is the end

of earth’s rebellion against God. Well may the heavens rejoice when His judgments prevail and everlasting righteousness is ushered in. There is no quiet and gradual merging of things into the peaceful reign of the Messiah. The kingdoms of this world must be cast into the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. Judgment only, and judgment of the most unsparing kind, falling on principalities and powers of evil, can drive from the heavens the stormwind of iniquity. The wrath and judgment of God can alone do this, and establish the kingdom of Christ in everlasting righteousness over the earth,—and failure to see this must come from the refusal to accept the reality of the final rebellion that shall fill up the cup of iniquity, and fit the world for the just judgment of God.—Pp. 417–24

Chapter XIII

The Messianic Kingdom of Christ Incarnate

This course of investigation turns at this point to one of the greatest of all Bible themes, namely, the Messianic kingdom—known also as the millennial kingdom since it continues a thousand years and as the Davidic kingdom since it is the realization of the kingdom covenanted to David. If it be claimed that Christ holds the central place in such an investigation, this is granted; and a Biblical Christology certainly must include that extended aspect of Christ's Person and work in which He appears as the theocratic King. Though the kingdom occupies so large a place in the Sacred Text, the theme of the kingdom has been more misunderstood and its terminology more misapplied than any other one subject in the Bible. This is directly due to the failure, so inherent and far-reaching in Covenant Theology, to recognize the dispensational aspect of divine revelation. Truth respecting the Messianic expectation as that is set forth in the Old Testament does not imply that the kingdom is the Church, nor does the New Testament, with its objectives centered in heaven, teach that the Church is the kingdom. Similarly, the earthly kingdom that according to the Scriptures had its origin in the covenant made to David, which is mundane and literal in its original form and equally as mundane and literal in uncounted references to it in all subsequent Scriptures which trace it on to its consummation, is by theological legerdemain metamorphosed into a spiritual monstrosity in which an absent King seated on His Father's throne in heaven is accepted in lieu of the theocratic monarch of David's line seated on David's throne in Jerusalem. Again, through careless inattention many modern writers refer to the kingdom of heaven as though it were heaven, and in spite of the absurdities and contradictions which arise when these terms are thus confused.

Under Ecclesiology, already treated (Vol. IV), the distinction in meaning between the terms *kingdom of God* and *kingdom of heaven* has been pointed out. Suffice it to say here that the authority of God over the entire universe is a dominant theme from Genesis to Revelation. And such, indeed, is the kingdom of God. It extends to all intelligences—angels and men—wherever

there is loyal subjection to divine authority. That there are angels as well as men who disown this authority is clearly taught in the Word of God, and as clearly is it asserted that before the millennial, Messianic reign of Christ is ended all opposition to God's rule will have been crushed by the theocratic King (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–28), and then the kingdom of God will be "delivered up" to God in the sense that His rightful supremacy, government, and empire will resume their former unchallenged sway of ages past. This universal exercise of authority is properly styled the *kingdom of God*, and should not be accounted the same as the Davidic theocratic rule over Israel and the earth, which rule is brought to its consummation and established in the earth before the transformations and restorations which belong to the kingdom of God have begun. Broadly speaking, the Kingdom of God—as defined above—is the universal authority of God from everlasting to everlasting, while the term *Kingdom of Heaven* is fittingly applied to God's rule in the earth—it is heaven's rule on the earth—and is restricted, with respect to time, as has been seen, to limited periods and well-defined situations. The prayer for and in the kingdom of heaven includes the words: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." While that kingdom appears in various forms, it had its tangible beginning in the Davidic Covenant and will be fulfilled and consummated with a perfected social order in the earth under the beneficent reign of the King of kings. When the vast distinctions between these two spheres of divine authority are observed there is a solving of many problems in the interpretation of the Bible which would otherwise exist. Faithful recognition of these dissimilarities is beginning to be held by expositors generally as the most effective key to the understanding of the Scriptures. So Dr. Auberlen quotes R. Rothe as saying: "Our key does not open—*the right key is lost;* and till we are put in possession of it again, our exposition will never succeed. The system of biblical ideas is *not* that of our schools; and so long as we attempt exegesis without it, the Bible will remain *a half-closed book.* We must enter upon it with *other conceptions* than those which we have been accustomed to think *the only possible ones;* and whatever these may be, this one thing at least is certain, from the whole tenor of the melody of Scripture in its natural fulness, that they must be *more realistic and massive*" (*Divine Revelation*, p. 387, cited by Peters, *Theocratic Kingdom,* I, 21). This is a confession which is at once both humiliating and significant. That this

millennial discussion to follow is related only to the earthly, Davidic, Messianic kingdom of heaven need hardly be pointed out. Consideration of the kingdom of God in its restored, final form will be the theme of the next and closing chapter of this work on Christology. Why, indeed, after centuries of study should so great a proportion of good men be in dire confusion over the divine program for the earth while others are informed and to that extent delivered from such difficulties, unless it be that some hold and use the key to which Rothe refers while others do not? Men of commendable scholarship do hold the key and for them these specific problems are really solved. There are now two schools of orthodox men. For one school, having imbibed the concoction of Whitby which proposes a man-made millennium and, having been run into the idealistic, cramping mold of Cocceius' one covenant of grace, there is little hope that a deliverance will be wrought. Such theological systems, seminaries, and individuals muddle on, transmitting idealism which is unsustained by the Word of God to succeeding generations. On the other hand, those who hold the key are increasing in number; they have their schools and system of theology which generates exposition of the Bible and promotes Bible study over the whole land. Certain obvious facts respecting the kingdom of heaven are now to be listed:

I. Assured by Jehovah's Covenants

Jehovah has made oath-bound covenants with Abraham and with David. Not only are these covenants unconditional and binding by the very terms by which they are declared, but extended subsequent Scriptures reaffirm these promises. The Abrahamic covenant records Jehovah's sovereign purpose in, through, and for Abraham. The covenant is unconditional in that no obligation is imposed upon Abraham; he contributes nothing, but rather is the recipient of all that Jehovah proposed to do for him. While this covenant (cf. Gen. 12:1–3; 13:14–17; 15:4–7; 17:1–8) provided personal blessings and great honor to Abraham, its more important features reach out in two other directions, namely, that of Abraham's seed and that of the land of promise. Abraham's seed is threefold: (1) a great nation through Ishmael (cf. Gen. 17:20), (2) a seed like the dust of the earth—realized in his physical seed through Israel and so through Jacob, and (3) a spiritual seed

like the stars of heaven for extent and realized on the principle of Abrahamic faith by Jew and Gentile. Of the physical seed it is written: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen" (Rom. 9:4–5). To this same physical seed pertain also the covenants respecting the land, the earthly Davidic throne, the king, and the kingdom. To this earthly seed the system known as Judaism, with its commandments, ordinances, and statutes, alone was addressed. If all this be acknowledged, as indeed it must be, practically every error relative to covenants, peoples and their destinies will be obviated. Over against all this is the truth that Abraham attained unto the righteousness of God through faith (Gen. 15:6), a stupendous privilege not restricted to Abraham (though not extended to other Old Testament saints) but promised to all in this age who exercise Abrahamic faith to the extent of believing God (Rom. 4:20–24), which righteousness of God Abraham's physical seed utterly failed to secure (cf. Rom. 9:30–10:4). The New Testament declares that all—individual Jews or Gentiles alike—who believe unto righteousness as Abraham did are spiritual children of Abraham. Great is the error when it is supposed that spiritual seed of Abraham ever become physical seed or that physical seed, aside from regeneration, ever become spiritual seed. Of the five eternal features of Jehovah's covenants with Israel—an everlasting nation, an everlasting possession of her land, an everlasting throne, an everlasting king, and an everlasting kingdom—two, the nation and the possession of the land, are covenanted through Abraham, while the remaining three, the throne, the king, and the kingdom, are covenanted through David. That covenanted to Abraham and that covenanted to David may now be considered separately.

1. The Covenant with Abraham. As noted above, there are in addition to the assurance of personal blessing for Abraham, his posterity, and those who bless his people two far-reaching features covenanted, namely:

a. An Everlasting Nation. Some theologians who seem not to have given close attention to what the Word of God discloses respecting the perpetuity of the earthly seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob have asserted that this nation is but a feature of one covenant, by which they are bound into the

same divine purpose with the Church of the New Testament and being thus merged into the Church have no distinctive future, while others have declared that, because of their sin, God has cut off His earthly people forever. The Scriptures hardly support these rationalistic notions. Beginning with the covenant made with Abraham as recorded in Genesis, chapter 12 and continuing to the end of the New Testament, the promise respecting an everlasting earthly seed is ever in view. There is but little said of Abraham's seed through Ishmael and nothing said of his seed which he secured late in life through his marriage to Keturah (cf. Gen. 25:1–4). None would question the endurance of the spiritual seed; but the unending future of the earthly seed through Isaac and Jacob is a matter of divine purpose just as clearly revealed and therefore not subject to human wishes, suppositions, or judgments. Several Scriptures may well be cited at this point. Speaking to Israel through Isaiah, Jehovah said: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, … so shall your seed and your name remain" (66:22). Likewise, having declared the terms of His new covenant (Jer. 31:31–34), Jehovah affirms regarding the one nation to whom this covenant will be made: "Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The LORD of hosts is his name: if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD" (vss. 35–37). Yet again, in Matthew 24:34–35, which reads: "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away," the line of Israel's descent or posterity will outlive all events which precede the return of the King. Jehovah declared to Abraham, according to Genesis 17:7: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," but there is no basis for an everlasting covenant if there is not an everlasting people to whom it applies. That this same nation, preserved in its identity, continues forever is implied in the several features of their covenants, namely, the everlasting possession of the land, the endless throne, the eternal king, and

unending kingdom. The entire 11th chapter of Romans is written to unfold the abiding character of the nation Israel. It is true that, to the end that the Church be called out, Israel has for an age been "broken off" and to them "blindness in part" hath happened (Rom. 11:20, 25), but all this only *until* the present divine purpose connected with the Church is accomplished. After that, "all Israel shall be saved." This last-named Scripture declares in full: "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:26–29).

b. An Everlasting Possession of the Land. The Palestinian covenant, as first announced to Abraham and confirmed to Isaac and Jacob, is set forth in its full character in Deuteronomy 30:3–8. The earlier proclamations are: "And the LORD appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the LORD, who appeared unto him. … And the LORD said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee. … And he said unto him, I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it. … In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen. 12:7; 13:14–17; 15:7, 18). In these passages the larger and final boundaries of the land are indicated. Likewise, the confirmations to the seed of Abraham assert: "Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father; and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. …

And God said unto him, I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins; and the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee I will give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land" (Gen. 26:3–4; 35:11–12; cf. 28:13–14). The Palestinian covenant conveys the land to Abraham and his earthly seed through Isaac and Jacob for an everlasting possession. Added predictions modify the covenant only with respect to the time of its final tenure. Three dispossessions were anticipated and three restorations (cf. Gen. 15:13–14, 16; Jer. 25:11–12; Deut. 28:25, 36–37, 63–68; 30:1–5). All three of the dispossessions are now fulfilled and two restorations. Thus the nation is out of her land for the third and last time. When restored again, as predicted, that people will go out no more forever. It hardly need be stated that no land is promised to the Church, and when Israel's promises of a long life in the land are applied to the Church the incongruity is at once apparent. Those appointed to "wait for his Son [their Lord] from heaven" are not to be looking for a long life in this sphere. Citizens of heaven hold no rights to earth in the sight of God.

2. The Covenant with David. Since the oncoming theocratic kingdom is the divine objective with respect to the earth and since it forms the national hope of Israel, the covenant with David which introduces the revelation of the kingdom declares the precise nature of all this. From the inception of this dominant theme onward as seen in subsequent Scriptures the subject is held in constant observation and as a feature of unfulfilled prophecy. This earthly kingdom, the throne, and the King are among the dominant themes of the Old Testament. The revelation respecting these great features in the Davidic covenant is both explicit and extended. Difficulty arises only for those who are determined to metamorphose a literal, earthly throne and kingdom into some vague and wholly imaginary spiritual idealism. The acid test to be applied to any such human notion is the pertinent inquiry of why the King must be of David's line. This evident requirement regarding the King is ignored by every theory which rejects the truth concerning the literal throne and kingdom; yet that the King must be born of David's lineage is both asserted and assumed throughout this great highway of prediction— consider, for example, John 7:42, which states: "Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town

of Bethlehem, where David was?" God said to David, "And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever" (2 Sam. 7:16). There was indeed but one reservation in this covenant, namely, that the sons of David succeeding him would be subject to chastisement, though the covenant itself could not be abrogated. Chastisement did fall in the form of disruption of the kingly line from the time of the Babylonian captivity to the birth of Christ. However, by the explicit terms of the covenant, the kingdom of David cannot be destroyed. It must yet be re-established and abide forever, else Jehovah's oath would fail. Description of David's own reaction, which indicates his understanding of the covenant, follows at once in this context. It is certain that David entertained no other thought than that his own literal throne, kingly line, and kingdom were to continue forever. He said to God "Who am I, O Lord GOD? and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto? And this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord GOD; but thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come. And is this the manner of man, O Lord GOD? And what can David say more unto thee? for thou, Lord GOD, knowest thy servant. For thy word's sake, and according to thine own heart, hast thou done all these great things, to make thy servant know them. … And now, O Lord GOD, thou art that God, and thy words be true, and thou hast promised this goodness unto thy servant: therefore now let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant, that it may continue for ever before thee: for thou, O Lord GOD, hast spoken it: and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed for ever" (2 Sam. 7:18–21, 28–29). So, also, the Psalmist gives his own apprehension of this covenant when it is quoted at length in Psalm 89:1–4, 20–37. In this context, which records the words of Jehovah more fully respecting this covenant with David, the literal character of the covenant is assured, the certainty of its fulfillment and the reservation about chastisement are all clearly stated. Though extended, this determining Scripture is quoted in full:

> I will sing of the mercies of the LORD for ever: with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said, Mercy shall be built up for ever: thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations. … I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: with whom my hand shall be established: mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him; nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down

> his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.

In his charge to Solomon David said: “That the LORD may continue his word which he spake concerning me, saying, If thy children take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee (said he) a man on the throne of Israel” (1 Kings 2:4). In the light of this, Solomon said of himself “Now therefore, as the LORD liveth, which hath established me, and set me on the throne of David my father, and who hath made me an house” (2:24). And Jeremiah writes: “For thus saith the LORD; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; … Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant” (Jer. 33:17, 21–22).

A notable feature of all this prediction respecting the covenant with David was the divine guarantee that David will never lack one to sit upon his throne. That throne is as literal, historical, and tangible as the throne of the Caesars, the Hohenzollerns, or the Hapsburgs. That throne is more often than not called “the throne of Israel” (1 Kings 2:4) and Christ termed it “the throne of his glory” (Matt. 19:28; 25:31). Jehovah refers to that throne in Psalm 2:6 as “my holy hill of Zion.” The Davidic earthly throne has never lacked one to sit upon it and never will. During the five hundred years which followed immediately upon David’s own reign, his sons in succession sat upon that throne. Beginning with the Babylonian captivity and continuing until the birth of Christ—a similar period of over five hundred years—there was in every generation a rightful heir to (though no

occupant of) that throne. With the birth of Christ there need be no other such, for He was the Heir in His generation and was thus identified (cf. Matt. 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30–31; 21:9, 15; 22:42; 2 Tim. 2:8; Rev. 22:16). There need be no other, since Christ abideth forever. He is now in heaven, seated upon His Father's throne and "expecting" until the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ—not by virtue of evangelizing forces, but by the decree of Jehovah and the gift to Himself of the raging nations. He will then Himself not only conquer those nations, but rule over them. The perpetuity of the literal Davidic throne and kingdom may be traced through various Scriptures. A few are given here.

Isaiah 9:6–7. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this."

The government shall be upon Messiah's shoulder, for He shall be upon the throne of David and over his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice forever. No error need be made with respect to this kingdom or this throne. That it will increase without end to both government and peace enters much into the limitless character of its duration. This is clearly a prediction of the reign of Christ in the earth—the kingdom of heaven as it will be when its final form is set up by the returning King. There is no future divine reign over the earth that is not related to and which does not proceed from the Messiah seated on David's throne.

Jeremiah 23:5–6. "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, the lord our righteousness."

According to this prophecy, which is of the greatest weight, Christ must be born of David's line and reign and prosper; He must execute judgment and justice in the earth. The same essential features of truth are recorded in

Isaiah 11:1–5, where it is said: “And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.” These are not predictions regarding a general rule of God exercised from heaven, as would be true of the kingdom of God, but regarding one Davidic in character as well as earthly in its sphere. Again it may be noted that it is the kingdom of heaven which is anticipated in the Davidic covenant.

Ezekiel 37:21–28. “Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children’s children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I

the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore."

It matters but little at this point whether it is, as some contend, King David who is exalted as a vice regent in the future kingdom or whether the reference is to Christ as David's greater Son, because the prophecy here is exceedingly explicit. The earthly kingdom over Israel in the sight of the nations with kingly authority exercised forever from David's throne is something too specific to allow this passage to be interpreted as a mere fraction of the general reign of God everywhere in His universe. It can be seen that no semblance of a fulfillment of this or any similar prediction was experienced at Christ's first advent, nor has it ever been fulfilled, nor would it be fulfilled even if all Jews and Gentiles were to be saved and brought into the Church.

Daniel 7:13–14. "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

The contribution of this portion of Scripture to this general theme is the fact that in His second advent when coming with the clouds of heaven, rather than in His first advent, He will establish a rule which is universal—so far as the earth is concerned—and everlasting.

Hosea 3:4–5. "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days."

The prophetic Scriptures thus anticipate Israel's present separation from their rightful relations to Jehovah; yet as certainly predict that they will return and seek Jehovah their God and David their king in the latter days—an expectation wholly unfulfilled to the present hour.

Matthew 1:1. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

The order of the Messianic truth set forth in Matthew's Gospel is here indicated. It presents first a record concerning the King, the Son of David,

and then the work of Christ in His death as the surety of the promise which is within the Abrahamic covenant. The title "Son of David" is many times applied to Christ and indicates not merely that He is a son of David, as many were in His generation, but that—as before stated—He is *the* Son, the immediate and rightful Heir to David's throne (cf. Matt. 9:27; 15:22; 20:30–31; 21:9, 15; 22:42). Why, indeed, should the Davidic sonship be emphasized? Is He not as much the son of Solomon or Jacob? There is but one answer to these questions: Christ not only fulfills but fills to the full the expectation contained in the Davidic covenant respecting a throne, a King, and a kingdom, and precisely in that literal sense in which the covenant was committed unto David and in that same literal sense in which it is magnified throughout all subsequent Scripture. Apart from the recognition of this relation between Christ and His human forefather David, there can be no workable interpretation of Matthew's Gospel or other Scripture which bears upon the same theme.

Luke 1:31–32. "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David."

No more determining Scripture for the point under consideration can be found than this message from the angel Gabriel to Mary. The passage incorporates truth related to each of His two advents. That which did not take place at the first coming will be accomplished at His second advent, namely, the predictions that the Lord God shall give unto Christ the throne of His father David, that He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever (vs. 33), and that of His kingdom there shall be no end (vs. 33). This throne is the Davidic, earthly throne; the house of Jacob is not the Church or any other people than those to whom the term properly applies. An endless reign carries this kingdom beyond the millennial age into eternity to come. It is yet to be observed that the throne which embodies the kingdom is a gift from "the Lord God." This, it is yet to be pointed out in the last chapter of Christology, is mentioned by the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:27–28, which declares: "For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him,

that God may be all in all." To the same end the Savior said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18). The word of the angel to Mary confirms the Davidic covenant and advances the highway of truth respecting that covenant, on its usual literal terms, to the day of Christ's second coming. No shifting into a spiritual idealism can be admitted at any point.

Acts 2:25–31. "For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."

The early part of this passage is identified as a quotation from Psalm 16; the latter portion is a direct assertion regarding the Davidic covenant as David himself understood and accepted it. He comprehended that the reference to an unending throne and kingdom contained in the covenant would be linked with the eternal Messiah who was, according to the covenant, to be of his own seed. To David was given some realization of the death of Christ, too. This he expressed in Psalm 22. He evidently reasoned that if his Son, the Messiah, was both to die and to sit upon his throne forever, He, the Messiah, must first die and be raised from death that He might satisfy the interminable feature of the covenant. Certainly Messiah could not occupy the throne forever and then come to die. It is thus that David foresaw Christ's resurrection. The passage also records the fact that God had sworn with an oath to fulfill this literal, earthly, everlasting kingdom which was covenanted to David. Of this the Psalmist writes as a record of Jehovah's declaration: "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the

sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven" (Ps. 89:34–37). Objectors, if such there be, would do well to reconsider the insult to divine veracity which a denial of Jehovah's oath constitutes. On this evil Ford C. Ottman has written:

> Affirmed it has been—and with great emphasis—that John the Baptist and the disciples of Jesus were "obsessed by popular misconceptions" and saturated with "delusions" concerning the restoration of the Davidic dynasty; and so positively has this been affirmed that many have come to accept the statement as final and no more open to question. But any general acceptance of this affirmation, without examination or understanding of what is involved in it, shows only how easily a people more modern than the Jews may be "obsessed" with a "popular misconception." The Jew knew—and so also do we—that God had sworn with an oath to establish the kingdom of David forever, and to build up his throne to all generations. Deny this we cannot, without denying Scripture that asserts it. If Scripture be of no authority, we may think what we will: if it has authority, our thinking must by it be governed. Despite the covenant and oath of God, the kingdom of David was not—as the prophets had predicted, and as the disciples had expected—restored to Israel under the Messiah. Are we to conclude from this that the national hope was a delusion, and the popular expectancy a misconception of the Messianic mission? Certainly not: and they that labor to maintain such a conclusion prove only that they are under a delusion worse than that charged against prophets, apostles and people.—*Imperialism and Christ*, pp. 81–82

This oath of Jehovah confirms the divine purpose to place the Christ on David's throne (cf. Ps. 2:6), and, according to every Scripture bearing upon it, this was not to occur in connection with His ascension when returning to heaven from the first advent, but in connection with His coming again in power and great glory (cf. Matt. 25:31; Rev. 19:16).

Acts 15:13–18. "And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world."

In defining Jehovah's new purpose in the present age, which purpose so completely set aside the essentials of Judaism for a time, the first council of the Church at Jerusalem recognized an order of events which were yet future. There was to be an outcalling of the Church from both Jews and

Gentiles, which outcalling has already begun and continues to the present hour. This, in turn, was to be followed and terminated by the return of Christ; and Christ in His return would re-establish the Davidic dynasty—a restoration foreseen by Amos, which prediction reads: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name, saith the LORD that doeth this" (Amos 9:11–12). There is no support here or elsewhere for the Romish notion that the church is the kingdom. The elders of the early church distinguished here between the Church as the present divine objective and the final return to, and completion of, the Davidic covenant.

Revelation 22:16. "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

This identification of Christ as the Son of David is not a meaningless reference to an indefinite heredity; it proclaims the truth, and that by the glorified Son of God Himself, that the Davidic kingdom will yet be realized through that One who bears the name *Son of David.*

As the opening portion of his masterful volume *Imperialism and Christ*, Ford C. Ottman has written the following:

> Imperialism and Christ are separate words of inseverable meaning. They hold each other in encircling grasp that cannot be unbound nor broken. Their disconnection, if this were possible, would throw out of gear, and stop the action of, the machinery of the Universe. Imperialism—a word insistent and resonant in the political vocabulary of today—is, without Christ, beyond the bounds of possibility. Christ—a word central and controlling in the theological vocabulary of the Church—is, without Imperialism, neither regnant nor real. For the Crown Rights of Jesus the martyrs of the Scots Kirk contended, asserting Christ's sole Headship over His Church, till they, bludgeoned and harried by dragoons, lay down on the heather and dyed it with a richer hue than ever had nature given it, the red of the blood of testimony. And yet, the Crown Rights of Jesus do not include nor consist of His Headship over the Church. The Crown Rights of Jesus are substantial and literal, and they appertain to Kingship over Israel rather than to Headship over the Church. Imperialism and Christ, in which are involved the Crown Rights of Jesus, is a phrase of concise and definite meaning: a meaning that is enshrined in the memorable and classic utterance of Andrew Melville, as he shook King James's sleeve, calling him "God's silly vassal"—and adding, "Remember, there are two kingdoms in Scotland. There is King James, whose loyal subjects we are. But there is King Jesus." "The Crown Rights of Jesus" are words that have echoed along the years from the land of the national covenant, through the highlands, and down the glens, and over the moors of Scotland; and they are words whose meaning is now expanding from bud into

bloom in the unfolding doctrine of the ever-approaching Eschatology of what we have here laid down as the "logical universe" in which our thoughts are now to move—Imperialism and Christ. Imperialism and Christ are convertible terms, equivalent in meaning, coordinate in rank, cooperative in action. Imperialism and Christ are not twain, but One. Christ without Imperialism is featureless. Imperialism without Christ is formless. It is in this, the correlative Unity of Christ and Imperialism, that all hope for the world is inextricably bound. The negation of this statement dismisses the one and the only clue given to guide us through the perplexing maze and mystery of the Universe. The negation of this statement, that with Christ's Imperialism the world's hope is indissolubly united, criminally drops the thread of the only exodus from the labyrinth of the great cosmic problem that presses upon the human soul for solution. The Crown Rights of the Lord Jesus Christ are positively declared and fully defined in Revelation, and they may not be nullified by speculation nor by pseudo-exegesis, nor, indeed, by these be in the least modified. Were the Bible incoherent or were the Bible vague in its statements of Imperialism and Christ, then we might account for the prevalent misconception of, and the prejudice against, God's Plan and Purpose in the probationary Ages of the world's history. But the Bible is not vague: it is as clear as a sunbeam, as concise as a mathematical proposition: it is positive in statement, plain in meaning, and precise in application: it pledges to the Lord Jesus Christ an Absolutism that has never been consummated in a kingdom spiritual. The real redemption of this pledge, however we may interpret its meaning, lies away in the future, and, whether it means a temporal kingdom on earth, or, whether it means a spiritual kingdom in the hearts of believers, must and can be determined by Revelation alone. Convictions, however profound they may be, have, unless they are sustained by Scripture, neither weight nor value, nor any call at all to be standard and measure of the coming kingdom. Christ in deity was David's Lord: in humanity He was David's Son. His exclusive and indisputable title to the throne of Israel was and is established and sealed by the genealogical tables of the authoritative records in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, the inspired Chroniclers of His Crown Rights as Son of David and Son of man.… "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife." By this marriage Jesus was constituted the adopted Son of Joseph and his legal heir. Thus, in the wisdom of God, Jesus, by natural descent, and by primo-geniture claim, and by legal right, is given title to the throne of His father David. That throne Jesus has never occupied. It was denied Him on earth, and since the ascension He has been seated on the throne of the Father. On that throne He is to remain until His enemies are made His footstool. The Spiritual Absolutism that traditional thought awards Him is neither the precise fulfilment of prophecy, nor the equivalent or substitute of the Temporal Absolutism that has been pledged to Him by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began.

The rejection of Christ by the Jews, and His death at the hands of the Romans, were fore-known and fore-told. "He was taken from prison and from judgment"—so centuries before His birth it was written— "and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken" (Is. 53:8). The same prophet tells us that the government was to be upon His shoulder, and that of the increase of His government and peace there should be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. This promise is confirmed by the angel's announcement to the virgin, that the Lord God should give unto Him the throne of His father David, and that He should reign over the house of Jacob forever, and that of His kingdom there should be no end. How are such

conflicting statements to be reconciled? Dying without generation, cut off out of the land of the living: yet reigning on the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it forever? The theological casuist, who has been trained to work out the subtleties of moral questions, may convince himself that the Church of Christ is that kingdom of David promised to Jesus, but such reasoning, however subtle and specious, is, to the man that believes that the words of the Bible are to be taken at their face value, inconclusive. If Gabriel stood alone in the declaration that Jesus should reign on David's throne there might be some reasonable question—in view of what has come to pass—as to the exact meaning of his words; but Gabriel is not alone in this testimony: the same is believed and is proclaimed by the Hebrew prophets. They predict a kingdom that is to be established in power, in the hands of Messiah, the Son of David; peace is to prevail and the earth is to be filled with the knowledge and glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea; the house of David is to be reestablished, and Israel, restored to divine favor, is to become the center of refreshment and blessing to all the nations of the earth; the glory of the Lord is to be revealed from Zion, and the throne of Messiah established there—such is the concurrent testimony of all the prophets. In vain would it be to assert that the kingdom has ever assumed such form. We know that it has not. The King was rejected and was crucified. And this also, as well as the overwhelming judgment that should fall upon Israel in consequence of this crowning sin, had been predicted by the Hebrew prophets. The children of Israel, during these long centuries unrolling since the rejection of Christ, have been, as was prophesied of them, "without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without pillar, and without ephod or teraphim" (Hos. 3:4, R.V.). This bereft people, in their wayward and weary wandering from God, have demonstrated and justified the literal application of this prophecy; and yet the prophecy, without a break, continues—"Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall come with fear unto the Lord and to his goodness in the latter days" (Hos. 3:5). By what principle of fair interpretation are we allowed to make a literal application of verse 4 and deny the literal force of verse 5? Is it that Israel's long banishment from God has justified the one, and has extinguished all hope of the other? If the "casting away" of Israel is a literal fact, Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God shall restore them again to His favor? And if God restores Israel, Why should it be thought a thing incredible that the kingdom shall be set up and established in the form that the prophets predicted? All believers in the Bible will admit that Jesus came into the world to establish a kingdom. Born King of the Jews was He, and—as the genealogical tables conclusively prove—legal Heir of David's throne He was, and is. Of the character and constitution of His kingdom a true conception cannot be weened from speculation, nor derived from any source beyond or other than from a sound rendering and strict interpretation of Scripture. The primitive form of the kingdom, whatever modifications there may, or may not, have been made subsequently, was a kingdom here upon the earth, during the continuance of which the law should "go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Micah 4:2). The kingdom, according to the united testimony of the prophets, is to be set up and established here upon the earth, with Jerusalem as the capital city of the kingdom, the Messiah reigning from the throne of David over restored Israel, and through Israel extending His dominion to the ends of the earth. That is the prophet's field of vision, and there is not the shadow of an intimation that the rejection and death of the King—both fore-known and fore-told—should result in any organic change of the kingdom, or modify in any way the prophet's conception. The form ultimate of the kingdom should be commensurate and concordant with its form primitive. Evidence of this is given by the prophet Micah, who says, "They shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek"—this foretells the King's rejection—"but"—the

prophecy continues—"thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel" (Micah 5:2). —Pp. 9–21

It is this latter which is the truth, namely, that the norm of the kingdom as covenanted by Jehovah with an oath is its ultimate form on earth. But that hermeneutical legerdemain which can start with a covenant respecting an earthly throne, an everlasting reign and kingdom, or without recognition of such a covenant at all, and emerge at the end with a mere fictitious idealism concerning a spiritual authority over men is borrowed—if concerned with Scripture at all—from the fact of the larger authority of God over His universe, namely, the kingdom of God. All this is but the dregs of Whitby's theory, which persuasion has so woefully ignored the precise teachings of the Bible and by so doing has become the progenitor of modern liberalism with its masquerade as the messenger of God. The indictment is against those who attempt no exposition of the Sacred Text and who present human opinions, more or less ethereal, respecting God's purpose in future ages.

II. Its Various Forms

Since the kingdom of heaven is the rule of God in the earth down through the ages, it may be identified in various forms. These are now to be traced.

1. The Judges. While God has guided the affairs of men from the beginning, there was no established method of His government over a nation until the period of the Judges. Before that time a temporary dictatorship was set up under Moses and continued under Joshua. The divine rule through the Judges is definitely owned of God as that period closes. Jehovah said to Samuel: "Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them" (1 Sam. 8:7; cf. Judges 2:16, 18; Acts 13:20). So, also, according to Isaiah the original method of administering the theocratic government will yet be restored. Isaiah declares "And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called, The city of righteousness, the

faithful city" (1:26). The rule of the Judges, being Jehovah's government over Israel, is a form of the kingdom of heaven.

2. The Davidic Reign and Covenant. Though Saul served as king over Israel for a long period, he failed and his reign was evidently an education of the people in preparation for the true exercise of divine authority through David. The reign of David was peculiarly a divine undertaking for it had in view as a pattern the final form of that Davidic reign. It served its greatest purpose, however, as the starting point for all that inheres in Jehovah's covenant with David. Such, indeed, is the start of the great highway of prediction respecting the kingdom of heaven.

3. The Kingdom Predicted. It is significant that the Old Testament prophets spoke, in the main, during one comparatively brief period. This was the time in which Israel was approaching and entering her national dispersion under the chastening hand of God. It was in the darkest hour of their nation's history that these seers, as if by contrast, set forth the unprecedented light of the nation's coming glory. This consensus of prophetic vision has never had a semblance of fulfillment; yet the nation is still divinely preserved, and so, evidently, with this consummation in view (Jer. 31:35–37; Matt. 24:32–34).

Some of the prophets spoke before the exile, some during the exile, while others spoke after the exile when a remnant, but not the nation, had returned to their land. While they spoke with individual purpose and style, they were united as one voice on certain great themes. They condemned the nation's sin and predicted the coming chastisement. They saw the judgments about to fall upon the surrounding nations, but these Gentile judgments are in view only as they are related to Israel. Above all they saw their own future blessings, the form and manner of which are too accurately described by them to be misunderstood. Their prophecies expanded into magnificent detail the covenanted reign of David's Son over the house of Jacob forever. In tracing these passages scarcely a comment is necessary if the statements are taken in their plain and obvious meaning. Passages are here selected from the many that were spoken by all the prophets concerning the coming King and His kingdom, and from these Scriptures it will be seen that Emmanuel's government is—

a. To Be Theocratic. The King will be "Emmanuel … God with us," for He is by human birth a rightful heir to David's throne and born of a virgin in Bethlehem.

First, the King will be "Emmanuel … God with us": "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14). "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us" (Matt. 1:22–23).

Second, the King will be heir to David's throne: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins" (Isa. 11:1–5). "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (Jer. 23:5). "And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd" (Ezek. 34:23). "And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them" (Ezek. 37:24). "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days" (Hos. 3:4–5).

Third, the King was to be born of a virgin in Bethlehem: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14). "But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among

the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (Mic. 5:2).

b. To Be Heavenly in Character. "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isa. 2:4). "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins" (Isa. 11:4–5). "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our righteousness. For thus saith the LORD; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel" (Jer. 33:14–17). "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground: and I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth, and will make them to lie down safely" (Hos. 2:18).

c. To Be in Jerusalem and World-Wide. First, Emmanuel's kingdom will be in the earth: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Ps. 2:8). "For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea" (Isa. 11:9). "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law" (Isa. 42:4). "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (Jer. 23:5). "And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one" (Zech. 14:9).

Second, Emmanuel's kingdom will be centered at Jerusalem:

“The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD’S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem” (Isa. 2:1–3). “For Zion’s sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem’s sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the LORD shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the LORD, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzi-bah, and thy land Beulah: for the LORD delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married. For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee: and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee. I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that make mention of the LORD, keep not silence, and give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth” (Isa. 62:1–7). “Thus saith the LORD of hosts; It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts: I will go also. Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD. Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you” (Zech. 8:20–23). “And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled” (Luke 21:24).

Third, Emmanuel’s kingdom will be over regathered and converted Israel:

“That then the LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the LORD thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: and the LORD thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live” (Deut. 30:3–6). “And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth” (Isa. 11:11–12). “For the LORD will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And the people shall take them, and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and handmaids: and they shall take them captives, whose captives they

were; and they shall rule over their oppressors” (Isa. 14:1–2; cf. 60:1–22). “In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord Our Righteousness. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that they shall no more say, The LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land” (Jer. 23:6–8). “Behold, I will gather them out of all countries, whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God” (Jer. 32:37–38). “And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them, as at the first. And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me. And it shall be to me a name of joy, a praise and an honour before all the nations of the earth, which shall hear all the good that I do unto them: and they shall fear and tremble for all the goodness and for all the prosperity that I procure unto it” (Jer. 33:7–9; cf. Ezek. 36:16–38). “And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children’s children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever” (Ezek. 37:21–25). “In that day, saith the LORD, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the LORD shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem” (Mic. 4:6–8).

Fourth, Emmanuel’s kingdom shall extend to the nations in the earth:

“Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him. … His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed” (Ps. 72:11, 17). “All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name” (Ps. 86:9). “Behold, thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee because of the LORD thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he hath glorified thee” (Isa. 55:5). “I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed” (Dan. 7:13–14). “And many

nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem" (Mic. 4:2). "Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD" (Zech. 8:22). "And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the LORD thy God" (Amos 9:15).

d. To Be Established by the Returning King. "That then the LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee" (Deut. 30:3). "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice" (Ps. 50:3–5). "For he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth" (Ps. 96:13). "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the LORD. And many nations shall be joined to the LORD in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the LORD of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the LORD shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land, and shall choose Jerusalem again. Be silent, O all flesh, before the LORD: for he is raised up out of his holy habitation" (Zech. 2:10–13). "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former years" (Mal. 3:1–4).

e. To Be Spiritual. The kingdom is not incorporeal or separate from that which is material, but still it is spiritual in that the will of God will be directly effective in all matters of government and conduct. The joy and

blessedness of fellowship with God will be experienced by all. The universal, temporal kingdom will be conducted in perfect righteousness and true holiness. The kingdom of God will again be "in the midst" (Luke 17:21, R.V. marg.) in the Person of the Messiah King and He will rule in the grace and power of the sevenfold Spirit (Isa. 11:2–5). Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and the nations shall walk in the light of the city of God. "Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD." The trees of the field shall clap their hands in accord with man's joy.

These passages, which might be multiplied many times, may serve to outline the prophet's vision of the features of Messiah's earthly kingdom which was covenanted to David. This kingdom has ever been Israel's only hope and was the consolation for which she waited when Christ was born (Luke 2:25).

4. THE KINGDOM OFFERED. In subject matter the division between the Old Testament and the New occurs at the cross of Christ, rather than between Malachi and Matthew. The Gospels, in the main, carry forward the same dispensational conditions that were in effect at the hour when Christ was born. Especially is this true of the Gospel of Matthew, Christ being set forth in that Gospel, first of all, as a King with His kingdom in full view. The Spirit has faithfully selected those deeds and teachings of Christ from the complete manifestation He made in the flesh which portray Him in the dominant character to be reflected in each individual Gospel. In Matthew He is presented as the King, in Mark as Jehovah's Servant, in Luke as the perfect Human, and in John as the very Son of God. In all these narratives, this one Person is seen acting and teaching under the same conditions which existed for centuries before the cross. There is some anticipation of what would follow the cross, as there is reference after the cross to what had gone before. Whatever preceded the cross, in the main, fell under those conditions linked with and colored by "the law [which] was given by Moses," for Jesus not only held up Moses as the authority for the time but also expanded his teachings. The great division between the Old Testament and the New, therefore, lies in the fact that "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," and this became effective with the cross of Christ rather than with His birth. Matthew opens with an emphasis upon Christ as the Son of

David: “The book of the generation [γένεσις—ancestry or line of descent; cf. the kindred term γενεά, Matt. 24:34] of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.” Although in this Gospel Jesus is also presented as “the son of Abraham” in His sacrificial death, the primary purpose of the writer is to set forth the nation’s King, this being the only office that is ever assigned to a firstborn “son of David.” The tracing of the divinely appointed kingdom thus proceeds from the Old Testament into the New without a change other than the appearance of the long-expected King, accompanied by His forerunner whose predicted ministry had occupied the closing words of the Old Testament revelation. There is no break in the narrative, then.

The fact that Jesus was David’s Greater Son, the fulfiller of all the nation’s kingdom blessings, is not based on human opinion. It was announced by the angel Gabriel before the birth of Christ as recorded in Luke 1:31–33: “And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end.” This treats distinctly of the “throne of … David” ruling over the “house of Jacob,” and proclaims of this kingdom that “there shall be no end.” No Gentile blessings are in view here; nor need the Gentiles seek to intrude. Gentile blessings will eventually flow out of this very throne, but these are not in view; nor are any Gentile blessings endangered by a faithful recognition of this distinctly Jewish purpose. The same is clearly stated in Romans 15:8: “Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision [i.e., Israel] for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.” He did not come to *disannul* those promises, but He did come to *confirm* them. The promises made unto the fathers are well defined; no promises were made to Gentiles. The terminology “the fathers” can mean none other than God’s chosen men, or Israel. By these promises Israel was to be redeemed and placed in her own land and that by Emmanuel, who should be the final Prophet, Priest, and King. He should be King over her covenanted kingdom. These promises made unto the fathers were the nation’s only hope, as is clearly indicated: “We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel”; “Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” In Christ, then, the kingdom covenant made to David had its confirmation as

well it might, being one of the promises made unto the fathers. How certainly that covenant must stand today! It is recorded of Jesus that He was "born King of the Jews" (Matt. 2:2). To this throne He made final claim at His trial (Matt. 27:11). And under this accusation He suffered (Matt. 27:29) and died (Matt. 27:37). One needs only to search the Scriptures to discover the fact that He is never mentioned as King of the church, nor even King of the nations until He comes again as "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords" (Rev. 19:16). He fulfilled every prediction that described Israel's Messiah King and the manner of His coming—that at a time when all the records and genealogies were intact. He came from the tribe of Judah, ranked as a firstborn Son of David, born of a virgin in Bethlehem of Judea. Such claims could not have been made then by an impostor without arousing the violent opposition of the rulers of the nation. His claim to be King was never challenged, so far as title was concerned. He met every prediction concerning Israel's Emmanuel-King. He was that King.

Four centuries before the birth of Jesus, Malachi had prophesied the coming of a forerunner to prepare the people for their King: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse" (4:5–6). This had a certain fulfillment in John the Baptist according, again, to angelic testimony: "But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord" (Luke 1:13–17). Furthermore, another Messianic claim was met in the faithful ministry of John, for the first message of this divinely foreseen witness is recorded thus: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Juda, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:1–2). This, too, was the first message recorded of Christ: "From that time Jesus began to

preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 4:17). So, again, it was the only message committed to His disciples when He first sent them forth to preach: "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 10:5–7). This message, it is clear, had no application to Gentiles; the messengers were to go only "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." It can scarcely go unnoticed that, while every detail of the manner of their journey was subject to the most careful instruction by the King, there is no record of their being given instruction on the meaning of this first, or kingdom, message committed to them. Evidently they did not need such instruction concerning the kingdom. Had not the kingdom hope been passed from father to son for generations? Had it not been sung to them at their mother's knee? Had it not been the one great theme of synagogue instruction? Was it not their national hope? How much in contrast to this was the prolonged inability on the part of these same disciples to grasp, later on, the new message and world-wide commission of the cross! This focusing of the testimony of Jesus, of John, and of the disciples upon one solitary message "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" places that message under an unusual emphasis, and its actual meaning should be carefully considered.

The phrase "the kingdom of heaven" is found only in Matthew, the Gospel of the King, and there it appears with different shades of meaning. Only one of these shades of meaning is used in chapters 1 to 12 of this first Gospel. Here it seems to refer to the same earthly Davidic kingdom with which the Old Testament had closed its Messianic prophesying in Malachi. As has been stated, whatever was meant by this New Testament announcement of "the kingdom of heaven," it was clearly understood by the preachers who first proclaimed it and by their hearers. No other kingdom message could have thus been received by Jewish people in that day. So, also, it was addressed to one nation, Israel, and to them as a whole rather than to individuals. Thus "the kingdom of heaven" as a message must ever be distinguished from the message of the gospel of grace which came by reason of the cross. The gospel of grace Israel as a nation has never understood, and furthermore it is addressed to all peoples and to them as

individuals only. The message of “the kingdom of heaven” as first set forth by Matthew had, therefore, a limited and national meaning, limited in the time of its application because a new message has since come in from God, and national because for the time being it was addressed to Israel alone. The message of “the kingdom of heaven” did not concern itself so much with the Person of the King as it did with His kingdom. But then Israel had never dreamed of a kingdom apart from the presence and power of the expected King. Thus Jesus could say of Himself, in the light of the accepted close relation between the Person of the King and His kingdom: “the kingdom of God is within you” (“in the midst of” Israel in the Person of the King, Luke 17:21). To assert the imminency of the kingdom was, to them, to assert the imminency of the King.

This kingdom message conforms in another respect, also, to the conditions of the Old Testament prophecy of a government. There must be a great national heart-turning, or repentance, to God as an immediate preparation for the kingdom, as seen in the Old Testament (Deut. 30:1–3; Isa. 42:7; Hos. 3:4–5; 14:8; Zech. 12:10—13:1; Mal. 3:7). Repentance, therefore, became an imperative part of the message concerning the imminency of the kingdom. So each of these kingdom messengers called upon that nation to repent. A “generation of vipers” must “bring forth … fruits meet for repentance.” They must turn about in heart as a prerequisite for this covenanted kingdom blessing. This they, by His grace, are yet to do, “in his time.” It is to be regretted that this required national repentance of Israel has been so often misapplied as a necessary preliminary step in an individual’s salvation by grace.

As certainly as the message of “the kingdom of heaven” was consistent with the nation’s hope, so, also, the rule of life presented in connection with this message by both John the Baptist and Christ was in harmony with the Old Testament predicted kingdom’s rule of life. The kingdom as foreseen in the Old Testament had ever in view the righteousness in life and conduct of its subjects (Isa. 11:3–5; 32:1; Jer. 23:6; Dan. 9:24). “The kingdom of heaven” as announced and offered in the early part of Matthew’s Gospel is also accompanied with positive demands for personal righteousness in life and conduct. This is not the principle of grace; it is rather the principle of law. Kingdom teaching extends into finer detail the law of Moses and never ceases to be the very opposite of the principle of grace. Law conditions its

blessings on human works, grace conditions its works on divine blessings. Law says “If ye forgive … your heavenly Father will also forgive you,” and in that measure only (Matt. 6:14–15), while grace says “Forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you” (Eph. 4:32). So, again, law says “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 5:20). This is not a present condition for entrance into heaven. Present conditions are wholly based on mercy: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us” (Titus 3:5). So the preaching of John the Baptist, like the Sermon on the Mount, was on a law basis as indicated by its appeal, which was only for a correct and righteous life: “Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then? He answered and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise. Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages” (Luke 3:7–14). This, like the Sermon on the Mount, is an appeal for a righteous life and cannot be confused with the present terms of salvation without nullifying the grounds of every hope and promise under grace. The present appeal to the unsaved is not for better conduct; it is for personal belief in, and acceptance of, the Savior. There are directions concerning the conduct of those who are saved by trust in the Savior; but these cannot be mixed with the law conditions of the Old Testament, or the New, without peril to souls. Later on, the same people said to Christ “What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?” and to this He replied “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent” (John 6:28–29). John the Baptist looked forward to the

blessings of grace when he said “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,” but his immediate demands were in conformity with pure law, as were the early, kingdom teachings of Jesus. Thus the legal principles of conduct of the Old Testament predicted kingdom are carried forward into the revelations of the same kingdom as it appears in the New Testament. The right division of Scripture does not destroy the usefulness of these legal passages for today, but it does fully classify them with the other Scriptures relating to the kingdom, both in the Old Testament and the New. There are many elements in this body of truth that indicates the required manner of life in the kingdom which will be found likewise under the consistent walk in grace; but whatever is carried forward to be a life-governing principle under grace is there restated in its own place and with its own new emphasis. Thus the two widely differing systems are meant to be kept distinct in the mind of the faithful student of God’s Word. It should be borne in mind that the legal kingdom requirements as stated in the Sermon on the Mount are meant to prepare the way for, and condition life in, the earthly Davidic kingdom when it shall be set up upon the earth, and at that very time when the kingdom prayer “Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” has been answered. These kingdom emphases appear in the early ministry of Jesus, since He was at that time faithfully offering the Messianic kingdom to Israel.

It has been objected that such stipulations as “Resist not evil,” “Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek …,” “Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile …,” and “… persecuted for righteousness’ sake” could not be possible in the kingdom. This challenge may be based upon a supposition that the earthly Messianic kingdom is to be as morally perfect as heaven. On the contrary, the Scriptures abundantly testify that, while there will be far less occasion to sin, for the sufficient reason that Satan is then bound and in a pit and the glorious King is on His throne, there will be need of immediate execution of judgment and justice in the earth, and even the King shall rule, of necessity, with a “rod of iron.” It is said that “All Israel shall be saved” and “They shall all know me [the Lord], from the least of them unto the greatest,” but it is also revealed that at the end of that millennium, when Satan is loosed for a little season, he is still able to solicit the allegiance of human hearts and to draw out of the multitudes within the kingdom an army for rebellion against the government of the King (Rev.

20:7–9). In that kingdom age “the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed” (Isa. 65:20). The saints of that age will doubtless have heaven before their eyes and be looking there for their reward. And they will be the “salt of the earth.” These kingdom commands and principles were given to Israel only and it is the same distinct nation that shall stand first in her predicted kingdom when it is set up in the earth. Jesus was first “a minister of the circumcision,” consequently is it an unnatural interpretation of Scripture to understand that He was performing this divinely appointed ministry at that very time when He was offering the kingdom to that nation and when He, with His forerunner, was depicting the principles of conduct that should condition life in that kingdom? Nothing is lost by such an interpretation; on the contrary, everything is gained, for the riches of grace —which alas so few apprehend—are thus kept pure and free from an unscriptural admixture with the kingdom law.

It may be concluded that the term “the kingdom of heaven” as used in the early ministry of Jesus referred to the Messianic, Davidic, earthly kingdom foreseen in the Old Testament. As has been noted, the Jewish preachers used by Christ needed no instruction in the details of that message. It was the hope of their nation, and it was addressed to that nation alone. So, also, an appeal was made with this message for the anticipated national repentance which must precede the setting up of their kingdom in the earth, and the requirements set forth were legal rather than gracious. Israel’s kingdom was faithfully offered to them by their King at His first appearing.

5. The Kingdom Rejected and Postponed. The suggestion that God has deferred any feature of His program of the ages engenders objection in some minds, assuming that such action on His part is unworthy of Him. The difficulty is removed at once when it is remembered that the postponement was not an afterthought or unexpected necessity, but was itself a part of the original plan of God—that is, to the end that an age might be introduced which had been kept secret in the counsels of God, that Messiah might be crucified and raised from the dead to be the Redeemer of both Israel and the Church, likewise the Judge of all created beings, and that Israel’s rejection of Jehovah might assume its final, concrete form as it did in the death of Christ. The setting up of Messiah’s kingdom, though first faithfully offered

to Israel, was deferred and now awaits the return of Messiah for its realization. The question which presents difficulty to some is how the kingdom could be offered to Israel in sincerity and yet Jehovah Himself know, as He did, that it would not be accepted and that it would be deferred. Was the whole divine purpose in redemption by so much rendered uncertain? Much has been written on this problem in an earlier portion of this theological work. It is evident that, as the present age was a divine secret, it could not have been revealed until the rejection of Christ was consummated in His death and resurrection. Similarly, there is a natural disposition to judge the entire question, which the postponement of the kingdom creates, from the finite viewpoint alone. Whatever occurs is usually directly or indirectly due to man's action in free will; it is therefore natural to suppose that God is in some way subject to human determination, not realizing that God not only knows beforehand the choice His creatures will make, but is Himself able to work in them both to will and to do of His own good pleasure. The Scriptures present many incidents which disclose the fact that the will of God is executed by men even when they have no conscious intention to do the will of God. Within their own sphere of recognition they act in perfect freedom. With reference to other situations in which God's sovereign purpose seems for a time to depend on the free-will action of men, it will be remembered that God ordained a Lamb before the foundation of the world and that Lamb to be slain at God's appointed time and way. By so much it is made clear that God anticipated the sin of man and his great need of redemption. God, however, told Adam *not* to sin; yet if Adam had not sinned there would have been no need of that redemption which God had before determined as something to be wrought out. Was God uncertain whether He would save life on the earth until Noah consented to build an ark? Was the nation Israel a matter of divine doubt until Abraham manifested his willingness to walk with God? Was the birth of Christ dubiety until Mary assented to the divine plan respecting the virgin birth? Is God censurable for determining that Christ should be born of the virgin Mary before she was even born? Is the virgin Mary deprived of her own volition through God's sovereign choice of her as the mother of Jesus? Was the death of Christ in danger of being abortive and all the types and prophecies respecting His death of being proved untrue until Pilate made his decision regarding that death? From these propositions, which

might be multiplied indefinitely, it can be seen that in the greatest issues of time and eternity—all predetermined before the foundation of the world—God has realized His purposes in and through man—often unsympathetic to God's will—who, so far as human determination is concerned, could have frustrated the whole divine program by the action of his free will. Could God promise a kingdom on the earth knowing and so planning that it would be rejected in the first advent but realized in the second advent? Could God offer a kingdom in the first advent in sincerity, knowing and determining that it would not be established until the second advent? After all, what constitutes divine sincerity under such circumstances? Who is in a position to measure what, from the divine side, enters into the seeming conflict between divine sovereignty and human free will? To inquire what would have become of the divine plan respecting the death of Christ and of this entire age had the Jews accepted the offer of the kingdom, is equivalent to asking what would have become of God's purpose in redemption through a divine Lamb slain had Adam not sinned? Beyond all these confusing crosscurrents of determinations is the simple fact of revelation which asserts that the kingdom was offered as it was predicted it would be offered by Messiah's forerunner, it was rejected, it was delayed until the immediate value of Christ's death and resurrection as seen in the outcalling of the Church could be made effective. In this connection it will not be overstressed that, so far as the vision accorded the prophets of the Old Testament is concerned, there was in the program for Israel, as predicted, no separation between the two advents. But for the Church intercalation—which was wholly unforeseen and is wholly unrelated to any divine purpose which precedes it or which follows it—Israel would be expected to pass directly from the crucifixion to her kingdom; for it was not the death of Christ and His resurrection which demanded the postponement, but rather an unforeseen age. It should require no great effort to note that the recognition of this age—wholly unforeseen, wholly unrelated, and itself a strict intercalation—is the key to the understanding of the entire program of God in the ages, and without that key only confusion can result. It is not claimed that many spiritual truths may not be drawn from the life and death of Christ by those who do not concern themselves with the deeper problems of interpretation; it is claimed, however, that the vital issues of the divine purpose as far as it has been revealed and the clear apprehension of the

doctrines involved depends upon the recognition of the truth which constitutes the above-mentioned key. It requires no profound study to observe that the earthly, Messianic, Davidic kingdom was offered by John the Baptist, by Christ, and by His disciples, that it was rejected even to the murder of John and the crucifixion of the King, and that it was not set up in connection with the first advent, nor is it being set up in the present age. Nevertheless, every oath-bound covenant of Jehovah will yet be consummated, His kingdom will come, and His bidding be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

6. The Present Form. Since, as earlier defined, the kingdom of heaven is the rule of God in the earth, it follows that it is now present to the extent to which He is exercising authority over the affairs of the *cosmos.* Assuredly God is not at this time executing a preannounced Jewish program, nor is He extending Jewish blessings to Gentiles; rather He is calling out a heavenly people from both Jews and Gentiles on equal terms of privilege and to the heights of glory never extended to any people in past ages. In such unprecedented and momentous undertakings God, of necessity, must govern the affairs of men to an extended degree. This present exercise of divine authority is styled "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" (cf. Matt. 13:11). A New Testament *mystery* is a hitherto unrevealed purpose of God. It therefore follows that God's direct authority is now exercised in the realization of the features of this age which are thus termed *mysteries.* On the Church in her relation to the New Testament mysteries, Dr. Rollin Thomas Chafer has written: "The Church does not appear in the Old Testament. As something new in God's provision for Jew and Gentile, the true Church and some of its unique characteristics are spoken of by Paul as *mysteries.* These mysteries were withheld from Old Testament saints, but are freely revealed to New Testament believers, hence the church is not found in the Old Testament. These mysteries include the Church itself, its Head, its message of grace, the Body of Christ as an organism made up of saved Jews and Gentiles, indwelt by Christ as the hope of glory, its ministry controlled by the Lord Himself, its ultimate removal from the earthly scene by resurrection and translation, and its approaching marriage as the Bride of the Lamb. Not a hint of these things appears in the Old Testament. On the contrary, this is the ethnic group which the Lord spoke of when he said, 'I

will build my church,' an accomplishment which was still future at the time of its announcement. Never does the Scripture confuse it with Israel—past, present or future" (*The Science of Biblical Hermeneutics,* p. 43). In each of these mysteries which Dr. R. T. Chafer enumerates—the Church itself, its head, its message of grace, the Body of Christ an organism indwelt by Christ as the believer's hope of glory, its ministry, its ultimate removal, and its approaching marriage as the Bride of the Lamb—it is to be noted that the originating of it, its progress, and its consummation are wholly wrought of God. In this He exerts His sovereign control. Thus the "mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" represent the present sphere of divine authority. It is true that, to the end that they may cooperate in His primary purpose, God is in authority over governments and all the affairs of men, both collectively and individually; but the divine objective is the kingdom in its mystery form. When the Church is completed and removed from the earth, every secondary feature of divine authority will automatically reach its termination too. In other words, the Church is not waiting for some crisis to be reached in the sphere of human governments, but instead the governments are muddling on until the divine purpose in the Church is consummated.

The moral character of this mystery age at its beginning, like its moral development and end, is clearly presented in the New Testament. At the very beginning the inspired writers spoke of it as an evil age: "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world" (or *age*, Gal. 1:4), "And be not conformed to this world" (or *age*, Rom. 12:2), "For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world" (or *age*, 2 Tim. 4:10), "In whom the god of this world [or *age*] hath blinded the minds of them which believe not" (2 Cor. 4:4). So the church was fully warned from the beginning about the nature of this age, and taught concerning her pilgrim character while here and her holy calling and separateness from the "evil age."

A portion of the time during which Israel was to be dispersed and deprived of national blessing had been divinely accounted for by the "seventy weeks" revelation given to Daniel. The fact and purpose of the present mystery age was not mentioned in this revelation; hence there was need that this sacred secret should be revealed when its time had fully come. This Jesus does in the seven parables of Matthew 13, it being ever

God's method to give a foreview of all His great purposes and undertakings. The course and moral development of this age are divinely presented in these parables. Three distinct features or elements of this age are to be seen in these seven parables, while each of the three are elsewhere said to be terminated by one and the same event. These are to be noted and the single conclusion they have, namely, Christ's return. (1) The blindness of Israel, mentioned in Romans 11:25, is followed by the promise: "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins" (Rom. 11:26–27). (2) The career of the "man of sin," who is said to be the consummation of the "mystery of iniquity," is ended thus: "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" (2 Thess. 2:8). (3) So, also, it is written concerning the completion of the calling out of the Church: "After this I will return" (cf. Acts 15:13–18). These great sacred secrets, it will be noticed, constitute the very elements in the parables which define the character and object of the age.

In the first of the parables a sower goes forth to sow, but only a fourth part (no reference, of course, to a percentage basis) of the seed thus sown comes to full development. The parable is interpreted by Christ and so permits of no speculation: "Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower. When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way side. But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended. He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful. But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty" (Matt. 13:18–23). In full agreement with experience during the past nineteen hundred years of Christian history the parable teaches that a great portion of those to whom the Word is preached are not saved by it; and lest it might be concluded by His hearers that, while this was the

condition at the beginning of the age, it would not be so at the end, the second parable, that of the wheat and the tares, immediately follows. This, like the first, is interpreted by Christ Himself and its meaning is made plain: “He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world [or *age*]; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world [or *age*]. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear” (Matt. 13:37–43). In this parable the born-again ones, the members of His Body, are seen as the “wheat” or the “children of God” amidst the whole sphere of religious profession and assumption. It is important to note how the age closes according to this divine interpretation: “So shall it be in the end of this world” (or *age*). Certainly this does not depict a regenerated world. It clearly pictures an outcalled people together with the full ripening of iniquity in the unregenerate portion of humanity. The third parable is not interpreted, nor is any parable following it explained; but enough has been revealed by the two interpretations to furnish a key to all that follows. The parables all present aspects of the kingdom of heaven in the one mystery form it now possesses, and so must be in fullest agreement. In the third parable Christ presents truth through the figure of the mustard seed and tree. Again the testimony of history and the teaching of the parable agree. The very small beginning in the early days of the church has developed out of all due proportion in mere members and includes all professing Christendom. The great tree now shelters even the birds of the air. It is significant that the birds of the first parable are represented as catching away the good seed. The truly saved ones are still a “little flock” compared with the multitude of nominal church supporters. The fourth parable is of the three measures of meal which all became leavened. Throughout the Bible, leaven symbolizes evil and Jesus fully defined His use of the word on other occasions. He used the word to represent evil doctrine to the extent of formality (Matt. 23:14, 16, 23–28),

unbelief (Matt. 22:23, 29; Mark 8:15), and worldliness (Matt. 22:16–21; Mark 3:6). Paul uses the same word with reference to "malice and wickedness" (1 Cor. 5:6–8). Its process of working is by a subtle permeating of the mass into which it is introduced. This much misunderstood parable teaches, in accord with the other parables and all related Scripture, that which has proved to be consonant with experience in the history of the age, namely, that even the true believers—and certainly the mass of professors—will be sadly influenced by these various forms of subtle evil. There can be no question that this has been true to the present hour. The fifth parable is evidently a teaching concerning Israel because she is His "treasure" (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 14:2), including all the twelve tribes, though now they are hid in the field, which is the world—all places where the nation is scattered. When He shall call forth His "treasure" it will be by virtue of the fact that He hath, as the Lamb of God, taken away the sins of the world, theirs included. One, we are told, sold all and purchased that field containing the treasure. What Jehovah may do now, or of course at any time in behalf of any people, will be because of the atoning value of the priceless blood of His Son as the purchase price for sinners in their need of redemption. The Only Begotten Son was given for the world. The mystery of the Church, the pearl of great cost as set forth in the sixth parable, has already been considered. She is not now hid in the field, i.e., the world; but is being formed there and is awaiting her bridal glory when, in the ages to come, she shall display His glory and grace. She, too, is redeemed at the same priceless cost as Israel (1 Pet. 1:18–19). The last parable restates the fact of the outworking of the two great mysteries—the outcalled Church and the mystery of iniquity—as two coexisting on to the time of the end. The good fish shall be gathered into vessels and the bad shall be cast away. "So shall it be at the end of the world" (or *age*). Thus the three great mystery purposes of this mystery age (Israel's blindness, the Church's formation, the man of sin's appearance) were related in the teachings of Jesus to the beginning, course, and end of the present age respectively.

The following Scriptures give added light on the thought and expectation of Christ and the apostles concerning the course and end of this age:

> "And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass,

but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are the beginning of sorrows" (Matt. 24:4–8). "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be" (24:37). "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some" (1 Cor. 9:22). "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (1 Tim. 4:1). "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come" (2 Tim. 3:1). "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived" (3:13). "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (4:3–4). "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. 3:3–4).

To this may be added the other parables of Jesus regarding the kingdom in its mystery form and the whole divinely given history of the church as previewed in Revelation 2:1–3:22. So, also, the more detailed description of the age-ending scenes as given by Daniel and Revelation 4:1–20:3. There is an age of universal blessing coming upon the earth; but it is in no way represented in Scripture as any part, or product, of this mystery age. On the other hand, it is revealed that it will be ushered in by the same divine movements that form the closing scenes of this age. The impelling motive for the service of saints at the present time must be nothing less than the world-wide testimony to the gospel of God's grace through which Christ may finish the gathering out of a people for His Person and soon complete His Bride. The great soul-winners of past generations have been actuated by this vision and purpose, and there could hardly be a ministry in the mind and power of the Spirit that did not wholly agree with the revealed purpose of God in the present mystery age.

7. The Kingdom of Heaven Realized and Manifested. Since it is a major theme of both the Old and New Testaments, the kingdom of heaven provides an almost inexhaustible study. In the introduction to his massive work *The Theocratic Kingdom*—about 2,100 pages of at least 750 words to the page—George N. H. Peters writes regarding the text he has produced: "This work is far from being exhaustive. Here are only presented the outlines of that which some other mind may mould into a more attractive and comprehensive form" (I, 15). Yet, but recently—and to demonstrate by way of contrast how restricted the modern theological understanding may

be—a professor of New Testament in a reputable seminary said, “I can tell all I know about the kingdom in fifteen minutes.” This drastic restriction in the knowledge of vital truth does not, however, hinder this professor from sitting in condemnatory judgment against the vast array of truth with all its adaptations and evident soundness of exposition to be set forth by Peters. Because of its comprehensiveness, a very real problem arises when a summarization of this subject is called for, as it is when closing this entire prophetic discussion. The essential character of the earthly, Davidic, millennial, Messianic kingdom yet to be set up on the earth by the power of Christ in His second advent has had some consideration in this chapter and still more in Ecclesiology (Vol. IV). It now remains only to present the following recapitulation.

According to prophecy, there will be two realities in the world especially to be reckoned with as the present age draws to its close, namely, the completion and removal of the Church and the increase of lawlessness in the world. Immediately after the removal of the Church and immediately before the establishment of the millennial kingdom is the brief period of incomparable trial in the earth. In relation to Israel, it is known as “the time of Jacob’s trouble” (Jer. 30:7), and in relation to the Gentiles it is the hour when their governments and institutions as represented in Nebuchadnezzar’s colossal image shall be ground to powder and blown away as the chaff of the summer threshing floor (Dan. 2:34–35, 44–45). It is the hour of God’s judgments upon a Christ-rejecting *cosmos* world—a world which will have produced the final manifestation of abomination in the person of the man of sin. Upon such a world as upon its god—Satan—the judgments of God must fall. As His consummation of those judgments and into the scenes of earth’s most wicked repudiation of God, the King returns in the clouds of heaven accompanied by His Bride and the holy angels. He utterly destroys all opposition to God and conquers the nations of the earth (cf. Ps. 2:1–9; Isa. 63:1–6; 2 Thess. 1:7–9; Rev. 19:11–21). Satan is bound and placed in the abyss (Rev. 20:1–3), and the King takes His throne— the throne of His glory, the throne of David in Jerusalem. He gathers and judges Israel (cf. Ezek. 20:33–44; Matt. 24:37–25:30) and those accepted by the King are saved and enter their kingdom (cf. Rom. 11:26–27). He also judges the nations from that same throne—the nations whom He will have conquered (Matt. 25:31–46). A portion of these nations then

upon earth shall be ushered into His kingdom, which is prepared for them by the Father from the foundation of the world. The remainder of these nations are dismissed to the lake of fire. Those Gentile nations that are allowed to enter Israel's kingdom are given a place as servants of Israel (cf. Isa. 14:1–2; 60:10, 12, 14, 16). Thus by the glorious return of Christ as Judge and King is ushered in the Day of Jehovah so long and explicitly foretold by prophets of old. That Day begins with the coming of Christ to Israel "as a thief in the night" (cf. Matt. 24:43; 1 Thess. 5:4; 2 Pet. 3:10), that is, to Israel His coming is at a time when they look not for Him (Matt. 24:50). With this in view, they are told to *watch*, which injunction does not apply to Israel in the present or in any past age but only at the time when they "shall see all these things" which have been named by Christ as characterizing the tribulation period (cf. Matt. 24:9–28, 37–51; 25:1–13). The Day of Jehovah is that long period of Christ's rule and judgments over the earth which begins with His return as a thief in the night and ends, in certain particulars, with the passing away of the heavens and the earth. Of this period and its boundaries and in connection with the comment that Jehovah's Day may in His eyes be as a thousand years, Peter declares: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up" (2 Pet. 3:10). This passage because connected directly with verse 8 intimates that the Old Testament Day of Jehovah, that is, Israel's age of kingdom glory, is to continue a thousand years, which is but a confirmation of the time measurement for the kingdom later given in Revelation 20:4, where it is seen that the saints who are resurrected "live and reign with Christ a thousand years." Truth to be especially noted at this point is that after a certain manner Christ reigns a thousand years. That His reign is Israel's day of glory is abundantly declared throughout the prophetic Scriptures. The conclusion is that the thousand-year period of Revelation 20:1–6 and the intimation of 2 Peter 3:3–8, 10 are references to the time when Israel's covenants will be fulfilled under the long-expected reign of Messiah, and that His reign will continue in this precise form a millennium.

To outline fully the character and blessedness of that coming age would require the quotation of great portions from the messages of the prophets in which language seems not to suffice to paint adequately the glory of the

transformed earth. A selection of passages, indicating the character of the Messianic kingdom, has been given already in this chapter of Christology, and another selection follows here. By these Scriptures this kingdom is seen to be theocratic. The King will be Emmanuel and by human birth a rightful heir to David's throne, Himself born of a virgin in Bethlehem of Judea. Emmanuel's kingdom will be heavenly in character in that the God of heaven will rule in the earth, His will to be done on earth as it is done in heaven. Emmanuel's kingdom will be in the earth, rather than in heaven, and centered at Jerusalem. His blessed reign will be over regathered and converted Israel and extend through them to the nations. Emmanuel's kingdom will be realized only by virtue of the power and presence of the returning King. Emmanuel's kingdom, though material and political, will be spiritual as well in that its subjects will walk on the earth in the undimmed light of God. The animal kingdom will be subdued: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea" (Isa. 11:6–9). So, among other things, the physical creation shall be changed:

> "For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the LORD for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off" (55:12–13). "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I the LORD will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together: that they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of the LORD hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it" (41:17–20). "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea" (Hab. 2:14). "The meek … shall inherit the earth" (Matt. 5:5). "And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Mic. 4:3). "Then the

eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert" (Isa. 35:5–6). "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:33–34). "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (Isa. 9:6–7). "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him … His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed. Blessed be the LORD God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory; Amen, and Amen" (Ps. 72:8–11, 17–19).

Chapter XIV

The Eternal Kingdom of Christ Incarnate

The passing from the kingdom age to the eternity which follows is marked by mighty transforming events. Such, indeed, has been the divine method of action when other major dispensational changes have been wrought—such changes as inaugurate and necessitate a whole new order and relationship between God and man. It will be remembered that there were seven days involved in creation, seven features to the covenant made with Noah, seven features to the covenant made with Abraham, seven features to the Palestinian covenant, and seven features to the covenant made with David. The last three of these covenants secure everything of blessing for Israel through all time and eternity. Seven stupendous age-transforming events serve as a cleavage between the Mosaic age of law and the present age of grace. Conditions could not be the same after these occurrences as they had been before. These events are: (1) the death of Christ, (2) the resurrection of Christ, (3) the ascension of Christ, (4) the advent of the Spirit on Pentecost, (5) revelation of a new divine age and purpose, (6) the placing of Jews and Gentiles on the same level as objects of divine grace, and (7) the scattering of Israel far and wide in her last dispersion. Similarly, there are seven stupendous age-transforming events which serve as a demarcation and cleavage between the present age of grace and the kingdom age that is to follow. These are: (1) removal of the Church from the earth, (2) the great tribulation, (3) the glorious return of Christ, (4) the judgment of Israel, (5) establishment of Israel's kingdom under the new covenant, (6) the judgment of living nations, and (7) binding of Satan. Again, and with the same transforming effect, there are seven stupendous events which mark the transition to be wrought between the kingdom age and eternity to come: (1) the release of Satan from the abyss, (2) the revolt on earth with judgments upon Satan and his armies, (3) the passing of the old heaven and the old earth, (4) the great white throne judgment, (5) creation of a new heaven and a new earth, (6) the descent of the bridal city from God out of heaven, and (7) the surrender of the mediatorial aspect of Christ's reign and adjustment to the eternal state following immediately. These last-named events, which

divide the kingdom age from the eternity to come, may be contemplated in the above order and with a special objective respecting the truth set forth in the final division—the surrender of the mediatorial reign—as properly the consummation of Christology.

I. The Release of Satan

No small mystery gathers around the fact that Satan is released from the abyss even for "a little season." Whatever solution may be found for this will lie within the sphere of the divine permission of sin in the world. Evidently, to the end that a final demonstration may be made of evil as represented by Satan, that sinister being is not only released but unhindered in His renewed program of war and attack upon God and His people. This strange release and the outbreak of evil doubtless serve in some measure to consummate the whole program of iniquity both as it exists in Satan and in the human heart. Armies are to be formed again and the curse of war revived. During the prophesied thousand years the earth will experience a perfect outward peace. Both righteousness and peace will have covered the whole earth. Weapons of warfare will have been forged into weapons of husbandry. It should be noted that the fact of Satan's release and the program he will then introduce have been predicted for thousands of years before their fulfillment. That all this will be enacted cannot be questioned when it resembles, and consummates, the program of evil in the universe. Its importance when seen in that light cannot be measured by the human mind.

II. The Revolt on Earth

While the astounding revolt on earth is closely related to the release of Satan, as intimated above, it stands much alone as a demonstration that the millennial age will not have changed the temptable character of the human heart. The revelation concerning this revolt is limited to the following words: "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth

of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:7–10). Much stress is thus placed on the fact that the nations are deceived by Satan and this is the cause of their defection. Such deception is not new. When Satan is bound for a thousand years it is said that as a result of that binding "he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season" (Rev. 20:3). Thus it is intimated that Satan is ever deceiving the nations, excepting for the period of his binding and until his final dismissal to the lake of fire. Much like the unceasing pressure of the sin nature on the individual's life is the influence of Satan upon the mass of humanity, inciting to war, greed, self-manifestations, and impious conduct. What even a day's release of the individual from the pressure of the sin nature would mean in actual experience or a day's release for humanity from the deceptions of Satan cannot be imagined; but humanity, whether released from the sin nature or not, will be released from satanic deceptions during the kingdom reign of Christ on the earth. It will be noted that the last army ever to be assembled will be drawn from the four quarters of the earth and "Gog and Magog," which designation is perhaps more a reference to the event in question than to any locality or specific peoples. This vast assembled army will be "as the sand of the sea" for number. It is difficult to understand how such an enterprise will be possible with Christ upon the throne and in immediate authority, as described in Isaiah 11:3–5, which text declares: "And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins." There is no solution to this problem other than that of a divine permission in the consummation of evil in the universe. To the same end it may be inquired why with Him upon the throne of the universe He ever permitted the evil which He hates. When, in the light of heaven's understanding, the one problem is solved, the other will be solved also.

III. The Passing of Heaven and Earth

If but a moment's consideration be given to the prediction that the present heaven and the present earth are to pass away and disappear forever, few would fail to be impressed with the immensity of the proposed undertaking or to be conscious of the fact that men and their institutions are not all that must exist in this universe. There are other objectives to be gained no doubt which have served no part in the human program. This is God's universe. It is planned and executed, and will be consummated to answer reasons which are within His infinite Being. Before such a disclosure, man may well bow in that humility which becomes the creature and find his only existing consolation in the fact that he is cast upon and sustained by the grace of God. Just what may become of dwellers in heaven and upon the earth when these vast spheres of abode fold up and are dismissed forever? God alone is equal to this problem. The command will go forth, possibly, for all such dwellers to stand apart and there witness both the passing of the old and the creation of the new. There is no intimation that agencies will be employed either angelic or human; yet all such beings pass through these mighty transformations and appear on the other side in the new glory that is to be. The Scriptures are explicit respecting the great event to come when the heavens and the earth shall pass away: It is written:

> "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35); "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail" (Heb. 1:10–12); "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.… But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?" (2 Pet. 3:7, 10–12); "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them" (Rev. 20:11).

IV. The Great White Throne Judgment

Placed in the Sacred Text between the account of the passing of the heaven and the earth and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth is the description of the awful final judgment. The account reads: “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire” (Rev. 20:12–15). In Revelation 21:4, as in 1 Corinthians 15:26, it is declared that there shall be no more death. This arresting statement evidently reaches beyond the mere idea that from that time forth there shall be no more death; it rather reaches backward and asserts that all death ever to have taken place in human spheres—excepting of course the case of those raised at the second coming of Christ —shall be reversed, repealed, and annulled. There is but one way in which so great an end may be attained, and that is by the resurrection of all the remaining dead no more to die. This universal and final resurrection is a theme of prophecy. Of it Christ said, “Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his [the Son’s] voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (John 5:28–29). The Apostle writes concerning the prophesied schedule of resurrections, “Then cometh the end”—that is, the last resurrection (1 Cor. 15:24). So, also, John writes, “But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished” (Rev. 20:5). In the text under consideration—Revelation 20:12–15—it is declared that “the dead, small and great, stand before God.” The position of standing which is assumed here by the dead after death has done its work is certainly an evidence of resurrection. Unlike the judgment of the living nations, as that is described in Matthew 25:31–46, these people are of all the generations who have seen death. “The first resurrection,” so far as humanity is concerned, will have been past a full thousand years (Rev. 20:4–5); but at the end of the thousand years this the last and all-inclusive resurrection will take place. The number of those to be resurrected is incomprehensible. It is estimated that for every

living person now on the earth at least one hundred have died and been buried. So far from being “the land of the living,” strictly speaking, earth is now the greatest cemetery that could ever be conceived. It is out of this state of bodily death that the dead will rise to judgment. Their resurrection serves to bring all of remaining humanity before God in judgment and to prepare them for their conscious destiny in the lake of fire. The books are opened and men are judged according to their works. It will be remembered that in all ages—unless saved from it as Christians are in this age—men have been under the inherent law or obligation to satisfy the design and purpose of their Creator. The believer has been perfected before God forever and therefore answers in his Christ-wrought perfection every demand of God upon him. In the present age, however, men are condemned not only for their unholy estate, but on the ground of their failure to respond to divine grace as it is offered them in Christ. At the present time evil works are wholly climaxed through an attitude of unbelief toward the Redeemer. The Lamb’s book of life is opened—evidently to demonstrate that no mistake has been made; for there will be none present whose names are written in that book. God’s irrevocable answer to human sin is the lake of fire, which is the second death. He may save men from it only as a Substitute answers the holy demands made of them and they receive that Provision for them. Too often men are blinded by the awfulness of this divine judgment against sin and contend that, since God is love, He will not finally execute all that is here predicted; but be it said again that, if God could save even one lost soul on the ground of His compassion apart from the righteous judgments wrought out by Christ in His death, He could save all lost souls by mere compassion, in which case the death of Christ becomes not only needless, but the greatest blunder of this universe. The glorious truth which needs ever to be proclaimed is that lost souls may be saved, which truth is good news indeed, but they may be saved only in and through Christ. Apart from Christ as Savior, there is no salvation. Even infinite wisdom, power, and love can provide no other escape from the holy judgments of God against sin. What God may do with those who die having never heard the gospel is not revealed, nor could it be revealed. The Scriptures present the unevangelized as wholly lost. Their estate is the impelling call to missionary endeavor. If men might be saved by their ignorance of the gospel, it were well never to take the gospel to them lest,

being enlightened, they reject the message and come to be lost forever. Christians being instant in season and out of season are to present this gospel to all who are yet living on the earth. This judgment scene lends no support to the fancy that men who reject Christ in this life will have another chance in realms beyond death. The unsaved remain what they were when death intervened and until they stand thus before God's great white throne to be judged according to their works.

V. The Creation of a New Heaven and a New Earth

Again, as always, the clear declaration of the Bible is the only dependable source of information. The greatness of the event in which God repeats His mighty creative act—including both heaven and earth and upon a more marvelous scale—will grow more impressive to a devout mind as it is contemplated. Great, indeed, is the anticipation of the coming day when this great act of God will be executed before the hosts of the redeemed and the holy angels. So far from there always being a fading memory of what now exists, what lies beyond will be attuned to the greater glory of the New Creation. Isaiah declares regarding the new heaven and the new earth that they will be of such exalted character that the former creation will not be brought to mind. This statement, speaking as it does for Jehovah, is: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind" (65:17). Isaiah speaks for Jehovah again when he asserts that the nation Israel will continue as long as the new heavens and the new earth abide (cf. 66:22). It is clear that Israel will dwell in their own land forever. If it is to be an unending residence, that dwelling in the land must transcend the millennial kingdom and thus continue into the new earth that shall be. Following directly upon the description in Revelation of the passing of the old order and the setting up of the Judge upon the great white throne, John the seer writes, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea" (21:1), and this in turn is followed by a delineation of the new earth. That it is the new earth which is presented is made evident in that it is said tears and crying, sorrow and death are removed; and, to be sure, these have belonged to earth and not to heaven. Thus it appears that the writer is referring to the earth and not to heaven,

where tears, pain, and death have never entered. He says: “And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away” (21:3–4). It may yet be observed that, in this picture of the new earth, the all-important feature is that “the tabernacle of God” will be with men. Such a situation has not obtained before. Earth has been the sphere of sin and corruption unsuited to the presence of God; but it will then be as holy as heaven, and in the new earth He will delight to dwell among men and to be their God. The term *men* is evidently in contradistinction to the Biblical term *saints*. Heaven will be, as now, the abode of the saints, while earth will be the abode of men. God is said now to dwell among men too. Peter asserts that righteousness will dwell in both the new heaven and the new earth alike (2 Pet. 3:13). In the present age, righteousness *suffers*; in the kingdom age, though some may suffer for righteousness’ sake (cf. Matt. 5:10), righteousness shall *reign* (cf. Isa. 11:4–5); but in the eternal new heaven and new earth righteousness shall *dwell*.

VI. The Descent of the Bridal City

Measured by the space given to it in the Sacred Text, the city from God is of surpassing import. Doubtless this very city “which hath foundations” is the one that so engaged Abraham the tent dweller (cf. Heb. 11:8–10). It is described in Hebrews 12:22–24, and Christ refers to it in His message from heaven to the church in Philadelphia, saying: “Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name” (Rev. 3:12). So, again, in Revelation 21:2 John testifies: “And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.” And for a third time in the last great prophetic book it is referred to: “And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem,

descending out of heaven from God" (21:10). The description of the city, which now follows, has been interpreted in many ways. Some contend that the descriptive matter of the book returns for the time being to the millennial age because of the statement that "the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it" (cf. vs. 24); but to revert at this point to the age that will have been completed already is far from a reasonable contemplation of the text. The chronological order of events in the closing pages of the Revelation is of great significance in the right understanding of it all. It is to be recognized that there is much here which the human mind cannot fully grasp; but still the description of the city falls in the context which has to do with the new heavens and the new earth that appear in eternity to come—unless the order of the truth as presented is abandoned altogether. An extended exposition of this descriptive passage is not permissible here. Suffice it to say that in full correspondence with the description as given in Hebrews 12:22–24, the Church is present, the angels are present, a company of "just men made perfect"—to which class Israel would belong—is present, Christ the Mediator and Lamb is present, and God the Father—the "Judge of all" and the Light of the temple thereof—is present. If the measurements of the city are taken literally, the length and breadth and the height are equal and so each dimension is 12,000 furlongs, which would be over 1,500 miles. That it is of pure gold is wholly within the creative power of God and an intimation may be found here respecting the glory of the new heaven and the new earth. The city descends from heaven and is therefore to be considered, to some degree, as something apart from heaven. It is named for the Bride of Christ and probably because she has some superior right to it; yet other peoples and beings enter her gates. It becomes a cosmopolitan center. The text, though extended, is here given in full:

> And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal; and had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel: on the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west

three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. And he that talked with me had a golden reed to measure the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall thereof. And the city lieth foursquare, and the length is as large as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel. And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolyte; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life. And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him: and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever.— Rev. 21:9–22:5

The last two chapters of the Bible not only describe the future eternal state of all things—Peter designates it as the coming "day of God"— but they indicate that there are then at least four different abodes: (a) the new heaven, (b) the new earth, (c) the bridal city, which may be anticipated in John 14:1–3, and (d) "without" (cf. Rev. 22:15), which may be identical with the lake of fire that is the second death (cf. 20:14–15; 21:8; 22:15). It should be considered carefully that in this changed situation with its varied abodes the place of residence is no more subject to change. This is the end of revealed things; it is God's last word, reaching on with its prophecy into an unchanging eternity to come.

VII. The Surrender of the Mediatorial Aspect

In the light of much prediction on the one hand and of one passage standing alone on the other hand, there has arisen a problem in many minds over the duration of Christ's reign upon the throne of David. All predictions of the Messianic rule give assurance that He will be King forever; yet one passage—1 Corinthians 15:24–28—has been interpreted by many worthy expositors as teaching that Christ will resign or withdraw as King at the end of the millennial period. Great inconsistency, accordingly, has been indulged at this point. Not a few writers, when considering the prophecies regarding David's throne, assert that His reign is eternal, and yet, when confronting this one Scripture, as definitely assert that the reign is terminated with the completion of the thousand years. The Scriptures are definite and conclusive with regard to the eternal character of Christ's reign. To David it was said, "And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever" (2 Sam. 7:16). To this David replied: "And now, O Lord GOD, thou art that God, and thy words be true, and thou hast promised this goodness unto thy servant: therefore now let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant, that it may continue for ever before thee: for thou, O Lord GOD, hast spoken it: and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed for ever" (vss. 28–29). So, also, the Psalmist makes fuller record of Jehovah's covenant: "I have made a covenant with my chosen. I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations … My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven" (Ps. 89:3–4, 34–37). Psalm 45:6 states, and it is applied to Christ in Hebrews 1:8, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre"; and in Psalm 72, a Psalm of the kingdom reign of Christ, it is written, "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations … His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed" (vss. 5, 17). Isaiah is exceedingly explicit when he says, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince

of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this" (9:6–7). So Jeremiah testifies for Jehovah, saying: "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our righteousness. For thus saith the LORD; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; … Thus saith the LORD; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne" (33:14–17, 20–21). In describing the final regathering of Israel and the perpetuity of the Davidic kingdom, Ezekiel gives the following as Jehovah's message to Israel, His people: "And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore" (37:24–28). Daniel declares: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. … And the kingdom and dominion, and the

greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him" (7:13–14, 27; cf. 2:44). Thus the word of Gabriel to Mary is of special note: "And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:30–33). Paul's ascription to Christ begins "Now unto the King eternal" (1 Tim. 1:17), and finally the voices in heaven declare at the sounding of the seventh trumpet: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:15).

Over against this array of positive Scriptures which so clearly assert the everlasting duration of Christ's reign on David's throne is the one passage thought by many to teach the limitation of Christ's reign to the thousand-year kingdom age. The passage reads: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:24–28).

Obviously this question regarding the perpetuity of Christ's kingly reign is, from the Christological viewpoint, of great importance. The subject has not been without consideration in past years and many might be quoted regarding it. There are those, such as the Anabaptists, who have held that Christ's reign terminates completely with the thousand years. However, the majority of worthy expositors, because of the extent of Scripture cited above, are compelled to recognize the continued rule of Christ beyond the millennial age. Some have sought the solution in a strained construction of the phrase, *a thousand years,* asserting that prophetic periods are implied by the word *years,* thus to make the millennium continue into hundreds of

thousands of years. Others suggest that the term is symbolical, representing eternity itself; but then the related revelations such as a binding of Satan, the accomplishment of angelic judgments, and the complete subjection of all enemies would indicate a restricted period of time—one which the inspired text of Revelation 20 declares to be a thousand years—and since there is no absurdity involved when the literal time period is accepted, the literal interpretation should be received until it is proved untenable. To those who argue that the words *eternal*, *everlasting*, and *forever* are sometimes limited in respect to the time element depending on the obvious duration of the situation with which these words are associated, it may be said that these words, as used in this connection, create the very situation itself; that is, the effort of this language in every instance is to declare the timeless character of Christ's reign. There can be no uncertainty attached to the words of the angel to Mary, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:33), or "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations" (Ps. 72:5), and, again, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end" (Isa. 9:7). Granted that God desires to announce a reign of Christ throughout eternity to come, there are no words available other than these or their like to express such a revelation. It is a notable fact that the Jews gave to Messiah's kingdom the character of endless duration (cf. Ps. 89:34–37).

In 1 Corinthians 15:24–28, the passage under consideration, the Apostle is presenting truth in general respecting both the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of humanity. Having indicated that there is an order or procession in resurrection with several distinct groups and that Christ's resurrection is the first in the series and that "afterward" there shall be a resurrection of "they that are Christ's at his coming"—a period between His and theirs already measuring nearly two thousand years and to be terminated only by Christ's coming—the Apostle declares, "Then cometh the end." Recognizing that various interpretations of the terminology, *the end*, have been advanced, it is nevertheless held that—as the whole purport of the Apostle's message at this point is to set forth the program of resurrection which follows a certain "order" and as the naming of but two of the events without a third would hardly call for any recognition of a procession or any distinction with respect to groups and as the words "every man in his own order" imply that there are more in resurrection than the

group designated as “they that are Christ’s”—the only tenable interpretation of the phrase, *the end,* is that it indicates the end of resurrection’s order and refers to the resurrection of all those who are not included in the first company, styled here “they that are Christ’s” How else can “every man” be accounted for, if only a limited company is included in the first of humanity’s resurrections? The whole program of resurrection is thus divided into three events. In this enumeration Christ’s resurrection stands first; however, when only humanity’s resurrections are in view, as in Revelation 20:4–6, the resurrection of those who are Christ’s is termed “the first resurrection,” and of “the rest of the dead” it is said that they “lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” Christ declared that there will be two distinct classes in resurrection, though their time relationship is not indicated by Him (cf. John 5:25, 28–29). After a like manner Daniel anticipated a similar division of his own people when they are raised (cf. Dan. 12:1–3). Besides, the Apostle asserts that, before the end resurrection can come to pass and after the resurrection of those who are the saved in Christ, great angelic judgments are to take place and all to the end that every opposition, whether it be from men or angels, be put down, thus to restore the rightful rule of God over His universe. The Scriptures are faithful in disclosing the truth that there are those among both angels and men who have repudiated the authority of God. It is difficult to understand that sin could thus be suffered to enter into God’s creation; but it would be even more difficult to comprehend were it implied that this rebellion must never be judged or corrected. In His judgments of humanity, Christ first deals with the living nations in what seems the briefest time, when seated on the throne of His glory (Matt. 25:31–46). Similarly, the wicked dead shall come up for judgment at the great white throne (Rev. 20:12–15); but the judgment of angelic opposition to God—including Satan, who will accordingly have been confined to the abyss for the duration of the kingdom—will be achieved during the thousand-year period. The text of the prophecy declares: “He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.” This leads on to the marvelous declaration set forth in verse 28: “And when all things shall be subdued unto him,” then He will continue to reign by the authority of the Father. It is evident from 1 Corinthians 6:2–3 that the judgment of men and the

judgment of angels come after the marriage of the Lamb, for His Bride is associated with Him in those judgments. The passage reads: “Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?” Returning to the passage in question, it will be noted from verse 27 that the Son is to rule during the thousand years by the authority of the Father and that, therefore, the Father is excepted from the authoritative rule of the Son. This verse reads: “For he [the Father] hath put all things under his [the Son’s] feet. But when he saith all things are put under him [the Son], it is manifest that he [the Father] is excepted, which did put all things under him” (i.e., the Son). The declarations of verses 24 and 28 become the point of misunderstanding. The delivery to God of a now unmarred kingdom does not imply the release of authority on the part of the Son. The truth asserted is that at last the kingdom is fully restored—the kingdom of God to God. The distinction to be noted lies between the presentation to the Father of a restored authority and the supposed abrogation of a throne on the part of the Son. The latter is neither required in the text nor even intimated. The picture presented in Revelation 22:3 is of the new Jerusalem in the eternal state, and it is declared that “the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it.” The translation in the Authorized Version of 1 Corinthians 15:28 is not clear. It reads: “And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” The statement is meant to signify that, when all is subdued and divine authority is restored in full, the Son, who has ruled by the authority of the Father throughout the thousand years and has put down all enemies, will go on ruling under that same authority of the Father’s as subject as ever to the First Person. This more clarified meaning of the text removes the suggestion of conflict between an everlasting reign and a supposed limited reign of Christ. He will, as so fully assured elsewhere, reign on the throne of David forever.

George N. H. Peters’ extended treatment of this theme is also added:

> There is only *one passage* in Scripture which is supposed to teach the yielding up or ending of the distinctive Messianic Kingdom, viz., 1 Cor. 15:27, 28. Whatever view is engrafted upon or derived from these verses, nearly all (excepting those which utterly degrade Christ, and hence are unworthy of notice) admit, whatever delivering up is intended,

that Jesus Christ *still reigns*, either as God, the humanity being subordinate, or as God-man deprived of His dominion and occupying a lower station, etc. Neander (*His. Plant. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 529) more cautiously than many, says: "The Kingdom of Christ in its peculiar" (i.e. mediatorial) "form will come to an end, when it has attained this object, when, through the efficiency of the glorified Christ, the Kingdom of God has no more opposition to encounter, and will no longer need a Redeemer and Mediator." "The Mediatorial Kingdom of God will *then* merge into the immediatorial, such is the declaration of Paul in 1 Cor. 15:24–28." Lange (*Com.* Matt. 3:1–12, doctrinal), more unguardedly, remarks: "At last when the Kingdom of God shall have been perfected, it will also have reached its full and final development, and be ripe for *self-annihilation* which awaits it," thus, as he explains, giving place to a Kingdom of glory. Barnes (*Com. loci*) incautiously says: "It means the Incarnate Son, the Mediator, the man that was born and that was raised from the dead and to whom this wide dominion had been given, *should resign* that dominion, and that the government should be re-assumed *by the Divinity* as God." Stephenson (*The Atonement*) makes Christ reigning first as "*an independent King*" and afterward as "*a subordinate King.*" Thus David's Son, who is *One* with the Father, actually as Theocratic King seated on the Davidic throne adopted and incorporated rated by the Father as His throne, is made to yield up a throne and dominion which in many other places is pronounced—*in view of this very relationship to the Father—never ending.* Can there be a contradiction between Scripture such as these interpretations present? After careful consideration of the various passages directly bearing upon the subject, we unhesitatingly—in the name and for the sake of David's Son—answer, that it does not exist saving in the interpretations thus attached to it. In giving our reasons for no such antagonism, let the reader notice, that we do not present for our criticisms those of persons favorable to Millenarianism, lest we might be chargeable with seeking out an accommodation for our doctrinal position. Instead of urging our own views of the passage in question, it is sufficient to let *others* specify them and thus indicate *the wonderful harmony* preserved in Holy Writ. … The phrase, "*for He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet,*" does not limit—as is shown by examples (Bush, etc.) of Scripture phraseology and the admissions of all that some kind of a reign continues—the reign of Christ. The 28th verse, "*And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.*" In the reasoning of the apostle he had just replied to an objection that might be alleged, that if Christ has "*all things*" put under Him, His supremacy might exceed that of the Father, by saying that "*He is excepted which did put all things under Him, "* and, in consequence, it follows, as an inevitable result, that if the Father is excepted and has put all things under the God-man Jesus Christ, He will retain His pre-eminence and that Christ is *still subordinate*, even after He has acquired His greatest power and glory in His Kingdom. Bush well observes: "A delegated authority necessarily implies a supremacy to him who conferred it. This is undoubtedly the force of the original (τότε καὶ) 'then also' i.e. then, just as now—which the rendering of the common translation entirely fails to represent." "As Christ, in the great mediatorial scheme, now holds a place inferior to the Father, so, notwithstanding all the grandeur and glory that is predicted to accrue to Him from the final subjection of His enemies, He is still ordained to occupy that subordinate station." Storr and others explain the 28th verse as follows: The adverbs ὅταν and τότε being regarded as influenced by the word translated "shall be subject" not as a future of time, but merely as a logical future denoting an inference, the verse is correspondingly rendered: "Since (ὅταν), therefore, all things have been (by a Divine decree) put under Him, it will follow (τότε) that the Son Himself is or is to be, subject to Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all." Having thus hastily passed over the

passage, giving the impartial, unbiassed views of Post and Anti-Millenarians, instead of finding it, as alleged, teaching the ending of the Kingdom, it stands *in harmony* with the prophetic announcements proclaiming *the perpetuity* of the Kingdom. In the language of Van Valkenburg (*Bib. Repos.*, vol. 2, "*Essay on Duration of Christ's Kingdom*"), "As the Father was excepted when all things were put under the Son, so also shall He be excepted when all things are subdued unto Him. It appears, then, that this passage does not even intimate that there *will ever be a termination of Christ's Kingdom, or that He will ever deliver up His Kingdom to the Father.* The dominion shall indeed be rescued from His enemies, and restored to the Godhead, but not in any such sense, but that His dominion is *an everlasting dominion*, and that of His Kingdom *there shall be no end.*" Storr (*Diss. on Kingdom*) takes the ground that "the government which it is said, verse 24, He shall restore to God, even the Father, *must not be supposed to mean Christ's government*, but that of every opposing power, which is evidently declared to be destroyed, that the power may be restored to God"—adding truly and most forcibly (as our Propositions abundantly prove) "*the government is restored to God when it is restored to Christ.*" Thus the passage is made by them to be in accord with Rev. 11:15, "*The Kingdoms [or Sovereignty] of this world are become the Kingdoms [or Sovereignty] of our Lord and His Christ, "* and when this is done, Father and Son *united* in this Theocratic ordering and Personage, "*He shall reign forever and ever.*" It is the fulfilment of Dan. 7 and other predictions, from which we learn that the Father gives Him dominion, that He exerts it until all His enemies are subdued, and reigns with acknowledged supremacy (subordinate as this passage teaches in His God-man rulership to One only) over all the earth. One thing must be self-evident to the believer, that this passage, so difficult of interpretation (universally so acknowledged), ought not to be pressed against the testimony *of a multitude* of other passages, either to the separation of the Christ, or to the removal of His distinctive kingship as the Christ, or to the diminishing of any honor, etc., conferred upon Him. The *honor* of both the Father and the Son are identified with the perpetuity of this Theocratic Kingdom, for it is just as much the Father's Kingdom as it is the Son's—the most perfect union existing between them constituting *a Oneness in rule and dominion*.—*The Theocratic Kingdom*, II, 634–36

Thus endeth the eschatological portion of Christology. Messiah was born into David's line, the fulfiller of the Davidic covenant respecting one to sit on David's throne, was born King of the Jews, was rejected, and is coming again, will at His second advent judge Israel and the nations, establish His promised kingdom over all the earth, judge angelic beings, and reign by the authority of the Father on David's throne forever and ever. Let all who adore the eternal Son ascribe to Him, joining in with the great Apostle, the doxology of adoration and worship: "Now unto the King Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, the Only Wise God, Be Honour and Glory for Ever and Ever. Amen."

Volume Six

Pneumatology

Table of Contents

Pneumatology

PREFACE

CHAPTER I. THE NAME OF THE HOLY SPIRIT I. THE THREEFOLD NAME OF DEITY II. DESCRIPTIVE TITLES

CHAPTER II. THE DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT I. DIVINE ATTRIBUTES

1. Eternity 2. Omnipotence
3. Omnipresence
4. Omniscience
5. Love
6. Faithfulness
7. Truthfulness
8. Holiness

II. DIVINE WORKS 1. Creation 2. Striving

3. Inspiration
4. Generating Christ
5. Convincing
6. Restraining
7. Regeneration
8. Illumination
9. As a Paraclete
10. Witnessing
11. Anointing
12. Baptism
13. Sealing
14. Filling
15. Intercession

16. Sanctification
17. As an Earnest

CONCLUSION Chapter III. Types and Symbols of the Holy Spirit I. oil

II. WATER

III. FIRE

IV. WIND

V. DOVE

VI. EARNEST

VII. SEAL

VIII. ABRAHAM'S SERVANT

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER IV. THE HOLY SPIRIT AND PROPHECY I. THE AUTHOR OF PROPHECY

II. THE SUBJECT OF PREDICTION

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER V. THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT I. FROM ADAM TO ABRAHAM
1. Direct References 2. The Revealer of Truth

II. FROM ABRAHAM TO CHRIST 1. Indwelling 2. Baptizing
3. Sealing
4. Filling

CHAPTER VI. THE DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER OF THE PRESENT AGE I. an intercalation

II. A NEW DIVINE PURPOSE

III. AN AGE OF WITNESSING

IV. ISRAEL DORMANT

V. SPECIAL CHARACTER OF EVIL

VI. AN AGE OF GENTILE PRIVILEGE VII. THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT WORLD-WIDE CHAPTER VII. THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE WORLD I. THE RESTRAINER OF THE *COSMOS* WORLD II. THE ONE WHO CONVICTS THE UNSAVED 1. OF SIN 2. OF RIGHTEOUSNESS
3. Of Judgment

CONCLUSION The Holy Spirit In Relation To The Christian CHAPTER VIII. INTRODUCTION TO THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE BELIEVER Chapter IX. Regeneration and the Holy

Spirit I. the necessity

II. THE IMPARTATION OF LIFE

1. A Knowledge of God 2. A New Reality in Prayer
3. A New Reality in the Reading of God's Word 4. A Recognition of God's Family 5. A Divine Compassion for a Lost World III. ACQUISITION OF THE NATURE OF GOD IV. induction into the family and household of god V. inheritance of a son's portion VI. god's own purpose to his eternal glory VII. the basis in faith

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER X. THE INDWELLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT I. ACCORDING TO REVELATION

II. IN RELATION TO ANOINTING

III. ACCORDING TO REASON

IV. IN RELATION TO SEALING

CHAPTER XI. THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT I. THE WORD BATIZ

II. THE DETERMING SCRIPTURES

III. THE THING ACCOMPLISHED

1. Organic Union 2. The Fourfold Prayer of Christ 3. The Only Ground for Imputed Righteousness 4. Due Recognition of the Union 5. The Ground of Appeal for a Holy Life IV. THE DISTINCTIVENESS 1. Not Regeneration 2. Not Indwelling
3. Not Filling

CONCLUSION The Believer's Responsibility

CHAPTER XII. INTRODUCTION TO THE BELIEVER'S RESPONSIBILITY I. intelligent motives

II. PRESCRIBED OBLIGATIONS

III. DEPENDENCE UPON THE SPIRIT IV. WORD OF GOD

V. A SPIRITUAL TRANSFORMATION

VI. THE TERMINOLOGY USED

CHAPTER XIII. POWER TO OVERCOME EVIL I. THE WORLD

II. THE FLESH

III. THE DEVIL

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XIV. POWER TO DO GOOD

I. THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT

1. Love a. Inclusive of the Whole World b. Exclusive of the World System c. Inclusive of the True Church d. Without End
   e. Toward Israel
   f. Sacrificial
   g. Unrequited and Pure
2. Joy
3. Peace
4. Long-suffering
5. Gentleness
6. Goodness
7. Faithfulness
8. Meekness
9. Self-control

II. THE GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT III. the offering of praise and thanksgiving IV. the teaching of the spirit V. the leading of the spirit

VI. THE LIFE OF FAITH

VII. THE INTERCESSION OF THE SPIRIT CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XV. CONDITIONS PREREQUISITE TO FILLING I. "GRIEVE NOT THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD"

1. Prevention of the Christian's Sin 2. Remedy of the Christian's Sin II. "QUENCH NOT THE SPIRIT"

1. Resistance of the Spirit 2. The Yielded Life
3. The Example of Christ
4. The Will of God
5. The Sacrificial Life

III. "WALK IN THE SPIRIT"

1. The World 2. The Flesh
3. The Devil

CHAPTER XVI. RELATED DOCTRINES I. the believer's share in christ's death II. perfection

III. SANCTIFICATION

IV. ERADICATION TEACHING

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XVII. AN ANALOGY

I. THE LOST ESTATE

II. THE DIVINE OBJECTIVE AND IDEAL III. THE GIFT OF GOD

IV. THE WORK OF THE CROSS

V. THE PLACE OF FAITH

CONCLUSION

PNEUMATOLOGY

Preface

(which every student should read) PNEUMATOLOGY IS the scientific treatment of any or all facts related to spirit. In its larger ramifications it embraces a threefold division, namely, (1) its bearing on Theology Proper, or the general doctrines related to the divine Spirit—"God is a Spirit" (John 4:24); (2) the doctrine of angelic beings both unfallen and fallen; and (3) the specific study of the immaterial part of man, which division of the subject is now termed psychology. Since the second of these divisions—that of the angels—has had an earlier treatment under Angelology, and such portions of psychology as are germane to Systematic Theology have been examined in this work under Anthropology, the present volume will be restricted to what is generally recognized as the strictly theological aspects of Pneumatology. This calls for consideration of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit, the Third Person in the blessed Trinity. In the first four volumes of this work, where the general sevenfold outline of Systematic Theology has been set forth, the Holy Spirit has been accorded recognition according to His rightful place in the Godhead, in the whole

redemptive undertaking, and in the life and service of those who are saved. However, as in the case of Christ and the later, more complete treatment of revelation respecting Him which has been attempted in Volume V under Christology, there is need at this point, if this work on theology is to serve its purpose, of an unabridged contemplation of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. Such an unabridged treatment is the design of this volume.

Whatever is true of the triune God is true of the Holy Spirit. This averment may be made with equal justification of the Father or the Son, and, if heeded in regard to the Third Person, will go far toward the right understanding and estimation of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. A strange neglect of the Holy Spirit's full identity is, and ever has been, abroad, which neglect is deplored by all attentive expositors. For want of extended and constructive teaching with respect to the Holy Spirit, the Christian church is, for the most part, in the same position as the twelve disciples of John the Baptist whom Paul found at Ephesus. Their statement —sincere and free from pretense—was, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost" (Acts 19:2). Doubtless some natural causes lie behind the fact that Christians generally are so little informed regarding this great theme. (1) There is no lack of plain revelation regarding the Holy Spirit; yet neglect, ignorance, and error are transmitted from teacher to pupil as freely and effectively as is the truth. "Like people, like priest" (Hos. 4:9) is a principle which may be extended to read *Like teacher, like pupil*. Of this the wider range of its outworking as a principle Isaiah writes: "And it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the taker of usury, so with the giver of usury to him" (24:2). If the teacher is given to neglect, ignorance, and error respecting any point of doctrine, the pupil could hardly be expected to correct these impressions— excepting in rare instances when, having repudiated the narrow mold into which he has been run, the pupil reaches out for a larger understanding of the revelation God has given. Such, indeed, has been the experience of the men who, under God, have been accorded the high honor of adding

something to the generally accepted body of recognized truth. Did not Christ refer to this when He said: “Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old” (Matt. 13:52)? Judging from the scant notice which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has received at the hands of those who have assayed to write works on Systematic Theology, a reason is easily discovered to explain why their pupils give so little consideration to it. Almost every error or disproportionate emphasis upon some aspect of doctrine on the part of a few is caused by the neglect of that truth on the part of the many. The Pentecostal errors with their misuse of Biblical terms and their assumptions would never have developed to any extent had the full and right doctrine of the Holy Spirit been taught generally in its right proportions. Similarly, those cults which live solely by an emphasis upon healing of the body would not have arisen had the church recognized and defended that which is true in that field of doctrine. (2) Again, a reason for the general failure to recognize the Person and work of the Holy Spirit is due to the fact that, within the range of the usual comprehension of revealed truth, the Spirit is not set forth as an object of faith as are the Father and the Son. Salvation is not said to depend upon faith in the Holy Spirit as it is in the case of the Father (cf. Rom. 4:24), or the Son (cf. John 3:16). It is only as the deeper truths related to the power of the Holy Spirit within the believer are approached that the thought of dependence upon the Third Person of the Godhead is brought into view. Thus it has come about as a general effect that the Father and the Son are really esteemed the objects of saving faith and the Holy Spirit is lost somewhat from consideration. (3) Similarly, the Father and the Son are constantly associated with one another in the text of the New Testament. This is due to the fact that in a large portion of the Gospels, which four books occupy two-fifths of the whole New Testament, the Son is speaking and that as One sent out by the Father and doing the will of the Father (cf. John 14:10). Likewise, personal declarations are not recorded as directly proceeding from the Holy Spirit (John 16:13); nevertheless, a considered perusal of the Sacred Text yields an impression that the Holy Spirit is the mighty executive of the Godhead and by so much His relation to both Father and Son is a theme of great proportions. (4) Lastly, there is a reason for the general neglect of the doctrine of the Holy

Spirit to be found in the fact that His work as executor of the Godhead is often attributed in a more or less impersonal way to God. Thus the precise truth that certain things are wrought specifically by the Holy Spirit are lost in a generalization. Of these four factors which together account, for the most part, for the failure to give due consideration to the Person and work of the Holy Spirit, the first—that of neglect, ignorance, and error all of which is passed down from teacher to pupil—is the most prolific source of the difficulty. Men in the pulpits would preach and teach this great line of doctrine had they themselves been so taught, and none can measure the loss in practical daily living on the part of the people of God that has come about by the withholding of these truths from them. The situation recognized by all who know these doctrines—that almost none of the limited number of hymns of the church which bear on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are Scriptural—is to be explained by the fact that attention has not been given to this subject. Nothing much is gained by a mere deploring of unfortunate conditions. Constructive teaching is needed, and pastors and teachers would do well to measure the amount of emphasis that should be given to this theme in accord with the extent to which it appears in the New Testament text, rather than to fall into and become party to the prevailing neglect of these portions of vital truth. It is earnestly desired that this volume may serve to teach some who in turn may teach others also. This treatise in the course of its development will follow a fivefold division: (1) the Holy Spirit and the Trinity, (2) types and symbols of the Holy Spirit, (3) the Holy Spirit and prophecy, (4) the Holy Spirit in relation to Gentiles and Israel, i.e., in the Old Testament, (5) the Holy Spirit in relation to Christians. Because of its immediate bearing on the believer’s life and service, the last division will receive the major consideration.

Chapter I

THE NAME OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

PROOF OF THE Deity and personality of the Holy Spirit is found alone in the divine attestation to be seen in the Word of God. No information is available elsewhere respecting the character and personality of any one of the Three who comprise the Godhead. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from an induction of the Bible witness respecting the Deity or the personality of either the Father or the Son, the same are to be drawn from an induction respecting the Holy Spirit. It is possible that the designation *Spirit* which He bears has influenced men in all generations to suppose He is no more than an influence emanating from God, or an attribute of God, or a periphrasis for Deity. Such suppositions, however, serve to reveal the fact that men either do not consider the Word of God, or, if considering it, are not amenable to it. Writers have employed many pages in proving the Deity and personality of the Holy Spirit. The task is not difficult, for every reference to Him is directly or indirectly a witness to His personality and essential Deity. It is sometimes asserted that the same arguments which demonstrate the Deity of Christ the Son serve to demonstrate the Deity of the Spirit, and that is true to a marked degree; but there is, nevertheless, a difference: for the Deity of the Second Person is involved with His assumption of humanity through the incarnation, while the Deity of the Holy Spirit is not thus involved. The Spirit ever sustains a mode of action which is altogether within the sphere of what belongs alone to God. Three lines of proof respecting the Deity and personality of the Holy Spirit are to be presented in this and the following chapter: (1) the Holy Spirit bears the names of Deity, (2) the Holy Spirit exhibits the attributes and perfections of Deity, and (3) the Holy Spirit accomplishes the works and exercises the prerogatives of Deity.

I. The Threefold Name of Deity

Right views of God—such as can be gained alone from the Holy Scriptures—are essential to every step in human life and progress. While it is true that God has revealed Himself through both the Written Word and

the Living Word and that His essential character is reflected in all His words and works, He is also revealed through the appellations which He has published as distinctions of title representing Himself. It is important to recognize that God has revealed His own titles, that they are in no way mere human inventions or ideals; and to the satisfaction of Infinity these cognomens, though but partially comprehended by man, speak forth the truth respecting God. Neither a mortal man, nor combination of men, nor an angel has been called upon to select names for God. In the height of his unfallen state and while in closest relation to God, Adam was called upon to name the newly created things of earth; but never did he presume to confer a designation upon God. In Volume I of this work—when considering Theology Proper—the revealed names of Deity have been given extended consideration. It need be added that, while in the Old Testament various titles are recognized as pertaining to the Persons of the Godhead, the full and complete name—not, names—of God is revealed in the New Testament. He is there styled *The Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost*. At once the baffling truths related to God as One whose subsistence is threefold are confronted.

Writing in his *Principles of Theology* (p. 24), Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas declares regarding the Trinity as taught in the New Testament: When we have approached the doctrine by means of the personal experience of redemption, we are prepared to give full consideration to the two lines of teaching found in the New Testament. (a) One line of teaching insists on the unity of the Godhead (1 Cor. 8:4; James 2:19); and (b) the other reveals distinctions within the Godhead (Matt. 3:16, 17; 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14). We see clearly that (1) the Father is God (Matt. 11:25; Rom. 15:6; Eph. 4:6); (2) the Son is God (John 1:1, 18; 20:28; Acts 20:28; Rom. 9:5; Heb. 1:8; Col. 2:9; Phil. 2:6; 2 Pet. 1:1); (3) the Holy Spirit is God (Acts 5:3, 4; 1 Cor. 2:10, 11; Eph. 2:22); (4) the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are distinct from one another, sending and being sent, honouring and being honoured. The Father honours the Son, the Son honours the Father, and the Holy Spirit honours the Son (John 15:26; 16:13, 14; 17:1, 8, 18, 23). (5) Nevertheless, whatever relations of subordination there may be between the Persons in working out redemption, the Three are alike regarded as God. The doctrine of the Trinity is the correlation, embodiment, and synthesis of the teaching of these passages. In the Unity of the Godhead there is a Trinity of Persons working out Redemption. God the Father is the Creator and Ruler of man and the Provider of redemption through His love (John 3:16). God the Son is the Redeemer, Who became man for the purpose of our redemption. God the Holy Spirit is the "Executive of the Godhead," the "Vicar of Christ," Who applies to each believing soul the benefits of redemption. We see this very clearly in Heb. 10:7–17, where the Father wills, the Son works and the Spirit witnesses. The elements of the plan of redemption thus find their root, foundation, and spring in the nature of the Godhead; and the obvious reason why these distinctions which we express by the terms "Person" and "Trinity" were not revealed earlier than New Testament times is that not until then was redemption accomplished.

A renewed discussion of the right trinitarian views will not be introduced here. The objective in view at this point is to center conviction upon the truth that the Holy Spirit is a rightful and equal member of the Godhead Three. In that sense which is true of the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is a Person. It must be acknowledged, however, that the term *Person* (ὑπόστασις—cf. Heb. 1:3) as used of any one of the divine Three is employed under necessary and revealed limitations. These Persons are not three separate and independent Beings; rather, the thought of personal identity marks an indefinable distinction in the Godhead—indefinable because it is not fully defined by God in His Word. Attempts which have been made by men even to illustrate what is true in the trinitarian mode of God's Being have, in earlier pages, been repudiated and declared to be more conducive to confusion and the engendering of misunderstanding than to advantage.

In the great commission (Matt. 28:18–20), direction is given to baptize in the *name*—which name is *Father and Son and Holy Ghost*—not in the three names belonging respectively to three loosely related Persons, but the one name belonging to one God whose mode of subsistence is that of Three Persons who are identified as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If these distinctions do not seem to represent relationships familiar to men, it may be observed that these are not the relationships peculiar to men. They signify what is true of God. It is peculiar to God with no parallel in human affairs. The great commission pronouncement is one of the most exalted declarations of the divine designations, and the point to be observed and emphasized at this juncture is that the Holy Spirit is included in this name. The fact that His name is third in the order creates not the slightest suggestion of inferiority, since this sequence of titles does not aim to represent a decreasing degree of exaltation or worthiness. Naturally, if a series of appellations which are absolutely identical with respect to the character of those indicated is to be named—whatever may be the divine reason for the order in which the names appear, so far as dignity, power, authority, honor, and all divine attributes are concerned—the last could have been named first and the first could have been named last. Thus, also, the second could have exchanged places with either the first or the last. There is a reason for the order in which these names appear which is wholly apart from the idea of a descending scale of importance. In the eternal counsels of

God, and but little revealed indeed to men, the same order is evidently sustained. The order reflects what has been termed the *doctrine of procession*. The idea of procession is based on what seems to be the uncomplicated teaching of the Bible with respect to the relation existing between the Persons of the Godhead. In recognition of the Scriptures the great creeds have made explicit averments. The Nicene Creed states: "And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who *proceedeth* from the Father and the Son, who, with the Father and Son together, is worshipped and glorified" (quoted by Watson, *Theological Institutes*, I, 628). So, also, the Athanasian Creed declares: "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*" (quoted by Watson, *loc. cit*.). Likewise the Thirty-Nine Articles state: "The Holy Ghost, *proceeding* from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal GOD" (quoted by Watson, *loc. cit*.). And the *Westminster Confession* asserts: "In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son" (II. III). Psalm 104:30, R.V. declares of Jehovah, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit." Likewise Christ said: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: … Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you" (John 15:26; 16:7). The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God and of Christ, not merely the spiritual presence of the Father or the Son; He is the Spirit of the Father because He is sent of the Father, and He is the Spirit of Christ in that He is sent of Christ. As the Son is ever the manifestation of the Father (John 1:18), so the Spirit is sent forth from both the Father and the Son. These are eternal facts of relationship which, though but little comprehended by men, represent mighty realities within the Godhead.

In an introduction to Dr. A. J. Gordon's book, *The Ministry of the Spirit*, Dr. F. B. Meyer writes: Christianity is beset with three powerful currents, which insidiously operate to deflect her from her course. Materialism, which denies or ignores the supernatural, and concentrates its heed on ameliorating the outward conditions of human life; criticism, which is clever

at analysis and dissection, but cannot construct a foundation on which the religious faculty may build and rest; and a fine literary taste, which has greatly developed of late, and is disposed to judge of power by force of words or by delicacy of expression. To all of these we have but one reply. And that is, not a system, a creed, a church, but the living Christ, who was dead, but is alive forevermore, and has the keys to unlock all per-plexities, problems, and failures. Though society could be reconstituted, and material necessities be more evenly supplied, discontent would break out again in some other form, unless the heart were satisfied with his love. The truth which he reveals to the soul, and which is ensphered in him, is alone able to appease the consuming hunger of the mind for data on which to construct its answer to the questions of life and destiny and God, which are ever knocking at its door for solution. And men have yet to learn that the highest power is not in words or metaphors or bursts of eloquence, but in the in-dwelling and out-working of the Word, who is the wisdom and the power of God, and who deals with regions below those where the mind vainly labors. Jesus Christ, the ever-living Son of God, is the one supreme answer to the restlessness and travail of our day. But he cannot, he will not reveal himself. Each person in the Holy Trinity reveals another. The Son reveals the Father, but his own revelation awaits the testimony of the Holy Ghost, which, though often given directly, is largely through the church. What we need then, and what the world is waiting for, is the Son of God, borne witness to and revealed in all his radiant beauty of the ministry of the Holy Spirit, as he energizes with and through the saints that make up the holy and mystical body, the church. It is needful to emphasize this distinction. In some quarters it seems to be supposed that the Holy Spirit himself is the solution of the perplexities of our time. Now what we may witness in some coming age we know not, but in this it is clear that God in the person of Christ is the one only and divine answer. Here is God’s yea and amen, the Alpha and Omega, sight for the blind, healing for the paralyzed, cleansing for the polluted, life for the dead, the gospel for the poor and sad and comfortless. Now we covet the gracious bestowal of the Spirit, that he may take more deeply of the things of Christ, and reveal them unto us. When the disciples sought to know the Father, the Lord said, He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. It is his glory that shines on my face, his will that molds my life, his purpose that is fulfilled in my ministry. So the blessed Paraclete would turn our thought and attention from himself to him, with whom he is One in the Holy Trinity, and whom he has come to reveal. Throughout the so-called Christian centuries the voice of the Holy Spirit has borne witness to the Lord, directly and mediately. Directly, in each widespread quickening of the human conscience, in each revival of religion, in each era of advance in the knowledge of divine truth, in each soul that has been regenerated, comforted, or taught. Mediately his work has been carried on through the church, the body of those that believe. But, alas! how sadly his witness has been weakened and hindered by the medium through which it has come. He has not been able to do many mighty works because of the unbelief which has kept closed and barred those avenues through which he would have poured his glad testimony to the unseen and glorified Lord. The divisions of the church, her strife about matters of comparative unimportance, her magnification of points of difference, her materialism, her love of pelf and place and power, her accounting herself rich and increased in goods and needing nothing, when she was poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked—these things have not only robbed her of her testimony, but have grieved and quenched the Holy Spirit, and nullified his testimony.—Pp. x–xiv Again, a warning is timely lest the impression be entertained that the doctrine of Procession implies some variation between the divine Persons in exaltation or importance. In Theology Proper an effort has been made to defend the Second Person from the supposition that He, being the Manifester of the Father and having become incarnate in human form, is inferior to the Father. It is also important to note that the Holy Spirit—as His name appears in the full title of the Godhead—though ever sent by Father and Son, is eternally equal to the Father or to the Son. The great revelations that the Son is begotten of the Father and that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son must be kept unconfused with human relationships; for, while

the Scriptures assuredly present the doctrine of procession, these same Scriptures as certainly announce the absolute equality of the Persons within the Godhead. In the outworking of the divine interrelationships which are manifest in redemption, the Son comes into the world to do the Father's will (Heb. 10:4–7) and the Spirit is subject to both the Father and the Son; yet it will be remembered that Christ made Himself subject also to the Spirit. It is written: "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" (Luke 4:1). Thus the human notion that the greater must be served by the less is wholly foreign to the divine interrelationships. The Son is no less equal with the Father though He seeks the glory of the Father (cf. John 14:13), and the Spirit is no less equal with the Father and the Son though He seeks the glory of the Son (cf. John 16:14).

Dr. William Cooke has written in his *Christian Theology* effectively on the threefold name of God. A portion of his thesis is included here: In the great commission to preach the Gospel to every creature, God speaks of himself under a threefold designation, saying, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." If in any part of our Lord's teaching special care was requisite in the use of words, in order to give men right views of God, it was here: for here is a declaration of God's Name; here is an authoritative mandate to make this Name known to the whole world; and here is an injunction to perform a solemn ordinance in this Name, as one special means of publishing and perpetuating it among all mankind. This threefold Name, then, has no human origin; it is applied by our Lord himself to the Godhead, and applied by him as expressive of the Divine Nature; and because expressive of the Divine Nature, he commands it to be proclaimed to the whole world, as the Name by which the Deity should be acknowledged and worshipped by all mankind. To deny this Name is to deny the authority of Christ; to question its appropriateness is to question his wisdom; to withhold it from God is to rebel against the plainest injunction to make it known. Wherever the Gospel is preached, this threefold Name must be proclaimed as the Name of God; and wherever baptism is celebrated, it must be performed in this as the Name of Him whom we receive and acknowledge as our only God. The Gospel cannot be preached without its publication; for it is expressly specified as a part of the Gospel message. It stands out both as a first and fundamental proposition in the Gospel system. Other doctrines are doubtless included in the Divine message; but this is not only included, it is *expressed*, and expressed because it is the basis of all other truths, and must, therefore, be made the first element in all evangelic teaching. Such being the importance of this Threefold Name, it is satisfactory to know that the text which embodies it is admitted by men of all creeds to be authentic and genuine. Here there is no dispute, nor can there be even any diversity of opinion. The text expressing this Name is contained in all copies of the original Greek, ancient as well as modern, however high you ascend in antiquity. It is contained, also, in all the versions, ancient and modern; and the translation of this threefold Name of God in every version is the same. Nor, indeed, can a different translation be given; for the text consists of a few simple terms which admit of only one literal translation. This is so obvious, that no difference of which we are aware has ever been suggested, even by men of opposite creeds and opinions. Commentators, grammarians, theologians, and critics, though differing on some points wide as the poles are asunder, uniformly agree in the translation of this passage. Even in the Unitarian version of the New Testament, the Name of God as "the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost," is in this passage rendered precisely as it is in our own version. This unanimity as to the genuineness and the translation of this passage is of the highest importance; for it narrows the ground of controversy, and gives an undisputed standard of appeal. We have, therefore, only to surrender our understanding to the teachings of acknowledged authority, in order to obtain clear and correct views of God. To this infallible standard, then, we

come, and placing ourselves before the sacred oracle, we reverently inquire, “Who is the Christian’s God, and what is his awful Name? Is he an absolute Unity, or a Duality, or a Trinity?” The text before us gives an answer, clear, decisive, and without the least ambiguity—“He is the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” Here, then, three appellations are applied to God; not more, not less. Each Name is distinct and separate from the other, yet connected by the copulative conjunction “*and.*” We are sure these three appellations are appropriate; for they are applied to God by the Great Teacher and Saviour of mankind, who came to show men who God is. But if these three distinct appellations are appropriate, constituting together the Name of the Ever Blessed God, they must be expressive of some distinctions in the Divine Nature. Yet in these distinctions there must, at the same time, be an essential union; for the three appellations constitute together but the Name of the One Living and True God. Guided by this important passage, and the general tenor of the Holy Scripture, we maintain that Jehovah, who is one in essence, has revealed himself to man as subsisting in a distinction of Three Persons, denominated Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We do not profess to define or explain precisely the *nature* of this distinction, because God has not revealed it. It is probable, indeed, that the terms of human language are inadequate to express it; and that our capacities in this life are too limited and feeble to receive it. We use the word “person,” therefore, under some limitation—not to express the existence of three separate and independent beings, but to mark the fact of a real threefold distinction existing in the Godhead. In this sense the word “person” has the sanction both of Holy Scripture and of a venerable ecclesiastical antiquity, being the translation of the word ὑπόστασις (*hypostasis*) as used by the Nicene Fathers, and by our own translators when they designate Christ the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of his person (Heb. 1:3). The distinction in the persons of the Godhead is such, we believe, as implies distinct consciousness, combined with united and co-equal participation of the Divine nature and attributes. Here, however, we are met by three opposing sentiments, which it is our duty to examine and refute—the Unitarian, the Sabellian, and the Tritheistic.

> The *Unitarian* theory embraces two classes of opinion, both denying the doctrine of the Trinity, and contending for the absolute Unity of God. The high Arian maintains that the being called the Son is the chief of God’s works, even higher than the angels; but the Socinian regards him as only a mere man. As to the Holy Spirit, the Unitarian sentiment is vague and diversified. Sometimes he is regarded as an attribute of God, or an influence proceeding from him; and sometimes as only another name for the Father himself. It is evident, at first sight, that these views of the Divine Nature are not derived from the threefold Name, which the Saviour applied to God in the great commission to preach the Gospel. There is nothing in these words to sanction the inferiority of the Son; nothing to sustain the notion that the Holy Spirit is an attribute or a mere influence proceeding from God; and nothing to countenance the idea of the Spirit being but another name for the Father himself. The natural and obvious meaning of the passage is decidedly against such notions. In the threefold Name of God we have evidently distinction and co-equality combined; for each one represented in that Name stands in the same relation to us as our God. As, however, the essential points of the Unitarian heresy are involved in the Sabellian creed, the same class of scriptural argumentation which overthrows the one will apply to the subversion of the other. …
>
> *The Sabellian heresy* is somewhat diversified in its minor aspects, but in its substantial principles it maintains that the Deity is an absolute unity; that the distinctions indicated by the terms “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost” are not real and personal, but nominal or official; that the Father alone is the Deity in his paternal character; that the Son is the same Being or Person incarnate, or “God manifest in the flesh”; and that the Holy Ghost is also the same Being manifested in his spiritual influences. Now, this doctrine is equally repugnant to the

threefold Name ascribed to Jehovah in the great Gospel commission, and in the formula of baptism. It is, indeed, directly contrary to the natural and obvious meaning of language. It is to assert that our Lord has used words without meaning; and not only so, but that he has used them in a sense *contrary* to their usual and proper signification. For in all languages the words Father and Son are *personal* and not nominal designations; and to say that our Lord intended these words to have merely a nominal signification, while in all languages they have a personal signification, is to say that he employed language more likely to deceive than to instruct; and not only so, but that he commanded others to perpetuate the same deception down to the end of time; and this on an occasion when his ostensible purpose was to make God known to mankind! Can we conceive a more revolting impeachment of the wisdom or sincerity of the Teacher and Saviour of mankind? Moreover, the appellations applied to God in the commission and formula of baptism are expressive of *relations*; and the relations are distinct, and personal as well as distinct; so personal, indeed, that they can be properly applied to none but persons; and so distinct that they are not inter-changeable, but fixed and permanent in their personal application. For the relation of a father to his own son involves both a personality that cannot be resolved into a metaphor, and a distinction that cannot be commuted; both relations are grounded in the very nature of things, and are eternally immutable. A father cannot be identical with his own son, and a son cannot be identical with his own father. These terms, therefore, applied to the Deity necessarily involve both distinction and personality; and, consequently, the Sabellian theory is false. Equally clear is the distinction and personality of the Holy Ghost; for either to resolve him into an attribute of God, or into an influence proceeding from God, or into another name for the Father himself, would involve the grossest absurdities and contradictions. The Holy Ghost is not only here distinguished from the Father by a separate appellation, but he is associated with the Father and the Son in the ordinance of baptism; and hence the Sabellian and Unitarian heresies imply that “baptism is to be administered in the Name of the Father, and of a creature, and of an attribute”; or “in the Name of the Father, and of a creature, and of an influence”; or,“in the Name of the Father, and of a creature, and the Father.” Can we conceive absurdities more glaring? Can we invent a grosser insult against the great Teacher and Redeemer of mankind? Would not the Scriptures, on this principle of interpretation, be the most absurd and deceptive volume ever written? We must either admit such follies and blasphemies, or reject the theories which involve them. Moreover, the fact that baptism is a *religious* ordinance implies the personality of the Holy Spirit, because it is to be performed in his Name, as well as in the Name of the Father and of the Son. Now, the Being in whose name a religious ordinance is performed, must be capable of approving and accepting the ordinance performed in his name: but to approve and accept imply intelligence, and intelligence implies consciousness; and intelligence and consciousness are the properties, not of an attribute, or of an influence, but of a real, personal existence. Thus, the fact that baptism is commanded to be performed in the Name of the Holy Spirit implies his personality, as much so as it implies the personality of the Father and of the Son. Further evidence of the personality of the Holy Spirit, as displayed in his attributes, will be adduced when we come to discourse on his Godhead. The sublime facts recorded in connection with the Redeemer’s baptism are striking evidences of the distinction and personality of each of the Glorious Three. When our Lord condescended to receive this ordinance at the hands of John, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Spirit descended like a Dove and abode upon him, and a voice proceeded from the parted sky, saying, “Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Mark 1:10, 11). Here was a visible and oracular demonstration of the distinction and personality of each of the Glorious Three. There was here the presence of the Incarnate Son, submitting to the rite of baptism;

the presence of the Holy Spirit, descending in the form of a Dove, and filling his humanity with consecrating power; and the presence of the Father, bearing witness to his incarnation, and proclaiming his own complacency. The Father, therefore, is not the Son, the Son is not the Father, and the Holy Spirit is distinct from both; the distinction, therefore, is real, not nominal; personal, not official. This grand display of the Three Persons in the Saviour's baptism, is a practical illustration of the distinction and personalities intended in the formula of our *own* baptism, and it shivers both the Sabellian and the Unitarian heresy into a thousand fragments.

Another erroneous theory is that of the *Tritheist*, who maintains that there are not simply three personalities, but three separate and independent Beings; or, in other words, three Gods instead of One. It is no small homage to truth when it is assailed by sentiments directly opposite to each other; for in their opposition they mutually destroy each other; and in destroying each other they support the doctrine which is true. The Unitarian and Sabellian maintain the Divine Unity, but deny the Trinity; the Tritheist maintains, on the contrary, the Trinity is so evident, that he denies the Divine Unity, and asserts the existence of three Gods. The whole truth is held by neither party, but a portion of truth is held by both. The errors of each lie in what each denies, and the truth in what each maintains. The Scriptures maintain as clearly that God is One in one sense, as they do that he is Three in another sense; and as they maintain both, both must be true; and as all truths must harmonize, there is a sense in which a trinity is compatible with unity. Hence that doctrine alone is orthodox which denies neither the one nor the other, but combines and harmonizes both; which recognizes the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as really and personally distinct, yet essentially united. This is the Trinitarian doctrine, which maintains a plurality, not of names only, but of persons having distinct consciousness, with mutual participation of the same attributes and essence.—5th ed., pp. 67–73

Obviously, the triune name—Father, Son, and Spirit—embodies, signifies, and exhibits about all that enters into the doctrine of the Trinity. That doctrine may for the moment be reconsidered with a view to the recognition of the equal position and honor which belong to the Third Person along with the First and Second. As already demonstrated under Theology Proper, when the discussion centered on the trinitarian mode of the existence of Deity, the Old Testament is the record concerning one God with little recognition of Three Persons, while the New Testament is the record concerning the character and achievements of the Three Persons with little recognition of their essential unity. No Jew of the early days or any student of either this or past generations could miss the significance of the plural form of the name *Elohim*. As Dr. Griffith Thomas has pointed out, when quoted above, it was not the purpose of God to unfold at the beginning all that was latent in the doctrine of the Trinity. In this revelation as in many others there is "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark 4:28). Thus the essential revelation respecting God

begins with the intimation which the plural form of *Elohim* presents. Without assigning a reason for rejecting this ancient belief that the name *Elohim* implies the Trinity and discovering any other reason for this plural ending that is worthy of the theme, modern theologians have sought to avoid the recognition of the Trinity to be seen in this one name *Elohim*. It is commonly accepted that the name *Jehovah*, being singular, is a representation of the unity in the Godhead. It is written, "Jehovah our God [*Elohim*] is one Jehovah" (Deut. 6:4, R.V.). However, in Genesis 11:6–9 it is recorded that Jehovah Himself said, "Let us go down, and there confound their language." As usual when great transformations are to be wrought, indeed, the accomplishment is secured by the Three Persons; that is, each may be accredited separately with doing what is done. Thus, while each Person is at different times and places in Scripture said to have created things that exist, the wise man has said, "Remember now thy Creators in the days of thy youth" (Eccl. 12:1, Heb.). The plural *Creators* is harmonious with the whole revelation of the Bible regarding creation.

Another recognition of plurality within the Godhead, as set forth in the Old Testament, is found in the threefold ascription of worship uttered by the heavenly beings and recorded in Isaiah 6:3: "Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory" (R.V.). After Isaiah had testified, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts," and the prophet's lips had been cleansed with a live coal from off the altar, it is then that Jehovah inquired: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" The singular *Jehovah* is thus again coupled with the plural pronoun *us*. Then follows the prediction concerning Israel's blinding, which prediction is quoted several times in the New Testament. The record is all of one event from the threefold ascription of praise on to the judgment upon Israel. Since the context permits of no division, it is important to note that in John 12:41—when speaking of Christ the Son of God;—it is said respecting this, Isaiah's vision of glory: "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him" and again in Acts 28:25, relative to the same vision, it is implied that it was the Holy Spirit who spoke to Isaiah. It is to be concluded, therefore, that it was the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit who spoke when Jehovah said, "Who will go for us?" The important issue being raised here is that the Holy Spirit is as

essentially represented in all these disclosures of Isaiah as is the Father or the Son. Is He not the Objective when the third "holy" is uttered? Yet, again, the Old Testament benediction (Num. 6:24–26, R.V.) corresponds perfectly with the New Testament benediction of 2 Corinthians 13:14. When these two benedictions are read together the similarity is evident: "Jehovah [the Father] bless thee, and keep thee"—"The love of God … be with you all"; "Jehovah [the Son] make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee"—"the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ [be with you]"; "Jehovah [the Spirit] lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace"—"the communion of the Holy Ghost [be with you]." Lest the facts be overlooked, it is well to consider how definitely the Person and work of the Holy Spirit is referred to in the Old Testament. Only a few passages need be cited: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the water" (Gen. 1:2); "My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever" (Gen. 6:3, R.V.); "Thy Spirit is good" (Ps. 143:10, R.V.); "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts" (Zech. 4:6, R.V.); "The Spirit of God hath made me" (Job 33:4); "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2:28, R.V.) ; "Take not thy holy Spirit from me" (Ps. 51:11).

Turning more specifically to the New Testament, it is discovered that the progress of trinitarian doctrine reaches its supreme and final revelation in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation, where reference is made to the Third Person under the one title of *Spirit* at least 125 times; and in every reference He is seen to be acting with all divine authority, wisdom, and grace. In all of these passages He is seen quite apart from the Father or the Son. This immense body of truth and distinctive revelation will be considered more fully in later divisions of this volume.

II. Descriptive Titles

In concluding at this place discussion of the Third Person as indicated by His place in the complete name of Deity, it may be said that all the appellations by which the Spirit is known besides are merely descriptive titles. He is styled *The Spirit* because He is a spirit; He is styled *Holy* because He is holy to the measure of infinity; He is identified as *The Spirit of God* because He belongs to the Godhead; He is called *The Spirit of Christ* because He is by Christ sent into the world. In his book *The Doctrine of the*

Holy Spirit, Dr. John F. Walvoord presents a valuable study on the names of the Third Person. This may well be included here: An examination of the Scriptural revelation on the Holy Spirit will indicate that He is nowhere given a formal name, such as we have for the Second Person, the Lord Jesus Christ, but is rather given descriptive titles, of which the most common in Scripture and in ordinary usage is *The Holy Spirit*. As His Person is pure spirit, to which no material is essential, He is revealed in the Scriptures as *the Spirit*. The descriptive adjective *holy* is used to distinguish Him from other spirits, which are creatures. A study of the references to the Holy Spirit by various titles in Scripture will reveal some significant facts. The basic words in the original are also used in reference to entities other than the Holy Spirit. In the Old Testament, however, *ruach* is used over one hundred times for the Holy Spirit. The matter of interpretation enters into the problem. Cummings lists eighty-eight references to the Holy Spirit in the Old Testment (*Through the Eternal Spirit*, p. 36). The American Standard Version of the Bible by means of initial capital letters indicates considerably more than this. In any case, the instances are numerous and well scattered throughout the Old Testament. Cummings notes that the Pentateuch has fourteen references, none in Leviticus, that Isaiah and Ezekiel have fifteen each, and that the references are scattered throughout twenty-two of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament (*Loc. cit*.). The concise summary of Cummings on the significance of these references may well be quoted: "It is impossible to say that the passages increase in number, or in clearness, with any special characteristic of the books of Scripture. They seem to bear no special relation to chronology, as they appear chiefly in Isaiah (750 B.C.), in Ezekiel (590 B.C.), and in the books of Moses. Nor can we trace any relation to the comparative spirituality of the books, though Isaiah stands so high in the list; for whereas Ezekiel stands first, and Judges has seven, Psalms has only six, Deuteronomy only one, and 2nd Chronicles four. But it is possible to discern that each of the inspired writers has caught some special aspect of the Holy Spirit's person or work, which is reiterated in his pages. In Ezekiel, for instance, it is the action of the Holy Spirit in transporting the prophet bodily to the places where he is needed, which accounts for *six* of the passages out of fifteen. In Judges it is the in-breathing of courage or strength which is alluded to in every one of the seven passages. In Exodus it is as the Spirit of wisdom that He is specially—and exclusively—regarded. It is His office as the Giver of prophetic inspiration which is most constantly spoken of in the books of Samuel and the Chronicles. In Isaiah, and in the Psalms, the twofold teaching concerning Him is His connection with the Messiah on the one hand, and what may be called His personal qualities, such as being grieved, or vexed, by ingratitude or rebellion, on the other" (*Ibid*., pp. 37, 38). In the New Testament, the references to the Holy Spirit are even more numerous. The New Testament word for the Spirit, πνεῦμα, is found in two hundred and sixty-two passages, according to Cummings, scattered throughout all the major New Testament books (*Ibid.*, p. 44). To quote Cummings, "The Gospels contain fifty-six passages; the Acts of the Apostles, fifty-seven; St. Paul's Epistles, one hundred and thirteen; and the other books, thirty-six" (*Loc. cit.*). From these facts, it may be clearly seen that there is consistent reference to the Holy Spirit from Gen. 1:2 to Rev. 22:17, and the inference is plain that a constant ministry of the Holy Spirit is maintained suitable for each dispensation. The titles of the Holy Spirit as commonly translated are subject to significant classification which furnishes an interesting background for the doctrine.

> Of the many titles and variations in reference to the Holy Spirit, sixteen reveal His relationship to the other Persons of the Trinity. Eleven titles are found relating the Holy Spirit to the Father: (1) *Spirit of God* (Gen. 1:2; Mt. 3:16); (2) *Spirit of the Lord* (Lk. 4:18); (3) *Spirit of Our God* (1 Cor. 6:11); (4) *His Spirit* (Num. 11:29); (5) *Spirit of Jehovah* (Jud. 3:10); (6) *Thy Spirit* (Psa. 139:7); (7) *Spirit of the Lord God* (Isa. 61:1); (8) *Spirit of your Father* (Mt. 10:20); (9) *Spirit of the living God* (2 Cor. 3:3); (10) *My Spirit* (Gen. 6:3); (11)

Spirit of Him (Rom. 8:11). Five titles are found relating the Holy Spirit to the Son: (1) *Spirit of Christ* (Rom. 8:9; 1 Pet. 1:11); (2) *Spirit of Jesus Christ* (Phil. 1:19); (3) *Spirit of Jesus* (Acts 16:7, Revised Version); (4) *Spirit of His Son* (Gal. 4:6); (5) *Spirit of the Lord* (Acts 5:9; 8:39). While there is some distinction in meaning in the various titles, the chief significance is to bring out the relationship of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Trinity, all affirming His deity and procession.

Abundant revelation is given in the titles of the Holy Spirit to disclose His attributes. At least seventeen of His titles indicate the divine attributes of His Person. (1) The unity of the Spirit is revealed in the title, *One Spirit* (Eph. 4:4). (2) Perfection is the implication of the title, *Seven Spirits* (Rev. 1:4; 3:1). (3) The identity of the Holy Spirit and the Essence of the Trinity is affirmed in the title, *the Lord the Spirit* (2 Cor. 3:18). (4) The eternity of the Spirit is seen in the title, *Eternal Spirit* (Heb. 9:14). (5) *Spirit of Glory* connotes His glory as being the same as the Father and the Son (1 Pet. 4:14). (6) *Spirit of Life* affirms the eternal life of the Spirit (Rom. 8:2). Three titles affirm the holiness of the Spirit: (7) *Spirit of Holiness* (Rom. 1:4), a possible reference to the holy human spirit of Christ; (8) *Holy Spirit* or *Holy Ghost* (Psa. 51:11; Mt. 1:20; Lk. 11:13), the most formal title of the Spirit and most frequently used; (9) *Holy One* (1 John 2:20). Five of the titles of the Holy Spirit refer to some extent to Him as the author of revelation and wisdom: (10) *Spirit of Wisdom* (Ex. 28:3; Eph. 1:17); (11) *Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding* (Isa. 11:2); (12) *Spirit of Counsel and Might* (Isa. 11:2); (13) *Spirit of Knowledge and of the Fear of the Lord* (Isa. 11:2); (14) *Spirit of Truth* (John 14:17). The transcendence of the Spirit is indicated (15) in the title, *Free Spirit* (Psa. 51:12). The attribute of grace is found in two titles, (16) *Spirit of Grace* (Heb. 10:29), and (17) *Spirit of Grace and Supplication* (Zech. 12:10).

Many of the titles referred to as indicating His attributes also connote His works. In the discussion of the titles revealing His attributes, it may be noticed that the *Spirit of Glory* (1 Pet. 4:14) engages in a work to bring the saints to glory. The *Spirit of Life* (Rom. 8:2) is the agent of regeneration. The *Spirit of Holiness* (Rom. 1:14), the *Holy Spirit* (Mt. 1:20), and the *Holy One* (1 John 2:20) is our sanctifier. The *Spirit of wisdom* (Eph. 1:17), the *Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding*, the *Spirit of Counsel and Might*, the *Spirit of Knowledge and of the Fear of the Lord* (Isa. 11:2) speak of the several ministries of God in teaching, guiding and strengthening the saint. The *Spirit of Truth* (John 14:17) has a similar idea. The Spirit as one who manifests grace is revealed in the titles, *Spirit of Grace* (Heb. 10:29), and the *Spirit of Grace and Supplication* (Zech. 12:10). In addition to these, two other titles are given the Holy Spirit, affirming His works. (1) The *Spirit of Adoption* (Rom. 8:15) has reference to His revelation of our adoption as sons. (2) The *Spirit of Faith* (2 Cor. 4:13), while perhaps impersonal, and in this case not referring to the Holy Spirit as such, if admitted as a reference, indicates the ministry of the Spirit in producing faith in us. Another title of the Holy Spirit, which does not involve the name *spirit*, however, is that of *Comforter*, from παράκλητος, meaning, according to Thayer, when used in its widest sense, "*a helper, succorer, aider, assistant*; so of the Holy Spirit destined to take the place of Christ with the apostles" (*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p. 483). It is found frequently in the New Testament (John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7). It reveals the Holy Spirit as one who is always ready to help the Christian. The many titles of the Holy Spirit with their manifold meanings speak eloquently of the beauties of His Person and the wonders of His attributes. The many aspects revealed speak of His infinite Person, equal in power and glory with the Father and the Son.—Pp. 15–19

As many Scriptures in combination with one another, if cited, would prove that to the Holy Spirit the titles *God*, *Jehovah*, *the God of Israel*, *Jehovah God*, *Jehovah God of Hosts* are ascribed, it is certain that, in the divine reckoning, the Holy Spirit is One of the Glorious Three with the undiminished authority and exaltation which belong to Deity alone.

Chapter II

The Deity of the Holy Spirit

If perchance the personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit seem vague to a believer, it is not due to any failure of the Sacred Text to represent the Third Person as such. So far as the Scriptures are concerned, the Holy Spirit is set forth in connection with all the actions and characteristics which belong to a divine Person. According to the record presented in the Bible, the Holy Spirit, though constantly seen in action, never appears in any light other than that which must be construed of Deity. In this, as before observed, there is a wide range of distinctions to be noted between that which enters into Christology and that which enters into Pneumatology. A worthy treatment of the doctrine of Christ demands recognition of His human birth, His human body, soul, and spirit, certain human limitations, His death, His resurrection, His present session in a glorified body in heaven, and His return in visible form to the earth again. None of these features are ever related directly to the Father or to the Holy Spirit. Therefore, it is confidently asserted that the whole sphere of the Spirit's activities, like that of His own Person, is wholly within the sphere of that which pertains to Deity. In like manner, if actions and revealed characteristics can intimate personality, the Holy Spirit's personality is more sustained by evidence than that of the Father, since the Spirit is the Executive, the Creator of the universe, the divine Author of the Scriptures, the Generator of Christ's humanity, the Regenerator of those who believe, and the direct source of every vital factor in a spiritual Christian's life; yet, oddly enough, in all generations men have yielded to a strange uncertainty respecting the actuality of the Holy Spirit's Person. It would seem as though the Scriptures were not read at all, or, if being read, the human mind is incapable of itself to receive the simplest and most obvious truths respecting this Member of the Godhead. Since all men are affected to some degree with such an incapacity to receive the revealed truth on this subject, it becomes a worthy subject of prayer that He whose work it is to actualize to the believer the things of the Father and of the Son will actualize Himself also.

I. Divine Attributes

It is the burden of any work which purports to serve as a textbook that in so far as is possible it shall present all the facts involved, even those most obvious. It thus becomes imperative that at least some of the attributes of the Holy Spirit shall be listed as evidence respecting His divine perfection. If executed in full, the undertaking would involve a recounting of all the attributes of God—already named under Theology Proper—for every attribute of God is ascribed to the Holy Spirit as fully and freely as to the Father or the Son.

1. ETERNITY. " … Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God" (Heb. 9:14).

It will be seen that in this one statement of but twelve words all three Persons of the Godhead are named, and it would be strained reasoning indeed to contend that in such a passage the identity of the Third Person is uncertain. The text could not—in conformity to human theories—read that Christ, through His own spirit, or through an attribute, or mere influence, offered Himself to God. The construction of the text, as well as the stupendous thing said to have been undertaken, demands as great a Person at the one point as is required at the other two. The Son is offering Himself; the Father is receiving; and all is executed by the Eternal Spirit. Could it possibly be demonstrated that the work of the Spirit in this vast undertaking is any less than that of the Son, or than the Father's responsibility in receiving? The term *eternal,* which with all propriety can also be assigned to God the Father or God the Son, is here assigned to the Holy Spirit. Since of God alone this attribute may be predicated, the Spirit is to be understood as God.

2. OMNIPOTENCE. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit" (1 Pet. 3:18).

By this passage the resurrection of Christ is credited to the energizing power of the Holy Spirit. It is asserted no less than twenty-five times that Christ was raised by the power of the Father (cf. Acts 2:32; Gal. 1:1), and once that Christ said of His own life: "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (John 10:18) . Likewise, Christ said: "Destroy

this temple [His own body], and in three days I will raise it up" (John 2:19). Nevertheless, the immeasurable omnipotence which can raise the dead is attributed also to the Holy Spirit. This is but one omnipotent achievement to which reference might be made. In truth, all the works of the Spirit, as will yet be indicated, are works which demand divine omnipotence.

3. Omnipresence. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me" (Ps. 139:7–10).

While not all of this context is quoted here, it is to be seen from the above portion that the reference is to the Holy Spirit, the Third Person. He is omnipresent. He has always been omnipresent in the whole of creation, but it is also true that He now, beginning with the Day of Pentecost and continuing until the removal of the Church, is *resident* in the world (Eph. 2:18–22).

4. Omniscience. "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2:10–11).

Nothing is ever hidden from the searching discernment of the Holy Spirit, not even "the deep things of God." Beyond what may be meant by the *deep things of God*, human imagination cannot function. The text definitely declares that unaided man cannot know the things of God (cf. vs. 14), but the Spirit knows all things. Reference is made to the outmost bounds of omniscience, and none can deny that, if the knowledge which the Spirit possesses reaches to the deep things of God, all else would likewise be comprehended by Him. He who thus plumbs the deepest ocean of truth and understanding is able as well to discern the thoughts and intents of the human heart. Those tempted to sin in secret may well remember that nothing is hidden from the Spirit of God. It is likewise a comfort to know that He as fully observes every sincere purpose, whether ability to execute it is found or not.

5. Love. "The fruit of the Spirit is love" (Gal. 5:22).

The attribute of love belongs to the Holy Spirit to the degree of infinity. Furthermore, He is the Executor of the things of God. So He literally loves with *divine* compassion through the one in whom He dwells. While this is a provision of priceless advantage to the Christian, the point to be recognized is that the Spirit exercises the full measure of divine love. He is its Source.

6. Faithfulness. "The fruit of the Spirit is … faithfulness" (Gal. 5:22, R.V.).

Here is no reference to the attitude of *faith,* as suggested perhaps in the Authorized Version; but rather the Spirit is said to reproduce divine faithfulness in the believer. All the covenants of God, His promises, and His predictions speak of His faithfulness. "He abideth faithful." "Great is thy faithfulness." The Holy Spirit partakes fully of this attribute of God's.

7. Truthfulness. "And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth" (1 John 5:6).

Christ earlier styled the Holy Spirit "the Spirit of truth." Thus it may be observed that the Spirit not only possesses the truth: He is the Faithful Witness to the truth. As such He is the divine Author of the Scriptures, and therein has He borne witness to the truth. A lie against the Spirit was instantly punished by death (Acts 5:1–11). Hence, infinitely vital is the truth as related to the Holy Spirit.

8. Holiness. "The Holy Spirit."

Whatever the underlying distinction inside the Trinity may be, there can be no doubt that the Scriptures place a peculiar emphasis upon the purity and sanctity of the Third Person. The very title "Holy Spirit" testifies to this solemn reality. Later in this volume it will be demonstrated that the Spirit is the One of the Three who copes directly with the sin nature in the believer and is the only existing power by which that nature is ever controlled. The truth that He is holy and that He, through that which Christ has wrought in bringing the sin nature into judgment, is Himself never tarnished by so much as a shadow of the evil He suppresses will also be made clear. It has been indicated above that instant death was inflicted upon two persons at the opening of this dispensation who presumed to lie to the Holy Spirit. Bearing on the same truth and with regard to the distinctive holiness of the Spirit, it will be remembered that there was a sin against the Holy Ghost

which could never be forgiven. Of this Christ said: “Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come” (Matt. 12:31–32). It is impossible for the inner character of one Person in the Godhead to be more holy than that of Another; the distinction must lie somewhat within the sphere of that which is the official responsibility of the Spirit. Being the divine Executive, the Third Person may have an especial appointment to manifest as well as to defend the infinite holiness of God. It is with equal appropriateness, then, that the angelic beings ascribe to the Blessed Three the adoration: “Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts.”

II. Divine Works

Introducing this theme in his *Christian Theology*, Dr. William Cooke writes: We have seen the works of creation ascribed to the Father and the Son, and the same authority ascribes them to the Holy Spirit. After the fiat which brought matter into being, the first agency we find employed in the construction of the universe is that of the Holy Spirit. Ere the heavens and the earth had received their form—when the chaotic mass was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, the Spirit of God *was moving* or brooding over the inert and confused mass, penetrating it with his omnipotent and vivifying energy, impregnating the congeries with their appropriate qualities, affinities, and laws; arranging and disposing the whole according to his unerring wisdom and sovereign pleasure. In each successive act of creating energy the blessed Spirit participated, for, says Job, “by his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens” (26:13), and Elihu says, “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.” Thus, if the glorious work of creation be challenged as a proof of the existence and Deity of the Father and the Son, it is equally a proof of the Deity of the Holy Spirit. The wonderful economy of Providence implies the same omnipotent agency and all-pervading presence as the work of creation. It is, indeed, a continued creation—a perpetual renovation and reproduction. The pious Psalmist acknowledges this fact, and ascribes the work to the Holy Spirit. Speaking of the absolute dependence of all creatures upon God, he says, “Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth” (Ps. 104:29, 30). Thus each reviving spring, and each successive generation of men and inferior animals, like a new creation, is declaratory of the Spirit’s presence and omnipotent energy. In the economy of grace the Holy Spirit performs a benign and conspicuous part. He begins, carries forward, and completes the work of salvation in the hearts of his people. It is impossible to estimate the immense amount of moral and spiritual good resulting from his holy influence upon the human heart. He is the great source of light and grace to the world—the fountain of holiness, love, and joy; and, excepting the gift of Christ, the bestowment of his agency is the greatest and most important blessing ever conferred upon our fallen world.—Pp. 154–155

Though much has been intimated earlier in these volumes on the work of the Holy Spirit and much that will yet appear will bear on this same theme, it is essential to an analysis of the present aspect of the truth to indicate in order some of the works of the Spirit which supply evidence respecting His Deity. These works now to be listed are approached with this one purpose in view. Later, they will be listed again and classified when the essential character of each must be considered.

1. Creation. It is significant indeed that in the first two verses of the Bible two Persons of the Godhead are mentioned—God and the Spirit of God. The combination of the First and Third Persons is far less frequent than the combination of the First and Second Persons, as in Psalm 2:2 and constantly in the New Testament. God is said to have created while "the Spirit of God moved [brooded as in incubation] upon the face of the waters." What division in creative work, if any, is implied is not clear. It is written in Psalm 33:6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." Likewise, in Psalm 104:30: "Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth," and Job declares: "By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent" (26:13). It has been indicated earlier that each Person of the Godhead is credited with creating all things; consequently, since the Holy Spirit is the Executor of the divine purpose, His part in creation is to be expected. By His incubation, He brought forth every living thing. Of this specific work of the Holy Spirit, Matthew Henry in his *Commentary* writes, "The Spirit of God was the first mover: He *moved upon the face of the waters*. When we consider the earth without form and void, methinks it is like the valley full of dead and dry bones. Can these live? Can this confused mass of matter be formed into a beautiful world? Yes, if a spirit of life from God enter into it (Ezek. 37:9). Now there is hope concerning this thing; for the Spirit of God begins to work, and, if he work, who or what shall hinder? God is said to make the world by his Spirit (Ps. 33:6; Job 26:13), and by the same mighty worker the new creation is effected. He moved upon the face of the deep, as Elijah stretched himself upon the dead child,—as the *hen gathers her chickens under her wings*, and hovers over them, to warm and cherish them (Matt. 23:37),—as the eagle stirs up her nest, and *flutters* over her young (it is the

same word that is here used, Deut. 32:11). Learn hence, That God is not only the author of all being, but the fountain of life and spring of motion" (at Gen. 1:2). A parallel is here suggested with the Spirit's work in bringing into existence the present spiritual, new creation. Of the three creative acts —that of Genesis, that of the present spiritual, New Creation, and that of the creation of the new heaven and the new earth—the Spirit is seen to work mightily in the first two, but no record is given of His participation in the last. Dwelling on the contrast between creation and evolution, *The Companion Bible* states: The introduction to Genesis (and to the whole Bible), Genesis 1:1–2:3, ascribes everything to the living God, creating, making, acting, moving, and speaking. There is no room for evolution without a flat denial of divine revelation. One must be true, the other false. All God's works were pronounced "good" seven times (Gen. 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31). They are "great" (Ps. 111:2; Rev. 15:3). They are "wondrous" (Job 37:14). They are "perfect" (Deut. 32:4). Man starts from nothing. He begins in helplessness, ignorance, and inexperience. All his works, therefore, proceed on the principle of *evolution*. This principle is seen *only in human* affairs; from the hut to the palace; from the canoe to the ocean liner; from the spade and ploughshare to machines for drilling, reaping, and binding, etc. But the birds build their nests today as at the beginning. The moment we pass the boundary line, and enter the divine sphere, no trace or vestige of evolution is seen. There is growth and development *within*, but no passing, change, or evolution out from one into another. On the other hand, *all* God's works are *perfect*. … Evolution is only one of several theories invented to explain the phenomena of created things. It is admitted by all scientists that no one of these theories covers all the ground; and the greatest claim made for Evolution, or Darwinism, is that "it covers more ground than any of the others." The Word of God claims *to cover all the ground*: and the only way in which this claim is met, is by a denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures, in order to weaken it. This is the special work undertaken by the so-called "Higher Criticism," which bases its conclusions on human assumptions and reasoning, instead of on the documentary evidence of manuscripts, as Textual Criticism does.—Volume I, Appendix 5

He who creates has declared how it was done and His testimony commands attention.

2. Striving. Jehovah said: "My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh" (Gen. 6:3). The wickedness of the antediluvian days and the unwillingness of men to heed the preaching of Noah prompted this prediction on Jehovah's part. It looks on for complete fulfillment to a future time when God's offers of mercy and grace and His restraining power are withdrawn from the earth (2 Thess. 2:7–8). This striving of the Spirit is closely related to His convicting work (John 16:7–11).

3. Inspiration. There are certain divine undertakings which are said to be wrought by the three Persons of the Godhead, notably, creation, the

death of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ; and there are divine undertakings which belong specifically to One or Another of the members of the Godhead. The Father gives the Son—it could not be said that the Son gives the Father, or that the Spirit gives the Son or the Father. The Son becomes incarnate, dies, is raised from the dead, ascends into heaven, and will come again. Though they cooperate in that which belongs to the Son, there is no intimation that the Father or the Spirit become incarnate, that they die, are raised, ascend into heaven, or will return to the earth again. There are achievements the doing of which belongs only to God the Holy Spirit. It is the purpose of this chapter of this volume to enumerate at least seventeen of these specific works of the Holy Spirit. Three of those to be named are of the greatest importance since they are in the sphere of generation or production, namely, the inspiring of the Scriptures, the generating of the humanity of Christ, and the regenerating of those from among the lost who believe. It seems probable that the part the Spirit takes in the production of the Living Word and the part He takes in the production of the Written Word are above the level of that creative act by which a soul is regenerated. Human estimations in the sphere of such values may be submitted only as a finite opinion. Since in the production of the Living Word the Spirit adds the humanity and in the production of the Written Word the Spirit adds the divinity, it would follow—from the same course of finite reasoning—that the inspiration of the Scriptures is the greatest of all the Spirit's undertakings which are specifically His own. Since truth is from God and is so finally contained in the Oracles of God, the character, authority, and dependability of those Oracles become a fundamental issue. Naturally the whole problem relating to the inspiration of the Scriptures is raised again at this point; but it is the purpose of this division of the general theme only to point out that which is the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit and to observe in that work the evidence of His Deity. That the Scriptures are perfect, being, in the original languages, the very words of God, has been asserted and defended in Volume I under Bibliology; the present purpose is to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit is the divine Author of those Oracles. An impartial mind, sufficiently instructed to be able to place a relative value on any work of God, would normally expect that production of the Scriptures, like that of all other works of God, must result in what is perfect to infinity. That the Scriptures in their original writings are the

inerrant Word of God—a master work of the Holy Spirit—is usually demonstrated, when defended, from an examination of the text itself. That effort has been made by many faithful men, and by none more conclusively than S. R. L. Gaussen in a volume published in 1842 (in English) entitled *Theopneusty*. In his introductory definition of the word *Theopneusty,* he declares: It is thus that God, who would make known to his elect, in an eternal book, the spiritual principles of the divine philosophy; has dictated its pages, during sixteen centuries, to priests, kings, warriors, shepherds, tax-gatherers, boatmen, scribes, tent-makers. Its first line, its last line, all its instructions, understood or not understood, are from the same author, and that is sufficient for us. Whoever the writers may have been, and whatever their understanding of the book; they have all written with a faithful, superintended hand, on the same scroll, under the dictation of the same master, to whom a thousand years are as one day; such is the origin of the Bible. I will not waste my time in vain questions; I will study the book. It is the word of Moses, the word of Amos, the word of John, the word of Paul; but it is the mind of God and the word of God. We should then deem it a very erroneous statement to say; certain passages in the Bible are from men, and certain others from God. No; every verse, without exception, is from men; and every verse, without exception, is from God; whether he speaks directly in his own name, or whether he employs all the individuality of the sacred writer. And as St. Bernard says of the living works of the regenerated man, "that our will performs none of them without grace; but that grace too performs none of them without our will"; so must we say, that in the scriptures, God has done nothing but by man, and man has done nothing but by God. There is, in fact, a perfect parallel between Theopneusty and efficacious grace. In the operations of the Holy Spirit in inditing the sacred books, and in those of the same Spirit converting a soul, and causing it to walk in the paths of holiness, man is in some respects entirely passive, in others entirely active. God there does everything; man there does all; and we may say of all these works, as St. Paul said of one of them to the Philippians; "it is God who worketh in you both *to will and to do."* And we see that in the Scriptures, the same work is attributed alternately to God and to man; God converts, and it is man who converts himself; God circumcises the heart, God gives a new heart, and it is man who must circumcise his own heart and make to himself a new heart. "Not only because we must employ the means of obtaining such an effect," says the famous Pres. Edwards, in his admirable remarks against the Arminians, "but because this effect itself is our act, as well as our duty; God producing all, and we acting all." … In theory, we might say that a religion could be divine, without the miraculous inspiration of its books. It might be possible, for example, to conceive of a Christianity without Theopneusty; and it might perhaps, be conceived that every other miracle of our religion, except that, was a fact. In this supposition (which is totally unauthorized), the eternal Father would have given his Son to the world; the all-creating Word, made flesh, would have undergone the death of the cross for us, and have sent down upon the Apostles the spirit of wisdom and miraculous powers; but, all these mysteries of redemption once accomplished, he would have abandoned to these men of God the work of writing our Sacred books, according to their own wisdom; and their writings would have presented to us only the natural language of their supernatural illuminations, of their convictions and their charity. Such an order of things is undoubtedly a vain supposition, directly contrary to the testimony of the Scriptures as to their own nature; but, without remarking here, that it explains nothing; and that, miracle for miracle, that of illumination is not less inexplicable than Theopneusty; without further saying that the word of God possesses a divine power peculiar to itself: such an order of things, if it were realized, would have exposed us to innumerable errors, and plunged us into the most ruinous uncertainty. With no security against the imprudence of the writers, we should not have been able to give their writings even the authority which the Church now

concedes to those of Augustine, Bernard, Luther, Calvin, or of a multitude of other men enlightened in the truth by the Holy Spirit. We are sufficiently aware how many imprudent words and erroneous propositions mar the most beautiful pages of these admirable writers. And yet the Apostles (on the supposition we have just made), would have been subjected still more than they, to serious errors; since they could not have had, like the doctors of the Church, a word of God, by which to correct their writings; and since they would have been compelled to invent the entire language of religious science; for a science, we know, is more than half formed, when its language is made. What fatal errors, what grievous ignorance, what inevitable imprudence had necessarily accompanied, in them, a revelation without Theopneusty; and in what deplorable doubts had the Church then been left!—errors in the selection of facts, errors in estimating them, errors in stating them, errors in the conception of the relations which they hold to doctrines, errors in the expression of these doctrines themselves, errors of omission, errors of language, errors of exaggeration, errors in the adoption of national, provincial or party prejudices, errors in the anticipations of the future and in the estimate of the past. But, thanks to God, it is not so with our sacred books. They contain no errors, all their writing is inspired of God. “Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth”; so that none of these words ought to be neglected, and we are called to respect them and to study them even to their least iota and to their least tittle; for this “scripture is purified, as silver seven times tried in the fire; it is perfect.” These assertions, themselves testimonies of the word of God, contain precisely our last definition of Theopneusty, and lead us to characterize it finally, as “that inexplicable power which the Divine Spirit formerly exercised over the authors of the Holy Scriptures, to guide them even in the employment of the words they were to use, and to preserve them from all error, as well as from every omission.”—Pp. 36–39

More determining and impressive than this argument for inspiration, which is based on the obvious divine character of the Sacred Text itself, is the fact that the Scriptures are the product of God the Holy Spirit. The works of God are infinitely perfect and worthy of Him, of course. It is therefore to be assumed that the Bible, being a work of God, is no exception, being, as it is, the Holy Spirit’s literary monument. When error or imperfections are thought to exist, it would be the first impulse of a truly devout mind to investigate whether the difficulty does not arise in the sphere of the finite understanding. No more does the human element in the Written Word jeopardize the infinite excellency of the divine element therein than does the humanity of Christ, the Living Word, jeopardize the Deity which He is. To believe the Bible to be an inerrant document is to honor its Author the Holy Spirit, to respect the Bible’s own claim for itself, and to agree with the conclusions of devout scholars of all generations. It has been pointed out that the Sadducees denied the resurrection, which denial indeed did not alter the fact of the resurrection, but only prompted Christ to say to them: “Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.”

All Scripture is *theopneustos* (θεόπνευστος), which declaration is made in 2 Timothy 3:16 and which includes all the Bible. The Scriptures originate with God and are His very breath. In the preceding verse the statement is made by Paul that, from a child, Timothy has known the sacred letters (γράμματα). All Scripture (γραφή), composed, as it is, of sacred letters, is God-breathed. Accordingly Peter states: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:20–21). The word *prophecy* as used by Peter in this passage reaches out to all utterance which is inspired by God; that is, it is not restricted to prediction. It includes forthtelling as well as foretelling. It comprehends all Scripture. Likewise, the declaration which the Scriptures set forth must be interpreted as related to, and in the light of, all other Scriptures. Prophecy did not in old time, or in any other time, arise from the volition of man. Holy men of God spake as they were *borne along* by the Spirit of God. The testimony of the prophets to themselves is most revealing and convincing. They said: "The mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it." "The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and his word was upon my tongue." "Hear this word that Jehovah hath spoken." "The word of the LORD came unto me." He "put a word in Balaam's mouth" "Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said …" "Which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David" "Those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets". It is clearly the testimony of the Bible respecting itself that it is a work of the Holy Spirit, its words are the inerrant words of God, and it is therefore in its perfection as suitable for heaven as it is for the earth.

4. GENERATING CHRIST. What may have been the Spirit's work in the impartation of life when creation took place is not revealed. Further more, the phase of the Spirit's work now under consideration is quite removed from His work in regeneration. The one great generating act of the Holy Spirit occurred when He brought the humanity of Christ into being. It is too often assumed that Mary the mother of Christ contributed His humanity and that the Holy Spirit contributed His Deity; but a moment's reflection would disclose that the Deity of Christ was His own from all eternity and therefore was not originated at the time of His birth. He became incarnate when His

eternal Person took on the human form. It is also true that in this instance, as in any other human gestation, Mary could contribute no more than that assigned to the woman in childbearing; she nurtured and developed the life committed to her. The Spirit caused the humanity of Christ to originate and that is His act of generation. Thus the Scripture declares: “And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35).

5. Convincing. The convincing work of the Holy Spirit is threefold—of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment—and much light falls upon the character of this essential ministry of the Holy Spirit when it is observed that the end which He accomplishes is the impartation of an understanding of facts, which understanding results in an enlightenment essential to an intelligent acceptance of Christ as Savior. The declaration on this point made by Christ in the Upper Room Discourse reads: “Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:7–11). This unfolding of truth is not addressed to the unsaved, though it describes a work of the Holy Spirit in their behalf; it is addressed to those who are saved and provides priceless instruction concerning the most vital factor in all evangelizing efforts. Much has been presented earlier respecting this ministry of the Spirit and the same theme must again come into consideration at a later time. Enough will have been said here if it is pointed out that this threefold convincing is the divine method of overcoming the veil which Satan has cast over the mind of each unregenerate person. Of this blindness it is written: “But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them” (2 Cor. 4:3–4). In the act of lifting this veil from the unsaved person’s mind, a clear vision is gained of the one sin of rejecting Christ, of a righteousness which is derived from the

invisible Christ in glory, and of the completed judgment of the cross. That this judgment is wholly achieved in the interests of the unsaved constitutes a challenge for faith. It becomes thereby, not something to persuade God to do, but something to believe that He has done. In fact, the only human responsibility indicated in all of this determining Scripture is *belief*. It is something to believe when the statement is made respecting imputed righteousness, which righteousness is the portion of all who are saved. It is likewise a demand upon faith to accept and rest in the revelation that Christ has borne all the individual's sin. The one remaining sin is that "they believe not on me," i.e., Christ. This convincing ministry of the Holy Spirit is not one of condemnation or of impressing the sinner with his sinfulness; it is distinctly a message of good news saying that Christ has died, "the just for the unjust," and that a perfect standing and acceptance before God are provided in the resurrected Son of God. Due warning of the necessary consequences if this message should not be believed is part of the Spirit's convincing work.

6. RESTRAINING. In the present age there are two ministries of the Holy Spirit to the unsaved, namely, that of convincing and that of restraining. The ministry of convincing, just considered, is directed to the individual and is the only hope that he will turn intelligently and sufficiently to Christ as Savior, while the ministry of restraining is directed to the whole *cosmos* world in mass. As the word *restrain* implies, it has to do with the impeding of the evil that is possible in the world. Evidently this curbing is not with a view to discontinuing all evil, else that would be accomplished without delay; it is rather a ministry by which evil is held within certain divinely predetermined bounds. The Restrainer will be removed in due time—and then follows an unprecedented tribulation, a period of seven years, before the King returns to exercise absolute authority over the earth. During these seven years the true character of evil will be demonstrated. It is clearly asserted that the restraint is to the end that the man of sin should not be revealed until his divinely appointed time, which time is that of the great tribulation. That time of distress is not something imposed upon humanity from without; it is simply the reaction of wickedness when the present divine restraint is removed. It is impossible to estimate what the church on earth, governments, and society in general owe to this unceasing inhibiting

influence of the Holy Spirit. The Scripture bearing on this theme reads: “And now ye know what withholdeth that he [the man of sin] might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity [lawlessness] doth already work: only he [the Spirit] who now letteth [restraineth] will let [go on restraining], until he [the Restrainer] be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit [breath] of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming” (2 Thess. 2:6–8).

7. Regeneration. The word παλιγγενεσία translated *regeneration*, is used but twice in the New Testament. In the first instance— Matthew 19:28—the Lord speaks of the restoration of all things unto God which He Himself shall yet accomplish (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24–28). This is not said to be a work of the Holy Spirit, but rather a work of the Son. The second instance is found in Titus 3:5, which reads: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” To be sure, the truth which this term expresses is set forth in many Scriptures and under various terms, but then always as a work of the Holy Spirit. The background of the doctrine of regeneration is its necessity springing from the universal fallen estate of man. Since the need is world-wide, the demand for regeneration is imperative in the case of every person born into the world. None can be excepted other than the Christ of God. In His conversation with Nicodemus by night (John 3:1–21), Christ recognized as acceptable to God nothing of the model character and attainments in Judaism on the part of this ruler in Israel. It was to such a one that Christ said: “Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again” (or, from above); and to the same purpose Christ said: “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” As human generation begets a life “after its kind” so divine regeneration means the impartation of a life from God which is wholly foreign to that of fallen man. It is the divine nature. It is “Christ in you, the hope of glory” (Col. 1:27). The Lord said: “The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly” (John 10:10). Upwards of eighty-five New Testament passages bear on this fact of an imparted divine life. No change in the human estate could be conceived which is as far-

reaching and effective as that of an actual birth into a legitimate and actual, filial relationship with God. This provision constitutes God's supreme message to man. Individual regeneration, so far as the testimony of Scripture is concerned, is a New Testament provision. Though Israelites were rightly related to God as such by physical birth, they anticipated in time to come the reception of eternal life as an "inheritance" (cf. Matt. 19:29; Luke 10:25–29; 18:18–30). Of Israel's relation to personal regeneration by the Holy Spirit, John L. Nuelsen writes in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia:* "Whether the Divine promises refer to the Messianic end of times, or are to be realized at an earlier date, they all refer to the nation of Israel as such, and to individuals only as far as they are partakers in the benefits bestowed upon the commonwealth. This is even true where the blessings prophesied are only spiritual, as in Isa. 60:21, 22. The mass of the people of Israel are therefore as yet scarcely aware of the fact that the conditions on which these Divine promises are to be attained are more than ceremonial and ritual ones" (*s.v.*, "Regeneration," IV, 2547). The Gospel written by John in its opening chapter states that a new thing has come into the range of human experience. This Scripture declares: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (vss. 12–13); and Peter describes a Christian thus: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Pet. 1:23). As for the human responsibility in regeneration, Christ said to Nicodemus: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). As this subject is to be reconsidered later in another connection, however, it will suffice to add that to be born of God means an induction into the order of heavenly beings. None, of a surety, are now able to comprehend the reality in which God becomes the regenerating and therefore legitimate Father for all eternity and the one who believes becomes a regenerated legitimate son for all eternity. Salvation includes a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17, R.V. marg.), which is wrought by the Holy Spirit as the Executor of the Godhead.

8. Illumination. Lying back of the Holy Spirit's illumination of the believer is the threefold condition of need calling for it, seeing that all members of the human family are dulled in their natural powers of understanding by sin, likewise by a specific veiling of their minds from Satan (cf. 2 Cor. 4:3–4), and that the truth to be comprehended, being of a celestial character, is not apprehended apart from a personal revelation of the truth wrought in the mind and heart by the Holy Spirit. The whole divinely arranged provision whereby the believer may come to know the things of God and all that enters into relationship with God is a system of pedagogy quite unlike anything of which this world knows and wholly outside the range of experience into which the natural man could enter. Much has already been made of this aspect of the Holy Spirit's ministry under Bibliology and the same theme will yet be considered more exhaustively in a later section of this volume. Illumination is specifically a work which is wrought by the Third Person, and, in so far as He opens the understanding to the Scriptures, He unveils that which He Himself has originated; yet when Christ declared that the Spirit would guide the believer into all truth, He made clear that the Spirit does not originate the message which He imparts, for He, the Spirit, does not speak from Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak (John 16:13). In this instance it is Christ who originates the message. Christ opened this particular declaration with the words: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Thus in the sphere of "all truth" "things to come" and "all things that the Father hath," the message arises with the Son and is delivered to the mind and heart of the believer by the Spirit who indwells him. To this end the Apostle declares, "We have received … the spirit which is of God" (1 Cor. 2:12). The position within the heart of the believer which the Holy Spirit now occupies secures the closest relationship, so that He, the Spirit Himself, is thus able to create impressions within the Christian's consciousness which seem to have occurred only to his own finite mind. All spiritual truth must be imparted by the indwelling Spirit in this way. This particular body of truth, or threefold group of "things," will be known by the believer only through the revelation which the Holy Spirit accomplishes. Of this the Apostle states: "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed

them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2:9–10). Using earlier the same term as here, namely, "things," Christ implied that "all truth" must be *shown* to the believer by the Holy Spirit (John 16:12–15). The practical appeal which is here confronted by Christians reveals the necessity for adjustment of heart and life to the mind and will of the Holy Spirit lest all progress in learning spiritual things be hindered.

9. As a Paraclete. When translators turn from translating to interpreting the result may easily be misleading. In His Upper Room Discourse (John 13:1–17:26), for example, Christ refers to the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete (παράκλητος) several times. The Authorized Version translation of the word *Comforter* is the result of interpretation; that is, Paraclete means *helper* or one called to one's side as an aid—and in this case an all-sufficient One. This includes the idea of comforting, but to restrict it to comforting is wholly inadequate. In the breadth of the meaning of this descriptive title almost all of the Spirit's activities as presented in this section of Chapter II could be included. For three and a half years Christ had been to the disciples to whom He was speaking their Paraclete, their all-sufficient One. When leaving them He promised another Paraclete. It follows, accordingly, that whatever Christ had been to them, the Holy Spirit would continue. In his *Word Studies*, Dr. M. R. Vincent discusses this title *Paraclete* as follows:

> Only [used] in John's Gospel and First Epistle (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; 1 Ep. 2:1). From παρά, *to the side of*, and καλέω, to *summon*. Hence, originally, *one who is called to another's side to aid him*, as an advocate in a court of justice. The later, Hellenistic use of παρακαλεῖν and παράκλησις, to denote *the act of consoling* and *consolation*, gave rise to the rendering *Comforter* which is given in every instance in the Gospel, but is changed to *advocate* in 1 John 2:1, agreeably to its uniform signification in classical Greek. The argument in favor of this rendering *throughout* is conclusive. It is urged that the rendering *Comforter* is justified by the fact that, in its original sense, it means more than a mere *consoler*, being derived from the Latin *confortare*, to *strengthen*, and that the Comforter is therefore one who strengthens the cause and the courage of his client at the bar: but, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, the history of this interpretation shows that it is not reached by this process, but grew out of a grammatical error, and that therefore this account can only be accepted as an apology after the fact, and not as an explanation of the fact. The Holy Spirit is, therefore, by the word παράκλητος, of which *Paraclete* is a transcription, represented as our *Advocate* or *Counsel*, "who suggests true reasonings to our minds, and true courses of action for our lives, who convicts our adversary, the world, of wrong, and pleads our cause before God our Father." It is to be noted that *Jesus* as well as the Holy *Spirit* is represented as Paraclete. The Holy Spirit is to be *another* Paraclete, and this falls in with the statement in the First Epistle, "we have an *advocate* with God, even *Jesus Christ*." Compare Romans 8:26. See on Luke 6:24. Note also that the word *another* is ἄλλον, and not

ἕτερον, which means *different*. The advocate who is to be sent is not *different* from Christ, but an *other* similar to Himself.–II, 243–44

In the title *Paraclete* there is abundant evidence both for the Personality and the Deity of the Holy Spirit. In his *Lectures on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, therefore, William Kelly writes: But I apprehend the word "Comforter" sometimes fails (perhaps to most fails) to give an adequate notion of what it is that our Lord Jesus really meant us to gather from thus speaking of the Holy Ghost. We might very naturally draw from it, that the term was in relation to sorrow, that it intimated a person who would console us in the midst of the distresses of this lower world. And, indeed, the Holy Ghost does console us and comfort us. But this is only a very small part of the functions here conveyed by the word "Paraclete." This is the expression, if one would give an English reproduction of that which is in point of fact the very word our Lord employed. But the meaning of that word "Paraclete" is not merely "Comforter" but one who is identified with our interests, one who undertakes all our cause, one who engages to see us through our difficulties, one who in every way becomes both our representative and the great personal agent that transacts all our business for us. This is the meaning of the Advocate or Paraclete or Comforter, whatever equivalent may be preferred. Manifestly, then, it has an incomparably larger bearing than either "advocate" on the one hand, or "comforter" on the other: it includes both, but takes in a great deal more than either. In point of fact, it is One who is absolutely and infinitely competent to undertake for us whatever He could do in our favour, whatever was or might be the limit of our need, whatever our want in any difficulty, whatever the exigencies of God's grace for the blessing of our souls. Such the Holy Ghost is now; and how blessed it is to have such an One! But remark here, that it never was known before. I have already hinted, and indeed plainly expressed the conviction, that it will never be known again, fully allowing that there will be, as to extent, a larger outpouring of blessing in the world to come. But the personal presence of the Spirit here below as an answer to the glory of Christ at the right hand of God!—such a state of things never can be repeated. While the High Priest is above, the Spirit sent down gives a heavenly entrance into His glory as well as redemption; when the High Priest comes out for the earthly throne, the Spirit then poured out will give a testimony suited to the earth over which the Lord will reign—Pp. 87–88

10. WITNESSING. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). In this distinctive work the Holy Spirit actualizes to the believer that which has been taken by faith. It is not, therefore, regeneration or the Spirit's work in generating the believer, but the consciousness of this new reality, the Christian's recognition of that which the Spirit has wrought in regeneration. Those who believe on Christ become in their own right the sons of God (John 1:12), and the Spirit Himself witnesseth that this great reality has been accomplished. John declares it in 1 John 5:10, "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." The advantage and blessing of this work of the Holy Spirit cannot be estimated. The whole field of experimental evidence for regeneration is important, though also fraught with danger lest confidence should be made to rest in changeable experience rather than in the

unchanging Word of God. One truth needs ever to be considered, namely, that the Spirit's witness, like all His ministries which relate to life experience, will be hindered and, to that extent, imperfect for the Christian who is not in right spiritual relation to God. Thus the richest witness of the Holy Spirit regarding sonship is not experienced fully by all who are saved and simply because the witness is hindered. There are those in the world who are saved, but who lack this form of assurance. In a much larger sphere the Spirit, being *the Spirit of Truth* and the divine Author of the Holy Scriptures, is God's special witness. As the Son manifests God both by a life on earth and a ministry now in heaven, so the Spirit manifests God both by a written testimony and by the illumination through which the testimony may be comprehended.

11. Anointing. Indwelling and anointing are synonymous terms in Pneumatology and therefore depend on the same body of Scripture for their exact meaning. As certainly as every believer is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, thus to become a temple of the Holy Spirit, so certainly every believer is anointed by the Holy Spirit. Without reference to any special class of Christians whatsoever, the Apostle John writes: "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him" (1 John 2:27). There could not be such a thing as a Christian who has not been anointed by receiving the Holy Spirit and thus made to partake of the divine nature, being born of the Spirit. The doctrine of the indwelling and anointing of the Holy Spirit calls for unprejudiced study, and will be treated quite at length in a later chapter.

12. Baptism. While tragic confusion obtains relative to various activities of the Holy Spirit—due, in the main, to a failure to consider all that the Scriptures declare on a given theme—no aspect of His work for the Christian is as perverted, if considered at all, as His baptism. The word *baptize*—more distorted by religious prejudice than any other term—is itself in need of careful definition. This is undertaken in other places in this work on theology. It may well be added here, however, that the word βαπτίζω in its various forms presents a primary and a secondary usage. The

primary usage, which carries with it no implication that it is more often used or is of greater importance, indicates a literal envelopment within an element and so to become subject to that element. This word is to be distinguished from βάπτω, the primary meaning of which is to dip whereby two actions are involved—that of putting in and that of taking out. Over against this, βαπτίζω, which it has just been shown means to immerse or submerge, implies only the putting in with no reference to the removal. Its secondary meaning has doubtless evolved from the primary meaning, since it represents an object being brought under the influence of another quite apart from any physical envelopment or intusposition. Such, indeed, is the baptism into repentance, the baptism into the remission of sins, the baptism into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the baptism by the cup into suffering, the baptism of Israel into Moses by the cloud and the sea, and the baptism by the Spirit into Christ. In none of these is there the remotest suggestion of a momentary dipping and removal. That which is most desired and fully assured respecting the union formed by the baptism into Christ is that there shall be no removal either in time or eternity; yet it is not a physical envelopment or an intusposition, but must be classified as the secondary use of the word βαπτίζω in which one thing is brought under the power and influence of another. By the Spirit's baptism into Christ the believer is joined permanently unto the Lord; he has put on Christ, and therefore, being in Christ, partakes of all that Christ is. This vital union is the ground of every position and possession into which the child of God has entered. It is obviously a grave error to confuse the baptism which the Spirit accomplishes when He joins the believer to Christ with any other experience, or to confound it with the filling of the Spirit, by which ministry Christian experience and power for life and service are secured. Since all that is vital in the Christian's relation to God depends upon this union with Christ, it is ever a point of satanic attack so as to hinder any right apprehension of it. Apart from this union which secures the imputation of the merit of Christ, there could be no standing before God and no entrance into heaven.

13. Sealing. The presence of the Holy Spirit within the believer becomes a distinguishing identification, not observable or useful as such in human spheres, but rather a mark of divine discrimination which God sees. "The

Lord knoweth them that are his" (2 Tim. 2:19), and what greater mark of recognition could any individual bear in the sight of God than that he is a temple of the Holy Spirit? Thus, being indwelt, the believer is sealed. Similarly, the seal speaks of a completed undertaking. Sealing belongs to those who are justified and perfected forever in Christ. So, also, sealing indicates security. The one who seals becomes responsible for the object upon which the seal is imposed. In the case of the believer, he is "sealed unto the day of redemption" Much that is suggested by the function of the seal is presented in Jeremiah 32:9–12. The Apostle Paul declares: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" (2 Cor. 1:22); "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13); "And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption" (4:30).

14. Filling. That ministry of the Holy Spirit which is termed His *filling* is the very center of the entire theme of the spiritual life. It is the Spirit fulfilling in the believer all that He came into that heart to do. This ministry represents two quite different spheres of achievement. On its negative side, the spiritual life calls for a deliverance from the power of the three great enemies—the *cosmos* world, the flesh, and the devil. On its constructive or positive side, the spiritual life calls for the manifestation of every divine grace—no less than the showing forth of the virtues of Him who called the believer out of darkness into His marvelous light. In a later chapter of this volume these two features of the spiritual life will be investigated and due consideration be given to the great body of Scripture involved. It will be disclosed that there is a divine plan and provision whereby the believer may be saved from the reigning power of sin and also from the habit and practice of sinning, as there is a divine arrangement whereby the unsaved may be saved from the penalty of sin and from their lost estate. The life that is delivered is not to be explained by human traits or dispositions of character, nor is it accidental when the change comes. It rests completely on the sufficient power of the Holy Spirit, which power is available to those who follow the precise plan which God has revealed. Few will question the statement that there is a precise plan for the salvation of the lost; yet, on the

other hand, but few have been awakened to the equally evident truth that God has a specific procedure whereby the power of the Holy Spirit may be realized in the individual believer's daily life. Though so much neglected, the way of life in dependence upon the Spirit is vital beyond measure.

15. Intercession. One central passage bears upon the intercession of the Spirit, namely, Romans 8:26–27: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." On this passage Dean Alford writes: The Holy Spirit of God dwelling in us, knowing our wants better than we, Himself pleads in our prayers, raising us to higher and holier desires than we can express in words, which can only find utterance in sighings and aspirations: see next verse. Chrysostom interprets the words of the spiritual gift of prayer, and adds, "For the man who is granted this grace, standing praying in great earnestness, supplicating God with many mental groanings, asks what is good for all." Calvin understands, that the Spirit suggests to us the proper words of acceptable prayer, which would *otherwise have been unutterable by us*. Macedonius gathered from this verse that the Holy Spirit is *a creature*, and *inferior to God*, because He *prays to God for us*. But as Augustine remarks, "The Holy Spirit groans not in Himself, with Himself, in the Holy Trinity, but *in us*, in that He makes us to groan". No *intercession in heaven* is here spoken of, but a *pleading in us* by the indwelling Spirit, of a nature above our comprehension and utterance. But [opposed to the words *"which cannot be uttered:"* the groanings are indeed unutterable by us, but …] **He that searcheth the hearts** [God] **knoweth what is the mind** [*intent*, or *bent*, as hidden in those sighs] **of the Spirit**. A difficulty presents itself in the rendering of the next clause. The particle with which it opens may mean either because, or that. If it is to be *causal*, **because He** [the Spirit] **pleads for the saints according to the will of God**, it would seem that knows must bear the meaning *"approves"* otherwise the connection will not be apparent; and so Calvin and others have rendered it. Hence many render it that—"*knows what is the mind of the Spirit, that He pleads, etc. with* [or, according to] **God**." But I must confess that the other rendering seems to me better to suit the context: and I do not see that the ordinary meaning of the word **knoweth** need be changed. The assurance which we have that God the Heart-Searcher interprets the inarticulate sighings of the Spirit in us,—is not, strictly speaking, His Omniscience,—but *the fact that the very Spirit who thus pleads, does it* according to God,—in pursuance of the divine purposes and in conformity with God's good pleasure.—All these pleadings of the Spirit are heard and answered, even when *inarticulately uttered:* we may extend the same comforting assurance to the *imperfect and mistaken verbal utterances* of our prayers, which are not themselves answered to our hurt, but the answer is given to the voice of the Spirit which speaks through them, which we *would* express, but *cannot*. Compare 2 Corinthians 12:7–10 for an instance in the Apostle's own case.—*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., at Rom. 8:27

This divine provision for the right and effective exercise of prayer should be apprehended and claimed as a new-birth privilege by every child of God.

So important is the Holy Spirit's part in prevailing prayer that one further quotation which expounds this Scripture is added here, taken from W. R. Newell: *And in like manner also*— We have just read that "we that have the firstfruits of the Spirit groan within ourselves," waiting for that blessed day of "the liberty of the glory of the sons of God." These words "in like manner," refer to that operation within us of the Spirit, which makes us, in real sympathy, one with the groaning creation about us. "In like manner", then, with this truly wonderful help, the Spirit "helps our infirmity,"—in its ignorant and infirm dealing with God. Note, the word "infirmity" is singular number: for we have nothing but infirmity! **We know not how to pray as we ought**. Oh, beware of the glib and intimate chatter of the "Modernist" preacher in his *prayers!* He would flatter both the Almighty and his hearers, and most of all, himself, in his "beautiful" and "eloquent" addresses to God! Not so with Paul, and the real saints of God, who have the Holy Ghost. There is with them the sense of utter and boundless *need*, and along with this the sense of *ignorance* and *inability*. Yet, still, bless God! there is, with all this, the sense of limitless help of the Holy Spirit! **The Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered**—We know that Christ maketh intercession for us at the right hand of God, but here the Spirit is making intercession within us: The Spirit, who knows the vast abysmal need of every one of us, knows that need to the least possible particular. **Groanings which cannot be uttered**—expresses at once the vastness of our need, our utter ignorance and inability, and the infinite concern of the blessed indwelling Spirit for us. "Groanings"—what a word! and to be used of the Spirit of the Almighty Himself! How shallow is our appreciation of what is done, both by Christ for us, and by the Spirit within us! **Which cannot be uttered**—Here, then, are needs of ours, of which our minds know nothing, and which our speech could not utter if we could perceive those needs. But it is part of God's great plan in our salvation that this effectual praying should have its place—praying, the very meaning of which we cannot grasp. Men of God have testified to the spirit of prayer prostrating them into deep and often long-continued "groanings." We believe that such consciousness of the Spirit's praying within us is included in this verse, but the chief or principal part of the Spirit's groaning within us, perhaps never reaches our spirit's consciousness. **And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is in the mind of the Spirit, because**

He maketh intercession for the saints according to God. It is God the Father here that is “searching the hearts.” How we used to shrink from the thought of such Divine searching! But here God is “searching hearts” to know what is the mind of the indwelling, holy Spirit concerning a saint, to know what the Spirit groans for, for that saint; in order that He may supply it. For in the plan of salvation, God the Father is the Source, Christ the Channel, and the Spirit the Agent. *Because He maketh intercession for the saints according to God*—We feel that the introduction of the words “the will of ” before the word *God* merely obscures the meaning. “According to God”—what an all-inclusive, blessed expression, enwrapping us as to our salvation and blessing, wholly in Divine love and power. We know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit makes intercession in us, “according to God,” according to His nature (of which we are partakers) ; according to our needs, which He discerns; according to our dangers, which He foresees —according to all the desires He has toward us.—*Romans Verse by Verse*, pp. 326–27

16. Sanctification. The root meaning of *sanctification* is to be set apart, to be classified, and specifically qualified unto the realization of some particular end. As presented in the Scriptures, sanctification is threefold: (a) that which is positional, or the setting apart which occurs when by the Holy Spirit the one who believes is joined unto Christ and thus comes to be in Christ. Of this it is written: “For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us” (Heb. 10:14–15). No classification known in heaven or on earth is more distinctive, far-reaching, or true than that wrought by the Spirit when He joins the individual to Christ. This same positional aspect of sanctification is also set forth in three other passages: “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (1 Cor. 1:30); “But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:13); “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” (1 Pet. 1:2). (b) Sanctification is also experimental, in that by the power of the Holy Spirit operating inside

the child of God that one is energized both to be delivered from sin and to be effective in every right attitude and service. Progressive, or experimental, sanctification is said to be God's will for each believer and this is reasonable. It is written: "For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour" (1 Thess. 4:3–4). Progress in the maturing of Spirit-wrought character can be attained only by and through the Third Person in the Godhead. (c) Sanctification will yet be achieved in its third or ultimate form; that is, the Christian will be presented faultless before the presence of God (cf. Eph. 1:4; Jude 1:24) and conformed to the image of Christ (cf. Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:1–3). Thus it is revealed that sanctification is a work of the Holy Spirit. Other Scriptures reveal that the Holy Spirit, though infinitely holy, is free to undertake all His ministries in the believer—even in spite of his fallen nature and his failures—since Christ has died not only *for* his sins, but *unto* sin.

17. As an Earnest. This, the concluding theme in this list, presents the engaging thought that all these limitless blessings together which are secured by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the believer are as an earnest or token, a pre-experience of the heavenly glory which will be. An earnest is a down payment—alike in kind, but the merest fraction in quantity though an exact specimen of the whole—of the believer's assured experience in heaven. It is written: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" (2 Cor. 1:22); "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit" (5:5); "Ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory" (Eph. 1:13–14).

Conclusion

This list of the activities of the Holy Spirit has been presented at this point with a view to demonstrating His Personality and Deity. None of the above-named undertakings could be wrought to the least degree by any other power than that of God. It is thus evidenced that the Holy Spirit is a Person and One of the Godhead Three.

Chapter III

Types and Symbols of the Holy Spirit

Though the Bible abounds with metaphors, similes, symbols, types, parables, allegories, and emblems—a sevenfold classification of its figures of speech—it is needful to remember that behind every form of utterance there is a reality of truth, which truth must not be underestimated because of the form in which it is presented. All these varied forms of speech which the Bible employs are directly chosen and utilized by God the Holy Spirit. They in no way represent mere literary notions of men. It is of more than passing interest that the Holy Spirit Himself is presented under various types and symbols. The types and symbols which anticipate and describe the Second Person have been realized or fulfilled in concrete, visible form through His incarnation; but the Person and work of the Third Person remains in that obscurity which the invisible and therefore intangible ever involves. Since acquaintance with the Holy Spirit must depend so largely on what is said rather than upon what is seen or felt, attention should be given to every intimation. Though a number of secondary symbols obtain in Scripture, the listing given here will be restricted to the following which are well-marked or major unveilings of the Holy Spirit.

I. Oil

As oil was used for healing, for comfort, for illumination, and for anointing unto specific purposes, so the Holy Spirit heals, comforts, illuminates, and consecrates. In the meal offering of Leviticus 2:1–16 in which Christ is foreshadowed in His human perfections, oil appears, first as mingled with the fine flour, and second as poured upon it. All this anticipates in type the life and ministry of Christ in His unique relation to the Holy Spirit, which relationship He maintained while here on earth—a relationship in which Christ's humanity was sustained and His actions empowered by the Holy Spirit. It was altogether possible, and it would have been natural, for Christ to have sustained His humanity by the power of His own Deity; yet, as man must be sustained by the Holy Spirit and not by the Second Person, and since Christ is the pattern man and God's ideal man, it

is required that He, too, shall be cast upon the Holy Spirit respecting every need and limitation which His humanity presented. In type (cf. Lev. 2:4–5, 7) the fine flour is mingled with oil, suggesting that, with regard to His humanity, Christ was generated by the Holy Spirit; and, again (cf. Lev. 2:1, 6, 15), the oil poured over the meal foresees the Spirit coming upon Christ, as was true at His baptism. There is real significance in the requirement that the priest, when cleansing the leper (Lev. 14:10–32), should apply oil in the specific manner prescribed. The work of Christ in physical healing, as in spiritual transformation, was wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit. The cleansing of the leper is one of the most evident types of Christ since it foreviews salvation from sin. C. H. Mackintosh presents here the following:

> "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand: and the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord. And of the rest of the oil that is in his hand shall the priest put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the blood of the trespass-offering; and the remnant of the oil that is in the priest's hand he shall pour upon the head of him that is to be cleansed; and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord" (vss. 15–18). Thus, not only are our members cleansed by the blood of Christ, but also consecrated to God in the power of the Spirit. God's work is not only negative, but positive. The ear is no longer to be the vehicle for communicating defilement, but to be "swift to hear" the voice of the Good Shepherd; the hand is no longer to be used as the instrument of unrighteousness, but to be stretched forth in acts of righteousness, grace, and true holiness; the foot is no longer to tread in folly's paths, but to run in the way of God's holy commandments: and, finally, the whole man is to be dedicated to God in the energy of the Holy Ghost. It is deeply interesting to see that "the oil" was put "upon the blood of the trespass-offering." The blood of Christ is the divine basis of the operations of the Holy Ghost. The blood and the oil go together. As sinners, we could know nothing of the latter save on the ground of the former. The oil could not have been put upon the leper until the blood of the trespass-offering had first been applied. "In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." The divine accuracy of the type evokes the admiration of the renewed mind. The more closely we scrutinize it, the more of the light of Scripture we concentrate upon it, the more its beauty, force, and precision are perceived and enjoyed. All, as might justly be expected, is in the most lovely harmony with the entire analogy of the Word of God.— *Notes on Leviticus,* Amer. ed., pp. 258–59

Again, Exodus 40:10, 13, 15 records the requirement respecting three particular anointings, namely, that of the altar, which speaks of Christ's death through the eternal Spirit, that of Aaron as the high priest, which speaks of the Spirit being upon Christ (Isa. 61:1), and that of the sons of Aaron, who are the type of the believer of this age and whose anointing

contemplates the Holy Spirit's present relation to the Christian. In the theocracy of old, kings were anointed (cf. 1 Sam. 16:12), as were officers (cf. 1 Sam. 10:1); and all this indicates the direct authority of God over His people in that form of His government.

An equally beautiful type of the Holy Spirit is to be seen in the fact that oil served as the source of light. The Israelites were directed to provide oil for the lights in the tabernacle (cf. Ex. 25:6). Two vital truths are implied in this particular typology, namely, that God the Holy Spirit is the essential light and the believer is to walk in the light which the Holy Spirit sheds upon his mind and heart, and that by so doing believers are themselves "as lights in the world." The light which the Christian may display is a manifestation of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in his life. In the light of old there was oil, flame, and the wick which served as a medium between the oil and the flame. There must be contact between the oil and the wick, and so the wick must be kept free from charred portions; it must be snuffed. This truth, so essential to all spiritual effectiveness, is obvious. The ten virgins of Matthew 25:1–13 were either wise or foolish according to their spiritual preparation, which fact oil symbolizes in the parable. Five are to be excluded from the King's palace when He returns to the earth, and five are to meet Him with right preparation and enter the palace with Him. The virgins represent Israel on the earth awaiting the return of Messiah with His Bride (cf. Luke 12:35–36; Ps. 45:8–15).

Yet three other themes appear in connection with the typology which oil represents. In Psalm 45:7 there is reference to "the oil of gladness"—"the fruit of the Spirit is … joy"—while in Psalm 104:15 oil is prescribed to make the face shine and in Psalm 23:5 David gives praise to God who has anointed his head with oil, all of which is a presage of the Spirit's presence and power in the believer.

Writing of oil as a symbol of the Spirit, Dr. John F. Walvoord declares:

> In both the Old and New Testaments, the Holy Spirit is frequently found in this type. In the tabernacle, the pure olive oil which kept the lamp burning continually in the holy place speaks eloquently of the ministry of the Holy Spirit in revelation and illumination, without which the showbread (Christ) would be unseen in the darkness, and the way into the holiest of all would not be made plain (Ex. 27:20, 21). Oil played an important part in the sacrifices (Lev. 1–7). It was used in the anointing of the priests and the consecration of the tabernacle (Lev. 8). It was used to induct kings into office (1 Sam. 10:1; 16:13; 1 Ki. 1:39; etc.). In addition to these sacred uses, it was used as food (Rev. 6:6), medicine (Mk. 6:13), and even

as a means of commodity exchange (1 Ki. 5:11; cf. *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, s.v., Oil*). The instances of reference to oil in the Old Testament outnumber those to the Holy Spirit. According to Young's Concordance, there are one hundred and seventy-five references to oil in the Old Testament and a dozen instances in the New Testament, the most notable being Matthew 25:3–8; Hebrews 1:9; James 5:14. An interesting reference is John 3:34, speaking of the Spirit as not being poured out "by measure" on Christ. From the various uses of oil in the Bible, we may conclude that oil speaks of holiness, sanctification, revelation, illumination, dedication, and healing.—*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 22–23

II. Water

This so common and so vast an element in the world serves as a type of judgment (cf. the flood, the destruction at the Red Sea, and the floods described by Christ in Matthew 7:25), of the Word of God (cf. John 3:5; Titus 3:5; 1 John 5:6, 8), and of the Holy Spirit. In His conversation with the woman of Samaria, Christ spoke of the water He would give as "living water," which living water is foreshadowed in the type as *running water*. The Holy Spirit is typified by water and this body of truth is indeed extensive. As water is essential for cleansing, satisfying, reviving, and refreshing, so the Holy Spirit is vital to the child of God. This general theme may be divided in a threefold manner: (a) the Spirit applies the blood of Christ for all cleansing, (b) the Spirit dwells within, and (c) the Spirit's manifestations flow out. These three divisions are here considered more at length. (a) The cleansing aspect is typified by the bathing of the priests in connection with their induction into the priestly office. They were then wholly and once-for-all bathed by the high priest (cf. Ex. 29:4; Lev. 8:6), which bathing prefigures the once-for-all washing of regeneration wrought for the believer-priest upon his entrance into both the saved estate and his service for God as a priest. So, also, there is a constant cleansing for the Christian in his walk which is anticipated in type by the cleansing provided by the sacrifice and ashes of the red heifer (Num. 19:2 ff.). The New Testament antitype is declared in 1 John 1:9: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (cf. Eph. 5:26). It is the Holy Spirit who applies the blood of cleansing. As a symbolic act, Christ bathed the disciples' feet (John 13:1–17). (b) As for the Holy Spirit within, Christ said to the woman of Samaria: "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst;

but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life" (John 4:14). The Holy Spirit indwelling the believer is a reality and His presence a measureless blessing, in all of which He is ever active. Like an artesian well, He is "springing up" unto everlasting life. Eternal life is not only gained and attained by the operation of the Holy Spirit, but is maintained—as are all its manifestations—by the Spirit. (c) With reference to the Spirit flowing out, the promise by Christ as recorded in John 7:37–39 is central. There it is written: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)" The river itself is by some interpreted as a separate type of the Holy Spirit, and in such a case much is made of the river which Ezekiel predicts will flow out from the very presence of Jehovah in the age to come (cf. Ezek. 47:1–12), symbolical of the vast increase of the Spirit's blessing and power in that day.

The majority of Christians interpret water, or ritual, baptism as an outward sign or symbol of the inward working of the Holy Spirit in the believer. To some, therefore, this type—water—represents all aspects of the Holy Spirit's work in the Christian; to others, it is more specifically related to the Spirit's baptism. It is believed among the latter that the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5 refers to the baptism by the Holy Spirit but includes also its outward sign or symbol—the two, the real and the ritual, together combining to form the "one baptism." The Spirit's approach to the believer with all that His gracious presence secures is signified, it is believed, by the application of water in baptism; and this, in turn, corresponds completely with the typical use of water throughout the Old Testament (cf. Isa. 52:15; Ezek. 36:25). One commendable feature of this interpretation of ritual baptism is seen in the fact that no separate, independent, and diverse baptism has been set up apart from the all-important baptism by the Holy Spirit which would compel the recognition of two baptisms—that of the Spirit and that which is ritual—in the face of the Scripture assertion that there is "one baptism." In all this truth respecting baptism, for those who so interpret it water becomes, again, an emblem of the Holy Spirit.

III. Fire

With reference to fire as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, the late F. E. Marsh of London writes:

> We often find that one symbol may represent two or more things. Lion, for instance, is used as a metaphor of Christ and Satan, and yet with a difference, for while it is used to express the boldness and achievements of our Lord, it symbolizes the cruelty and ferociousness of Satan (Rev. 5:5; 1 Pet. 5:8). Fire, also, is used of several things. It is a symbol of the Lord's presence, hence, Jehovah appeared to Moses "in a flame of fire" (Ex. 3:2). Fire is a sign of the Lord's approval. Thus in connection with the Tabernacle (Lev. 9:24), at the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. 7:1), and on Mount Carmel, fire came down from heaven and consumed the sacrifice, as a sign of God's approval and acceptance (1 Kings 18:38). Fire is associated with the protection of God's presence, hence, He was as a "pillar of fire" to the children of Israel for illumination and defence (Ex. 13:21), and He promises to be a "wall of fire" about His people (Zech. 2:5). Fire is a simile of His discipline and testing. When the Lord purifies the sons of Levi, He does it as a refiner purifies gold, by the action of fire (Mal. 3:3); and when Christ searched the seven churches, His eyes are described as "a flame of fire" (Rev. 1:14); and when believers are tried, they are reminded "the trial of your faith" is "much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire" (1 Pet. 1:7) ; and we are also reminded, "Our God is a consuming fire" (Heb. 12:29). Fire is an emblem of God's Word, igniting and warming. Jehovah's declaration to Jeremiah was, "Behold I will make my words in thy mouth, fire"; and later, when the prophet resolved not to speak the Word, he had to confess, "Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones. … and I could not stay" (Jer. 5:14; 20:9). Fire speaks of God's judgment. When Aaron's sons brought the strange fire in their self-willed effrontery, "there went out fire from the LORD, and devoured them" (Lev. 10:2) ; and fire is also an emblem of the Holy Spirit, for He is compared to "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne" (Rev. 4:5), and His gifts at Pentecost are compared to "cloven tongues like as of fire" (Acts 2:3). … Directly and indirectly the Spirit's might and ministry may be compared to fire. The zeal of service, the flame of love, the fervour of prayer, the earnestness of testimony, the devotion of consecration, the sacrifice of worship, and the igniting-power of influence are attributable to the Spirit.—*Emblems of the Holy Spirit*, 2nd ed., pp. 114–15

IV. Wind

The breath of God is likened to wind, and it may be as a judgment (cf. Isa. 40:24) or as a blessing. The Scriptures, for instance, are the breath of God. After His resurrection, Christ breathed on His disciples and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22). Thus, also, when man was created, God breathed into the lifeless form the breath of life and man became a living soul. Christ compared the working of the Spirit to the action of the wind when to Nicodemus He said: "The wind bloweth where it

listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). Thus, also, the Spirit moved the holy men of old in the writing of the Sacred Text. They were *borne along* as a ship is driven by the wind. Peter states, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21). The Spirit came on Pentecost as a "rushing mighty wind," and thus He comes as a quickening and reviving power to save the lost.

V. Dove

It was at Christ's baptism that the Holy Spirit descended upon Him in a bodily shape like a dove. Of this important moment in the life of Christ on earth John the Baptist asserted: "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John 1:30–34). There are many particulars in which the Holy Spirit may be likened to a dove. As for the character of a dove, C. H. Mackintosh in his *Notes on Genesis* writes of the dove which Noah released from the ark:

> "And it came to pass, at the end of forty days, that Noah opened the window of the ark which he had made: and he sent forth a raven, which went forth, to and fro, until the waters were dried up from off the earth." The unclean bird made its escape, and found, no doubt, a resting-place on some floating carcass. It sought not the ark again. Not so the dove,—"She found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him into the ark … and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark: and the dove came in to him in the evening; and, lo, in her mouth was an olive leaf, plucked off." Sweet emblem of the renewed mind, which, amid the surrounding desolation, seeks and finds its rest and portion in Christ; and not only so, but also lays hold of the earnest of the inheritance, and furnishes the blessed proof that judgment has passed away, and that a renewed earth is coming fully into view. The carnal mind, on the contrary, can rest in anything and everything but Christ. It can feed upon all uncleanness. "The olive leaf" has no attraction for it. It can find all it needs in a scene of death, and hence is not occupied with the thought of a new world and its glories; but the heart that is taught and exercised by the Spirit of God, can only rest and rejoice in that in which He rests and

> rejoices. It rests in the Ark of His salvation “until the times of the restitution of all things.” May it be thus with you and me, beloved reader,—may Jesus be the abiding rest and portion of our hearts, that so we may not seek them in a world which is under the judgment of God. The dove went back to Noah, and waited for his time of rest: and we should ever find our place with Christ, until the time of His exaltation and glory in the ages to come. “He that shall come will come, and will not tarry.” All we want, as to this, is a little patience. May God direct our hearts into His love, and into “the patience of Christ.”—4th ed., pp. 104–5

This emblem, as all others found in the Scriptures, is directly chosen, appointed, and employed as such by God the Holy Spirit.

VI. Earnest

Looking toward that eternal estate in glory which awaits every child of God, there is some foretaste of it accorded the believer. Those immeasurable gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit into which the Christian may enter now are but an earnest of that blessedness, that incomparable fullness, which awaits the hour of release from this sphere of life. The fruit which the spies brought from the promised land was an earnest of all that the land held in store for the covenant people. The jewels which Isaac’s servant placed on Rebekah were an earnest of all of Isaac’s wealth and honor. Nothing can be added to that already promised, when it is said that “all things are your’s” and that ye are “joint-heirs with Christ.” It is essential to note, however, that the gifts and the blessings are not the earnest; it is the Holy Spirit Himself that secures these who is the earnest. Again, as in the relation which the believer sustains to Christ, the attention is centered not on things, however glorious, but on a Person.

VII. Seal

This theme, which speaks of the ownership and the authority of the Spirit over the believer, and of his security and portion unto the day of redemption, has been considered earlier and will yet be contemplated more at length in another chapter of this volume.

VIII. Abraham’s Servant

There remains one outstanding type of the Holy Spirit, which is presented in Genesis 24:1–67. It is the part of the trusted servant whom

Abraham sent to secure a bride for Isaac. Since no real name is given in the Scriptures to the Holy Spirit, but He is known only by descriptive titles, no name has been assigned this servant. Doubtless, it was Eliezer of Damascus, steward of Abraham's household (cf. Gen. 15:2); but still no name is given, that the type may be complete. Abraham is a type of God the Father in many respects, here and elsewhere, as Isaac is the type of the Son of God. The servant is sent to a distant place to secure a bride for the son. Every step of this journey and all that was accomplished is fragrant with rich suggestion relative to the Holy Spirit's present mission in the world and the outcalling of the Bride of Christ. The late Dr. George E. Guille in a pamphlet entitled *Isaac and Rebecca* writes, "Three persons are prominent in this twenty-fourth chapter of Genesis: a father, his son, and their servant. The father and son are hidden in the father's house in Canaan, while the servant journeys after the bride. Canaan is the well-known picture of heaven, whither Christ has gone to prepare for the coming of His bride, for whom the Father has sent the Holy Spirit into the scene of His Son's rejection. The length of our chapter (67 verses) shows how much God's heart is occupied with the story,—how He is absorbed in the work of His Spirit: wooing and winning souls to Himself." Continuing with a description of the journey that Rebekah took with the servant, Dr. Guille writes: "Camel-riding is not pleasant, and the desert has no charm, but one thing made every hour of the journey a delight: the servant, who was under oath to bring the bride, was there, leading the way to Isaac, and refreshing the heart of Rebekah by telling her of him. Over and over again did he tell the story of his miraculous birth, of his willing sacrifice on Mt. Moriah, of his position and honor and wealth, as Abraham's beloved son and heir, and of his personal loveliness and dignity. … Oh, soul, do you know the spiritual experience of which this is a figure? The Holy Spirit, who won you for Christ, is dwelling in your heart, and is leading the way to the true Isaac. And at each step of the journey, He has a blessed ministry to perform. He would take the things of Christ and show them unto you" (pp. 15, 26–27).

Conclusion

He who is not seen, who has never been "made manifest" as was Christ —excepting as He was identified to John the Baptist by the symbolism of a

bodily shape like a dove—is, nevertheless, presented under types and symbols or emblems to the end that He may become real to the child of God and that His many characteristics may be disclosed.

Chapter IV

The Holy Spirit and Prophecy

In the broadest sense of this theme, the Holy Spirit is (1) the Author of all prophecy and (2) He is Himself the subject of prediction. These two aspects of truth may well be considered separately.

I. The Author of Prophecy

At once it should be observed that the word *prophecy* as here used is contemplated in its larger meaning which includes both forthtelling and foretelling. In the former idea is included the entire revelation from God, while in the latter is included only that which is predictive in its character. This distinction demands full recognition of the former as well as the latter.

God has spoken. His Word is recorded and His message forms the text of Scripture. The forming of the Bible is distinctly a task committed to the Holy Spirit of God. It was the Holy Spirit who caused the words of the Father and the words of the Son to be written down; for the Spirit is the Recorder of all that is written. In the unity which obtains in the Godhead, the Father may speak of the Scriptures as "my word" (Isa. 55:11) and, likewise, the word of the Son may be thus indicated (Col. 3:16); but the Holy Spirit remains the Author of the Sacred Text which records these words.

An extended and somewhat replete treatment of the authorship of the Scriptures has been included in this work under Bibliology. A repetition of this general thesis is not called for. Dr. John F. Walvoord's approach to this subject is such as may well be incorporated here. He states:

> Of the many ministries of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament, few are of more immediate concern to Christians than the work of the inspiration of Old Testament Scriptures. While the peculiar doctrines of Christianity to a large extent are based on New Testament revelation, it is clear to even a casual observer that the New Testament is based on the Old Testament, and one without the other does not constitute a complete or satisfying revelation. The doctrine of inspiration, having to do with the formation of the Scriptures, does not differ to a great extent in the two Testaments. The doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures has been the historic position of most Protestant churches, as their creeds bear abundant testimony. Whatever the degrees of unbelief latent in either the clergy or the laity, and whatever disagreements there may be between denominational groups on other doctrines,

Protestant churches have officially held the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures. This has been subject to extended discussion and argument, however, as various views of inspiration have been proffered. A complete discussion of the doctrine of inspiration cannot be undertaken here. The importance of the inspiration of the Scriptures, while tacitly denied by some in modern times, is easily sustained. It is a matter of tremendous import whether the Scriptures are a supernaturally produced Word of God, or whether they are a collection of the works of men, containing the errors one must expect in any human work. As Boettner writes: "That the question of inspiration is of vital importance for the Christian Church is easily seen. If she has a definite and authoritative body of Scripture to which she can go, it is a comparatively easy task to formulate her doctrines. All she has to do is to search out the teachings of Scripture and embody them in her creed. But if the Scriptures are not authoritative, if they are to be corrected and edited and some parts are to be openly rejected, the Church has a much more serious problem, and there can be no end of conflicting opinions concerning either the purpose of the Church or the system of doctrine which she is to set forth" (*The Inspiration of the Scriptures*, p. 10). It is not the purpose of the present discussion to attempt the display of the arguments supporting the inspiration of the Scriptures. The arguments from sources external to the Scriptures will not be considered at all, and the Biblical evidences discussed only as they illustrate the work of the Holy Spirit. What the Bible says on the subject is far more conclusive and plain to the eye of faith than all the high-flown arguments of unbelievers …

The technical meaning of *inspiration* is quite apart from its common usage in reference to non-Biblical concepts. As B. B. Warfield points out, "The word 'inspire' and its derivatives seem to have come into Middle Eng. from the Fr., and have been employed from the first (early in the 14th cent.) in a considerable number of significations, physical and metaphorical, secular and religious" (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, *s.v. Inspiration*, p. 1473). We still speak of being inspired by a beautiful sunset, or of hearing an inspiring sermon. Such common usages, however, are not parallel to *inspiration* in a doctrinal sense. Even in ordinary speech, we conceive of inspiration as something that constitutes an influence from without. As Warfield says, "Underlying all their use, however, is the constant implication of an influence from without, producing in its object movements and effects beyond its native, or at least its ordinary, powers" (*loc. cit*.). Turning to the Scriptures, we observe a paucity of reference to the word *inspiration* as far as the term itself is concerned. In Job 32:8, Elihu is quoted, "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding". This can hardly be referred to the inspiration of Scripture, however, as it is doubtful if any of the Bible, in its present form at least, was in existence at that time. The only other reference is found in 2 Timothy 3:16, where the Authorized Version gives this translation, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Even here, in the American revision, the translation is changed to read, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness." The revised translation, while attempting to solve the problem created by the absence of the copula, not at all unusual in the Greek, has greatly weakened the passage, and that, unjustly. The noun *inspiration* would disappear entirely from the English New Testament if this translation were allowed, and a misleading impression is created that some Scripture is not inspired. The difficulty lies chiefly in the word *inspiration* itself. The Greek, θεόπνευστος, really does not mean *inspiring* at all. As Warfield notes,"The Gr. term has, however, nothing to say of *in*spiring or of *in*spiration: it speaks only of a 'spiring' or 'spiration.' What it says of Scripture is, not that it is 'breathed into by God' or is the product of the Divine 'in-breathing'

into its human authors, but that it is breathed out by God, ‘God-breathed’ the product of the creative breath of God. In a word, what is declared by this fundamental passage is simply that the Scriptures are a Divine product, without any indication of how God has operated in producing them” (*Ibid*., p. 1474). From 2 Timothy 3:16, we may conclude that inspiration is the work of God by which or through which the Scriptures are given. After stating the fact of inspiration, however, the same verse draws a most interesting and significant conclusion. Because the Scriptures are inspired, they are, therefore, profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. In other words, inspiration guarantees accuracy, and gives divine authority to the record. It is hardly necessary here to review the abundant testimony of the Scriptures to this very fact. Christ Himself frequently quoted the Old Testament as the Word of God. The writers claimed inspiration for their own works. The content of Scripture is such that its prophecies must have been the product of divine revelation and its accurate recording the work of inspiration. The witness to inspiration is all the more conclusive because the Scriptures never attempt to prove inspiration; they merely state it and assume it, in the same manner as the Scriptures assume the existence of God. A matter of further observation is that the Scriptures are not only divine, but also human. The words used were those within the vocabulary of the writers. Their own emotions, human knowledge, experiences, and hopes entered into the Scriptures which they wrote, without compromising in the least their inspiration. Without doubt, some portions of Scripture are dictated, as the Scriptures themselves indicate, but most of the Scriptures do not have this characteristic. Regardless of the degree of human or divine influence in the Scriptures, the resultant is equally inspired and equally suited to God’s purpose. The examination of the work of the Holy Spirit in inspiration will sustain these evidences for the dual authorship, divine and human, of the Scriptures.

A proper statement of the meaning of inspiratiion must contend that God so supernaturally directed the writers of Scripture that without waiving their human intelligence, their individuality, their literary style, their personal feelings, or any other human factor, His own complete and coherent message to man was recorded in perfect accuracy, the very words of Scripture bearing the authority of divine authorship. Nothing less than a plenary and verbal inspiration will satisfy the demands of the Scriptures themselves and give to faith the confidence in the Word of God which is essential to faith and life.—*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 56–60

Within the range of his own competency, no human being could write Scripture. The subject matter must be harmonized with the eternal plan and purpose of God. It must comprehend all that characterizes God and eternity to come. It must recognize the divine intent in the whole field of permitted evil and provide a redemption. It must be not only a revelation of God, but be worthy of Him. A moment’s consideration of these stupendous requirements would convince a thoughtful mind of the absolute necessity that there be a dual authorship respecting every word of the Bible—one of the Holy Spirit and one of human agency—and that the Scriptures be a divine product as definitely as were the tables of stone written with the finger of God.

II. The Subject of Prediction

Again, Dr. Walvoord may well be quoted. On the Eschatology respecting the Holy Spirit he writes:

> The doctrine of the future work of the Holy Spirit has attracted practically no attention in existing works on theology and in books on the Holy Spirit. We search in vain for an exposition of this doctrine in standard theologies such as those of Hodge, Strong, Shedd, Alexander, Watson, Wardlaw, Dorner, Dick, Miley, Gerhart, Valentine, Buel, and the recent work of Berkhof. In works on the Holy Spirit such as those of Kuyper, Smeaton, Moule, Cummings, and Simpson there is practically no mention of the doctrine. The chief factor causing this defect is the three-way division in the treatment of eschatology itself. The postmillennial theory holds that the prophesied millennium will be fulfilled in the present age through preaching the Gospel or a "spiritual" return of Christ. If this theory be held, of course, the present ministries of the Spirit will continue through the age and culminate in the conclusion of all things in the final judgment. There is, in this theory, no need of treating the eschatology of the Holy Spirit. A similar situation is found among the writings of the socalled amillennialist view, i.e., that the present age will continue and issue into the eternal state without any millennium. Only the premillennialist, who anticipates a millennium on earth after Christ returns to set up His kingdom, can be expected to consider the doctrine and furnish an exposition of it. In the writing of premillennial teachers and theologians there is also, however, a surprising neglect of this doctrine. Among the older premillennialists, such as Van Oosterzee, there is little exposition and defense of the premillennial position, and practically no attention is given the prophesied ministries of the Spirit in the millennial period. More attention has been given to the other great themes of prophecy. The result has been that there has been little understanding of the nature of the ministries of the Spirit in the prophesied period of tribulation and in the millennium which follows. It is to this task that we now turn.
>
> The usual premillennial position is assumed as the basis for the discussion. The Scriptures prophesy that after the return of Christ for the Church a period of unprecedented trouble will follow, a period of approximately seven years according to Daniel 9:27, shortened a little (Mt. 24:22), and divided into two halves of three and one-half years each. The latter half is known as the great tribulation and in it is an unprecedented display of sin and of divine judgment upon sin. The return of Christ to set up His kingdom abruptly closes the tribulation, and the millennium follows in which Christ will rule and establish universal righteousness and peace. The millennium itself closes with another outbreak of sin and the final judgment of the wicked, and the establishment of the new heavens and new earth brings in the eternal state. It is amidst these stirring events that the Holy Spirit ministers in fulfillment of prophecy. It is clear that in the nature of the circumstances His work will be quite different than His present undertaking for the Church. While the body of Scripture is not large, it does speak with certain voice on important points.
>
> One of the popular misconceptions of the prophesied period of tribulation is that all who enter this period are irrevocably lost. It is true that individuals who have had opportunity to hear the Gospel and receive Christ during this present dispensation of grace are unlikely to accept Christ in the difficult days of tribulation. On the other hand, it is obvious that many will be saved, some of them surviving the horrors of the tribulation to enter the millennium, and others to die the death of martyrs. The rapture of the Church before the seven-year period

of tribulation removes every Christian from the world. Immediately, however, Israel's blindness is removed (Rom. 11:25), and thousands among Israel turn to their long-neglected Messiah. Among Gentiles, too, there will be conversions from every nation and tongue (Rev. 7:9–17). While the tribulation period is characterized by wickedness and apostasy, it will be a period attended by a great harvest of souls. In the light of these facts, one might expect to find the Holy Spirit ministering during this period. …

The millennium will undoubtedly be the most glorious of all the dispensations. There will be the fullest display of righteousness, and universal peace and prosperity will characterize the period. Christ will rule all the earth, and every nation will acknowledge Him. The knowledge of the Lord will be from sea to sea. Throughout the millennium, Satan will be bound, and there will be no demonic activity. Man will continue to possess a sin nature with its inherent weakness, but there will be no outside temptation to arouse it. The ministry of resurrected saints in the earth will add its distinctive touch to the unusual situation. It is manifest that in such a period the Holy Spirit will have a ministry which exceeds previous dispensations in its fullness and power, even though the millennium will be legal in its government instead of gracious as in the present dispensation. …

The prophecies picturing the millennium, to which reference has already been made, unite in their testimony that the work of the Holy Spirit in believers will be more abundant and have greater manifestation in the millennium than in any previous dispensation. It is evident from the Scriptures that all believers will be indwelt by the Holy Spirit in the millennium even as they are in the present age (Ezk. 36:27; 37:14, cf. Jer. 31:33).

The filling of the Holy Spirit will be common in the millennium, in contrast to the infrequency of it in other ages, and it will be manifested in worship and praise of the Lord and in willing obedience to Him as well as in spiritual power and inner transformation (Isa. 32:15; 44:3; Ezk. 39:29; Joel 2:28, 29). In contrast to present-day spiritual apathy, coldness, and worldliness, there will be spiritual fervor, love of God, holy joy, universal understanding of spiritual truth, and a wonderful fellowship of the saints. The spiritual unity and blessings which characterized the early church assemblies are a foreview of the fellowship of saints throughout the world in the millennium. The emphasis will be on righteousness in life and on joy of spirit.

The fullness of the Spirit will also rest upon Christ (Isa. 11:2) and will be manifest in His Person and in His righteous rule of the earth. The millennium will be the final display of the heart of God before the bringing in of the eternal state. In it God is revealed again as loving and righteous, the source of all joy and peace; and in the period also, at its close, man is revealed as at heart in rebellion against God and unwilling to bow even before such glorious evidence of His power.

From such revelation as is found in the Scriptures, all the ministries of the Spirit known to us in the present age will be found in the millennium except the baptism of the Spirit—which has already been shown to be peculiar to the dispensation of grace, from the day of Pentecost to the rapture. Though ourselves in the midst of growing apostasy in the world and indifference to the Spirit even among those in whom He dwells, we can envision the coming day; and as we wait for Him whose right it is to reign, we can by yieldedness and by dependence on the indwelling Spirit find in our hearts and manifest in our own lives the fragrance of the fruit of the Spirit.—*Ibid*., pp. 255–57, 262, 264–65

The outstanding prediction respecting the Holy Spirit is found in Joel 2:28–32. The passage reads: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will

pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. And I will skew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call." On this important anticipation, which has been too often misunderstood, William Kelly writes:

> It is the very scripture, as we know, which the apostle Peter quotes on the day of Pentecost to shew that the immense blessing of that day was in accordance with the highest favour promised for the kingdom, not that human excitement or moral folly which mistaken or deluded men were quick to impute to those who surpassed others in spiritual power. But, observe, the apostle did not affirm that this scripture was fulfilled. He says, "It is that thing which was spoken by the prophet Joel"; and so it is. What was promised was the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Without saying that the present fact was the fulfilment of the prophecy (which men have assumed, to the great misunderstanding of scripture and lowering of Christianity), he shewed that it was of that nature, and such therefore as to be vindicated by the prophecy before their conscience; but the apostle's language is guarded, while commentators are not. They go too far. We do well always to hold fast to scripture. As to the promise that the Spirit should be poured upon "all flesh," we must bear in mind that "all flesh" is in contrast with restriction to the Jew. This is another feature which made the Pentecostal gift so admirably illustrate the scripture. For the patent fact that God caused those who received the Holy Ghost to speak in the different tongues distributed over the Gentile world, not causing all the converts to speak the Jewish language (a poor thing if true, which it is not, but a mere dream of superficial paradox), but causing the Jews gathered from their dispersion among all nations to speak the tongues of the Gentiles was a magnificent witness of the grace that was going out to the Gentiles to meet them where they were. The judgment of God had inflicted these various tongues upon them, and completely broken up the ambitious project of joining together to establish an unity of their own through the tower of Babel. But the grace of God went out exactly where His judgment had placed them. If a crushing blow laid their pride in ever so many separate ditches, the grace of God went out to these ditches, and blessed them where they lay, raising them out of their fallen estate. Such then is the first interruption, and really the beginning of a new strain, which is sufficiently plain from the way in which it is introduced. "It shall come to pass *afterward*, that I will pour out my Spirit" — makes therefore a break with what goes before, and thus again most admirably suits it to the use to which the apostle Peter applies it. But then we must remember that when the day comes for the Holy Spirit to be poured out afresh, not for the gathering out of a people for heaven, but for the earthly purposes of God's grace (for that is the difference), it will be manifest that the Holy Spirit will be given to men altogether apart from their being Jews. So on the day of Pentecost, when they were exclusively Jews, it was yet shewn by the

miracle of Gentile tongues that God did not mean to stop there, but to go out towards all the nations. God will never give up that principle. He does not mean to be limited to the children of Israel again. He will bless the children of Israel once more, and will take up Judah also as such, and will accomplish every word He has promised to their united joy.There is no good that He has annexed to them in His word which He will not bestow; but He will never more restrict Himself to the Jew in the day that is coming. And therefore, when the Holy Ghost is poured out at that time, it will be strictly upon "all flesh," not meaning that every individual in the millennium will have the Holy Ghost; but that no race left after that great day will be excluded from the gift of the Spirit. No class of persons, no age, no sex will be forgotten in God's grace. But it may be desirable to remark here that there is no thought of healing or improving the flesh, as the fathers and the theologians say. The light of the New Testament shews us the fallacy of such a view. The old nature is judged; our old man is crucified, not renovated. To our Adam state we have died, and enter a new position in Christ, and are called to walk accordingly as dead and risen with Christ. The external signs here named will precede the day which is still unfulfilled. It is vain to apply verses 30, 31 to the first advent. "I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth" is evidently another character of things. "And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of Jehovah come." There will be a remarkable outward manifestation of divine power before the judgment is executed. God always sends a testimony before the thing itself. He does not strike before He warns. It is so in His dealings with us every day. What Christian has a chastening upon him before he is admonished of the Spirit of God? There is always a sense of wrong, and a lack of communion sensible to the spirit before the Lord inflicts the blow which tells of His watchful love over our careless ways. He gives the opportunity, if one may say so, of setting ourselves morally right; and if we do not heed the teaching, then comes the sorrow. And so it is here. These wonders cannot but attract the mind and attention of men, but they will not really be heeded. Infatuated and under judicial hardness, they will turn a deaf ear to all, and so the great and terrible day of Jehovah will overtake them like a thief. But God at least will not fail. He had foretold that so it should be, and His people will take heed. There will be a remnant enabled to see, and pre-eminently, as we know, from among the Jews, though by no means limited to them, as we learn from the second half of Revelation 7 and the end of Matthew 25. There will be still the witness of "all flesh" prepared for the glory of Jehovah about to be revealed. "Whosoever will call upon the name of Jehovah shall be delivered" shews that the blessing is by faith, and hence by grace. "All flesh" does not necessarily mean every individual, but, as we know from other scriptures, blessing here goes forth largely toward all classes — that is, toward all nations and even all divisions among nations. But all this is of great importance, because the Jewish system naturally tended to limit God as well as to make classes within the Jews. Only the family of Aaron could go into the sanctuary; only Levites could touch the holy vessels with impunity; whereas this greatest blessing of God will go out with the most indiscriminate character of grace. "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of Jehovah shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as Jehovah hath said, and in the remnant whom Jehovah shall call." Hence it is plain that, although it is blessing for Israel, still our prophet Joel keeps true to his purpose. The city of Jerusalem abides the great and royal centre; mount Zion reappears, the sign of grace for the kingdom which Jehovah will establish in that day.—*Lectures Introductory to the Study of the Minor Prophets*, 5th ed., *in loc*.

In an article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* (CI:374) on "The Baptism with the Spirit," Dr. Merrill Frederick Unger writes: "The whole context of Joel's prophecy, which forms the basis of Peter's quotation in Acts 2:17–21, emphasizes (apart from any consideration of the events of Pentecost) that these words quoted by Peter have never been fulfilled. The Spirit was outpoured at Pentecost, but not in the full sense of Joel's prophecy. His special coming to form the Church was unrevealed in the Old Testament (Eph. 3:1–9). Joel knew nothing of the baptism with the Spirit, or the formation of the Church. Indeed, the fulfilment of this graphic passage, in the time of Israel's restoration, will consist, not in the baptism with the Spirit, which is strictly confined to the Church age, but in the indwelling of, and especially the filling with, the Spirit, which Joel describes as the 'pouring out upon all flesh' (2:28). Before ever it is fulfilled, however, the great invasion from the North must occur (Joel 2:1–10), the tribulation take place (Acts 2:19–21), Armageddon be fought (Joel 2:11), Israel be regathered and converted (Joel 2:12–17), and the Lord's second advent come about, issuing in a great deliverance (Joel 2:18–27)."

Conclusion

The Holy Spirit is the Author of prophecy in its widest form and to its last and least detail. This is the doctrine of inspiration which is advanced in the Sacred Text itself and which has been defended in this theological work. The Holy Spirit is likewise the subject of prediction. His Person and work are so extensive and so vital to the whole program of God that any scheme of prediction which essays to forecast the plan and purpose of God from its beginning would hardly fail to contemplate features which pertain to the Holy Spirit.

Chapter V

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

PNEUMATOLOGY has more to do with New Testament truth than with Old Testament. Still, in any consideration of the theme that covers the whole field more or less completely, some of the time must be devoted to revelation given before Christ and the Church.

I. From Adam to Abraham

Since the work of the Holy Spirit as related to Gentiles in the present age will be considered later in this volume (Chapter VII) and in connection with the outcalling of the Church, and since all other history from Abraham to the end of the kingdom age is centered in Israel, the present discussion is necessarily restricted to Gentiles and the first two thousand years or more of human history, i.e., the period from Adam to Abraham. It is recognized that the Holy Spirit, being the active divine agency in the world, exercises a constant sovereignty over the affairs of men of all classes and of all dispensations. The stupendous program of God which includes the birth, rise, character, and end of nations, extending down to the least conception of God which ever originates in the most obscure individual's mind, is all the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit. What a mainspring is to a timepiece the Holy Spirit has been and is and ever must be to all that enter into this mundane enterprise. The period from Adam to Moses which is specifically contemplated in this section will be discussed under a twofold division: (1) the direct references to the Holy Spirit and (2) the Holy Spirit as the Revealer of truth.

1. DIRECT REFERENCES. Only five direct references to the Holy Spirit are found in the history of that long period which precedes the call of Abraham. These Scriptures are full of significance and freighted with suggestive truth.

Genesis 1:2. "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

This work of the Holy Spirit is one of reconstruction following the cataclysm which is indicated here. Dr. James M. Gray declares:

> What was the condition of inert matter as represented in verse 2? The first verb "was" has sometimes been translated "became." Read it thus and you get the idea that originally the earth was otherwise than void and waste, but that some catastrophe took place resulting in that state. This means, if true, that a period elapsed between verses 1 and 2, long enough to account for the geological formations of which some scientists speak, and a race of pre-Adamite men of which others speculate. It suggests too that the earth as we now know it may not be much older than tradition places it. The word "earth" in this verse, however, must not be understood to mean our globe with its land and seas, which was not made till the third day, but simply matter in general, that is, the cosmic material out of which the Holy Spirit organized the whole universe, including the earth of today. "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." "Moved upon" means brooded over as a bird on its nest. "Waters" means not the oceans and seas as we know them, but the gaseous condition of the matter before spoken of. The Spirit of God moved "upon" the waters, and not "inside of" them, showing that God is a personal Being separate from His work. As the result of this brooding, what appeared? We need not suppose that God spake just as a human being speaks, but the coming forth of light out of thick darkness would have seemed to a spectator as the effect of a divine command (Ps. 33:6–9). On the natural plane of things vibration is light or produces light, which illustrates the relation between the moving of the Spirit upon inert matter and the effect it produced. —*Christian Workers' Commentary*, 6th ed., at Gen. 1:2–5

Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown may well be quoted also: "the Spirit of God moved—*lit*., continued brooding over it, as a fowl does, when hatching eggs. The immediate agency of the Spirit, by working on the dead and discordant elements, combined, arranged, and ripened them into a state adapted for being the scene of a new creation. The account of this new creation properly begins at the end of this second verse; and the details of the process are described in the natural way an onlooker would have done, who beheld the changes that successively took place".(*The Critical and Explanatory Commentary*, at Gen. 1:2). So, also, C. H. Mackintosh states: "'The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' He sat brooding over the scene of His future operations. A dark scene, truly; and one in which there was ample room for the God of light and life to act. He alone could enlighten the darkness, cause life to spring up, substitute order for chaos, open an expanse between the waters, where life might display itself without fear of death. These were operations worthy of God" (*Notes on Genesis*, 4th Amer. ed., p. 4).

Job 26:13. "By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent."

The three references to the Holy Spirit in the book of Job are included in the pre-Abrahamic period both because of the probable dating of that book within that period and because of the fact that in this earliest book no mention is made of any other than the general purpose of God with the undivided human stock, which stock obtained before the call of Abraham. The reference quoted above is of creation by the Holy Spirit and contains the record that by His hand the Holy Spirit formed the "crooked serpent." This is usually taken to refer to the Milky Way with its unnumbered constellations. The direct intimation of the passage is that God the Holy Spirit served as the Creator of the material universe.

Genesis 6:3. "And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years."

On this divine warning Matthew Henry comments: "God's resolution not always to strive with man by his Spirit. The Spirit then strove by Noah's preaching (1 Pet. 3:19, 20) and by inward checks, but it was in vain with the most of men; therefore, says God, *He shall not always strive*. Note, 1. The blessed Spirit strives with sinners, by the convictions and admonitions of conscience, to turn them from sin to God. 2. If the Spirit be resisted, quenched, and striven against, though he strive long, he will not strive always (Hos. 4:17). 3. Those are ripening apace for ruin whom the Spirit of grace has left off striving with. The reason of this resolution: *For that he also is flesh*, that is, incurably corrupt, and carnal, and sensual, so that it is labour lost to strive with him. Can the Ethiopian change his skin? *He also*, that is, All, one as well as another, they have all sunk into the mire of flesh" (*Commentary*, at Gen. 6:3). The whole theme of divine judgment is introduced here. That judgment was to fall upon the immediate situation described in the context; but the passage also serves as a warning that God's time of grace is restricted in its duration. "Sons of God" —so termed here (vs. 2) and in Job 1:6; 2:1—may be angelic beings, probably those who kept not their first estate. Of the judgment upon them it is written: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them unto chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (2 Pet. 2:4); "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 1:6).

Job 27:3; 33:4. "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils. … The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life."

Both of these Scriptures present human life as utterly dependent upon the Holy Spirit of God. In the former Job likens his own breath and life to the immediate presence of the Holy Spirit; and in the latter, Elihu, expressing the convictions of godly men of his time, asserts that he is made by the Holy Spirit.

All these five passages serve to construct an indication of what men believed and what was true of the Holy Spirit from the beginning of the race.

2. The Revealer of Truth. The Spirit who produces and provides the written word likewise produces and provides all communications from God to men. In the days preceding the Jewish age God spoke to men and doubtless more freely and more often than would be implied from the text of Scripture. A notable instance is the truth revealed to Enoch as recorded in the next to the last book of the Bible—a revelation given to Enoch which finds no expression in the Old Testament as being given to him. The passage reads: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him" (Jude 1:14–15). A distinction should be made between a thing revealed from God which calls for no proclamation of it and a revelation from God which anticipates its publication. God spoke to Adam, to Cain, and to Noah, but with no instruction that it be transmitted to others and preserved as revelatory truth. But to the prophets He spoke with the expectation that the message would be conveyed somehow to others. Of this distinction Kuyper writes: "God spoke also to others than prophets, *e.g.*, to Eve, Cain, Hagar, etc. To receive a revelation or a vision does not make one a prophet, unless it be accompanied by the command to communicate the revelation to others. The word 'nabi,' the Scriptural term for prophet, does not indicate a person who receives something of God, but one who brings something to the people. Hence it is a mistake to confine divine revelation to the prophetic

office" (*The Work of the Holy Spirit*, p. 70, as cited by Walvoord, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 46).

In view of the evidence at hand it would seem reasonable to assume that a very full revelation was given to the early members of the race. Much was said directly to Adam. The difference between the sacrifice offered by Cain and that offered by Abel implies not only the knowledge relative to sacrifice on their part, but indicates that peculiar features were included in the divine instructions. The antediluvians had sufficient light to serve as a basis upon which the world that then was could be judged for its sinfulness. The book of job is rich with doctrine. Recently, R. R. Hawthorne has identified over a hundred doctrines in the book of job and collected the various passages under their doctrinal heads (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, CI: 64 ff.). All that Job had on which to live for God was wholly apart from even a verse of written Scripture. From whence came Melchizedek with the bread and wine which he served to Abraham? And to what is reference made in Genesis 26:5 when it says: "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws"? How extensive was the knowledge of God's purpose and of the future consummation of all things if the prophecy by Enoch is to be considered as an indication of the knowledge possessed in the day in which he lived? Noah was deeply taught of God both with regard to the building of the ark as Moses was taught regarding the tabernacle, and with regard to a message to preach—one not his own, but come from God—for he was a preacher of righteousness (2 Pet. 2:5). All that characterizes the first two thousand or more years of human history is compressed into the first eleven chapters of the Bible, so that every feature of that time has but meager recognition in the Sacred Text; but from that which is revealed and that which may be deduced, it is to be concluded that the Holy Spirit was active then in the furtherance of those relationships which exist between God and men. The Gentiles, or the original human stock, were favored by the ministries of the Holy Spirit.

II. From Abraham to Christ

This division of the Spirit's work is extensive since it embraces the entire history of Jewry as recorded in the Scriptures, reaching all the way from Abraham to Christ. It properly contemplates the whole Bible relative to its

inspiration, owing to the truth that these Oracles are, with slight exception, given through members of the Jewish race (in the case of the New Testament, however, the writers were Christians, strictly speaking). It is to be noted, also, that the great company of prophets spoke as they were "moved" by the Holy Spirit, and that often officers and rulers were under the guiding power of the Spirit of God. The Spirit came upon men for the accomplishment of divinely appointed undertakings reaching even to mechanical tasks and to works of art. Especially to be observed is the fact that there was no provision for, and no promise of, an abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of any Old Testament saint. In this truth is to be seen one of the most differentiating features of the Spirit's relationship in the Mosaic age, as compared to the present age. The term *sovereign* best describes the Spirit's relation to men of old. He came upon them and departed according to His sovereign good pleasure. In no instance did the faith of men determine the Spirit's actions. Two passages may be cited in this connection. (1) There is the request of Elisha when Elijah was about to be taken from him. The account presents the old prophet Elijah accompanied by the young prophet Elisha as they moved on together to the place where the former was to be translated. The description as it is given follows: "And it came to pass, when they were gone over, that Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away from thee. And Elisha said, I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me. And he said, Thou hast asked a hard thing: nevertheless, if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so. And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. And Elisha saw it, and he cried, My father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof. And he saw him no more: and he took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces. He took up also the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and went back, and stood by the bank of Jordan; and he took the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and smote the waters, and said, Where is the LORD God of Elijah? and when he also had smitten the waters, they parted hither and thither: and Elisha went over" (2 Kings 2:9–14). In this account Elisha makes a request of Elijah that "a double portion" of Elijah's spirit may be upon himself. It is not at all determined by this text that the young prophet

recognized and requested for himself the Holy Spirit of God. If he did so recognize the Holy Spirit, his request is forthwith treated as a “hard thing,” which would indicate the exceptional character of it. It still stands as a characteristic of that age that as a rule men did not expect to receive the Spirit by asking for Him. (2) The second passage is found in Psalm 51:11, R.V. where David prays, “And take not thy holy Spirit from me.” Two things are at once evident—the Holy Spirit might be taken from David, and David desired that the presence and power of the Holy Spirit might be his portion for a longer period so that he might serve Israel well as her king. The evidence is well sustained that, in contrast to the present-age provision whereby every believer is indwelt by the Holy Spirit and quite apart from asking for that Presence, in the past dispensation the Spirit’s relation to men was sovereign. The force of this truth is seen in the fact that, when at the beginning of His three and a half years’ ministry Christ promised the Holy Spirit to those who would ask—He said: “If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?” (Luke 11:13)—so far as the record reveals, none of the disciples ever made this request. The offer and all it implies evidently was too much of an innovation for that which was the age-condition relative to the Spirit and that to which they were adjusted. Later, at the end of His ministry, Christ said: “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you” (John 14:16–17). Why, indeed, should Christ pray thus for the Spirit if the Spirit had been the portion of the saints of that dispensation already? It will be observed that the issue here under consideration has only to do with the fact that the Spirit’s relation to the saints of old was *Sovereign*. The men of that age who were Christ’s disciples did not act as if prepared for so great a privilege, namely, that the Holy Spirit could be claimed by merely asking. Note, also, that the present immeasurable blessing of the interminable indwelling of the Holy Spirit is due to Christ’s asking and not to the request of any person on earth. Every reference to the Spirit’s presence and work in this age, especially those references related to its introduction which publish and disclose the new order and character thereof, imply a wholly new plan for the Christian

which provides the very presence and power of the Holy Spirit in each believer's life. These implications constitute a very important indication of the relation that the Spirit sustained to the saints of old. That interpretation —far too common—which assumes that the Old Testament saints were on the same ground of privilege as the believers of this age, is rendered possible only through unpardonable inattention to the revelation which has been given on this point.

Of the present ministries of the Holy Spirit in relation to the believer—regeneration, indwelling or anointing, baptizing, sealing, and filling—nothing indeed is said with respect to these having been experienced by the Old Testament saints, excepting a few well-defined instances where individuals were said to be filled with the Spirit. Old Testament saints are invested with these blessings only theoretically, and without the support of the Bible, by those who read New Testament blessings back into the Old Testament—an error equalled in point of the danger to sound doctrine only by its counterpart, which reads Old Testament limitations forward into the New Testament portions designed to present the new divine purpose in grace.

With respect to regeneration, the Old Testament saints were evidently renewed; but as there is no definite doctrinal teaching relative to the extent and character of that renewal, no positive declaration can be made. In its New Testament aspect, regeneration provides for the impartation of the divine nature; the regenerated person becomes thus the very offspring of God, an heir of God and a joint heir with Jesus Christ. It results in membership in the household and family of God. If the first law of interpretation is to be observed—that which restricts every doctrinal truth to the exact body of Scripture which pertains to it—it cannot be demonstrated that this spiritual renewal known to the Old Testament, whatever its character may have been, resulted in the impartation of the divine nature, in an actual sonship, a joint heirship with Christ, or a placing in the household and family of God. So the case of Nicodemus—a perfected saint under Judaism—was duplicated in the experience of every Jew who passed from the old order into the new. To Nicodemus Christ said, "Ye must be born again," and it is significant that this imperative was not addressed to the lowest member of Jewish society but to one of its rulers who could serve as the supreme example of all that entered into the reality which Judaism

provided. Nicodemus, like Saul of Tarsus, could have been classed as a "just man" before the Mosaic Law; but to claim for him that he was justified on the ground of imputed righteousness through a placing in Christ by the Holy Spirit is to assert that which could have no foundation in fact, otherwise he would have had no need or occasion to be born "from above." The silence of God must be respected relative to what constituted one a *just man* according to the Mosaic demands. He naturally stood "touching the righteousness which is in the law blameless" if, perchance, he had provided the sacrifices required; but his actual standing with God was largely determined by the fact that he was born into a covenant relation with Him. The Old Testament will be searched in vain for record of Jews passing from an unsaved to a saved state, or for any declaration about the terms upon which such a change would be secured. In other words, their national covenant standing was a tremendous spiritual advantage; but it cannot rightfully be compared with the estate of the believer today who is justified and perfected forever, having received the *plērōma* of the Godhead through vital union with Christ.

1. INDWELLING. Regarding the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in Old Testament saints, it has been stated already that the Spirit came and went, in accord with His sovereign relation to men of old. His coming to them was for a specific purpose, as in the case of Bezaleel merely to give skill in his work as an artisan and that restricted to the construction of the tabernacle. The conception of an abiding indwelling of the Holy Spirit by which every believer now becomes an unalterable temple of the Holy Spirit belongs only to this age of the Church, and has no place in the provisions of Judaism.

2. BAPTIZING. Of all the present functions of the Holy Spirit, none is more completely foreign to the Old Testament than the Spirit's baptism. The Old Testament knows nothing of the Body of Christ, nor of the New Creation Headship in the resurrected Christ. Men were *just* and *righteous* as related to the Mosaic Law, but none had the righteousness of God imputed to them on the ground of simple faith except Abraham, he who was so evidently marked out and raised up of God to anticipate and illustrate (cf. Romans and Galatians) the New Testament doctrine of imputed

righteousness; so of Abraham alone Christ said, “Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad” (John 8:56).

3. Sealing. Again, no similar idea is discovered in the Old Testament. The “bond of the covenant” was that which bound the Jew to Jehovah and those bonds were perfectly recognized by Jehovah Himself; but that is far removed from the sealing of the Spirit unto the day of redemption (cf. Eph. 4:30).

4. Filling. The filling of the Holy Spirit is common to both Testaments; likewise, its equivalent expression, *the Spirit came upon*: but as the filling of the Holy Spirit is unto the end that the whole purpose of God in something may be fulfilled, it is important to discover in every instance precisely what that filling was designed to accomplish. In the case of the men of Old Testament times, the Holy Spirit came upon them or filled them that they might accomplish some particular work, which objective may have comprehended all the field of their activity or have been restricted to some one feature. Over against this, it will be seen that the divine purpose in filling as set forth in the New Testament is the larger and unlimited ministry of the Spirit manifest in every aspect of the believer’s life—its conflicts, its victories and achievements. As before indicated, the Holy Spirit is said to have come upon Bezaleel. He came also upon Balaam, Samson, Saul, the prophet Azariah, and Ezekiel; and, by a consideration of the things wrought through this relationship, it will be seen that the Spirit’s presence was not determined by moral or spiritual qualities in the one thus blessed, whereas, as is so clearly taught in the New Testament, the Spirit’s filling depends now upon a complete adjustment to His mind and will.

In every consideration of the problem of the salvation of Old Testament saints, it should be remembered that, in its complete form, all Israel shall yet be saved when the Deliverer comes out of Zion (cf. Rom. 11:26–27) and this includes men of the Abrahamic and Mosaic dispensations who will be raised for Israel’s specific judgment and, if accepted, to enter into their earthly kingdom, but excludes those who are rejected and condemned at that specific judgment. Whatever salvation was wrought in Old Testament times was wrought by the Holy Spirit, as in the New Testament the Spirit is the Executor of all the works of God.

The “holy men of God” who wrote the Old Testament Scriptures were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21). That influence upon these holy men represents a very distinct divine undertaking and forms a large part of the doctrine respecting the Holy Spirit as found in the Old Testament. The prophets spoke by divine power whether their message was recorded in written form or not. The prophet was God’s messenger to the people and his declarations, if appointed of God, were accomplished by the power of the Holy Spirit. Thus the fact of revelation by the Spirit and its kindred doctrine of inspiration are included in the listing of the works of the Holy Spirit in His relation to the Jewish people. The assertion that “all scripture is given by inspiration of God” refers primarily to the Old Testament and these Oracles of God are given almost wholly through Jewish authors. Israel gave to the world both the written Word and the Living Word. On the extent of inspiration, Dr. John F. Walvoord has written:

> An examination into the records of the Old Testament will reveal literature of all types: history, poetry, drama, sermons, love stories, and insight into the innermost devotional thoughts of the writers. It is a matter of great significance that inspiration extends to all of these kinds of literature, without regard as to form or style, without concern as to the origin or the knowledge embodied in writing. The question naturally presents itself concerning the relation of inspiration to various portions of Scripture. Every attempt to fathom the supernatural is doomed to a measure of failure. Man has no criterion by which to judge that which transcends our experience. Without trying to explain inspiration, an examination of its application may be undertaken. At least seven types of operation may be observed in the work of inspiration.
>
> (1) *The Unknown Past*. Scripture occasionally speaks with authority concerning the past in such detail and upon such themes as would be unknown to man. In the early chapters of Genesis, for instance, Moses portrays events occurring before the creation of man, therefore beyond all possible bounds of tradition. In Isaiah and Ezekiel, reference is made to events in heaven outside the sphere of man’s knowledge and prior to his creation. It is clear that these narratives demand both a revelation concerning the facts and the work of the Holy Spirit in inspiration to guarantee their accurate statement. Some have advanced the idea in relation to the accounts of creation that these are similar in many details to pagan accounts of creation. It is possible that revelation was given prior to the writing of Scripture on the subject of creation, and that men had added to and altered this revelation in the formation of non-scriptural accounts of creation. The existence of other records of creation and points of similarity of these with the Scriptures in no wise affects the inspiration of Genesis. Whether Moses used documents or not has no bearing on the writing of the Scriptures. Whether documents were used, whether there was knowledge of pagan ideas of creation, or whether tradition had contributed some truth on the subject, the work of inspiration was necessary in any event to distinguish truth from error and to incorporate in the record all that was true and to omit all that was false. Without doubt, the primary source of information was direct

revelation, and the documents if any and such traditional accounts as may have been known by Moses were quite incidental.

(2) *History*. A large portion of the Old Testament conforms to the pattern of history. In such sections, the writer is speaking about events known to many and concerning which other documents not inspired may have been written. In many cases, the writer is dealing with contemporary events in which the element of revelation is practically absent. How may inspiration be said to operate in such Scripture? As in all Scripture, inspiration is not concerned with the source of the facts but only with their accurate statement. In the record of history, the Holy Spirit guided the writers in the selection of events to be noted, the proper statement of the history of these events, and the omission of all that should not be included. The result is an infallibly accurate account of what happened with the emphasis on the events important to the mind of God.

(3) *Law*. Certain portions of the Old Testament consist in laws governing various phases of individual and national life. This kind of Scripture is found chiefly in the Pentateuch, where the law is revealed in three major divisions: the commandments, governing the moral life of the people; the ordinances, governing the religious life of the people; and the judgments, dealing with the social life of the people. In some cases, the law consisted in commandments given by means of dictation, the laws retaining in every particular the character of being spoken by God. In other cases, Moses charges the people as God's prophet and gives commandments which can hardly be construed to have been committed to him by way of dictation; yet the commandments have equal force with other commandments. Inspiration operates in the writing of all law in the Scriptures to the end that the laws perfectly express the mind of God for the people to whom they are given; the laws are kept from error and include all that God desires to command at that time; the laws are authoritative and are a proper basis for all matters to which they pertain.

(4) *Dictation*. As previously intimated, some portions of God's Word consist in direct quotation of God's commands and revelation. How does inspiration operate under these circumstances? Inspiration guarantees that commands and revelation received from God are properly recorded in the exact way in which God wills. On His part, God speaks in the language of the one writing, using his vocabulary and speaking His message in such a way that naturally or supernaturally the writer can receive and record the message from God. In such portions, the writer's peculiarities are probably noticed least. Dictation, however, should not be regarded as more authoritative than other portions of Scripture. Inspiration extends freely and equally to all portions of Scripture, even in the faithful record of human sin and the repetition of human speech which may be untruth. Inspiration adds to the account the stamp of an infallible record, justifying the reader in accepting the Scriptures in all confidence.

(5) *Devotional Literature*. One of the intricate problems of inspiration is to relate its operation to the writing of the devotional literature of the Old Testament, of which the Psalms are the major portion. Does inspiration merely guarantee an accurate picture of what the writers felt and thought, or does it do more than this? In the case of the recording of human speech, inspiration does not necessarily vouch for the truth of what is said. For instance, in the record of the temptation, Satan is recorded to have said, "Ye shall not surely die" (Gen. 3:4). Inspiration guarantees the accuracy of this quotation of the words of Satan, but does not make these words true. In the case of the Psalmists, then, who were men subject to sin and mistake, whose experiences and thoughts were not necessarily accurate, does inspiration do more than merely give a faithful record? The answer to the problem is found in the Psalms themselves. An examination of their content will reveal that God not only caused

an inspired record of their thoughts to be written, but worked in their thoughts and their experiences with the result that they revealed God, portrayed the true worship of the heart, the hearing ear of God to prayer, the joy of the Spirit, the burden of sin, and even prophesied of future events. Thus David, in his own experience realizing the preservation of God, speaks of the goodness of God, his praise transcending the bounds of his own experience to that of Christ's, the greater David. He exults, "Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (Psa. 16:9, 10). Much that David said would apply to himself. David could say that his heart was glad, that his flesh rested in hope. David knew that his soul would not remain forever in hell. But when David said that his body would not see corruption, he was clearly beyond his own experience and was revealing that of Christ. Peter states this fact in his sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2:25–31), and points out the difference between David and Christ. Inspiration can, therefore, be said to result in more than a record of devotional thoughts. While the process is inscrutable, inspiration so wrought that an accurate record was made of the thoughts of the writers, these thoughts being prepared by the providence of God. All that the writers experienced was not incorporated in Scripture. Inspiration was selective. As Warfield so well describes: "Or consider how a psalmist would be prepared to put into moving verse a piece of normative religious experience: how he would be born with just the right quality of religious sensibility, of parents through whom he should receive just the right hereditary bent, and from whom he should get precisely the right religious example and training, in circumstances of life in which his religious tendencies should be developed precisely on right lines; how he would be brought through just the right experiences to quicken in him the precise emotions he would be called upon to express, and finally would be placed in precisely the exigencies which would call out their expression" (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, s.v.* "Inspiration," p. 1481). While providential preparation should not be confused with inspiration, it can be seen that *with* providential preparation, inspiration of the devotional literature of the Old Testament takes on the nature of the recording of revelation, not revelation by the voice of God, but revelation by the workings of God in the human heart.

(6) *The Contemporary Prophetic Message*. Much that is recorded as a message from a prophet concerned the immediate needs of his own generation. To them he would bring God's messages of warning; he would exhort; he would direct their armies; he would choose their leaders; in the manifold needs of the people for the wisdom of God, the prophet would be God's instrument of revelation. In this aspect of prophetic ministry, the Scripture doubtless records only a small portion. The record is given for the sake of its historic importance and to constitute a living example to later generations. How is inspiration related to this aspect of Scripture? As in the case of other types of Scripture, inspiration is first of all selective. In the writing of the Scripture, the writer is guided to include and exclude according to the mind of God. Inspiration assures that the record is an accurate one, giving the message of the prophet the character of infallibility. This was true even in the case of the few ungodly men who gave voice to prophecy and were guided in it by God. The work of inspiration in this particular type of Scripture is similar to that operative in recording history in the larger sense, in the writing of history, guiding in the selection and statement of the history, and in the case of prophecy, guiding in the selection and statement of the message and deeds of God through His prophets.

(7) *Prophecy of the Future*. In the nature of prophecy, it frequently took the aspect of predicting future events. It would warn of impending judgment, and in the midst of chastening experiences, it would portray the glory and deliverance that would come with the

Messiah. Approximately a fourth of the Old Testament is in the form of prediction. Does inspiration have a peculiar relation to this form of prophecy? Most of the Old Testament Scripture was comprehended by the writers. They could understand to a large degree the events of history. They could appreciate much of the Psalms. What they wrote was in a large measure passing through their own thoughts and was subject to their understanding. The introduction of predictive prophecy, however, brings to the foreground the statement of future events which were not understood. The prophets themselves confessed that they did not always understand what they wrote. As Peter writes, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who phophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow" (1 Pet. 1:10, 11). The work of inspiration in predictive prophecy is probably more evident than in the other types of Scripture. Here indeed human wisdom was of no avail, and accuracy of the finest kind was demanded. Here inspiration can be tested more severely than in any other field, and the testimony of fulfilled prophecy gives its conclusive voice to the work of the Holy Spirit which caused it to be written. Predictive prophecy required revelation from God in such form that inspiration could cause it to be written revealing the eternal purposes and sovereign will of God. Visions and trances play an important part in some revelation of future events, and the power of God through the Holy Spirit was especially evident.

While distinctive aspects of the operation of the Holy Spirit may be seen, corresponding to the various types of Scripture, it can be concluded that in the main inspiration bears the same characteristics in all kinds of Old Testament Scripture. In it all the Spirit guided, excluding the false, including all that the mind of God directed, giving to revelation accurate statement, to history purposeful selection and authentic facts, to providentially guided experience its intimate record of God dealing with the hearts of His servants, to prophecy, whether a contemporary message or predictive, the unfailing accuracy that made it the proper standard for faith to apprehend. The work of inspiration was not accomplished by an impersonal force, by a law of nature, or by providence alone; but the immanent Holy Spirit, working in the hearts and affairs of men, not only revealed the truth of God, but caused the Old Testament to be written, the most amazing document ever to see the light of day, bearing in its pages the unmistakable evidences that the hands which inscribed them were guided by the unwavering, infinitely wise, unfailing Holy Spirit.—*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,* pp. 64–70

Chapter VI

The Distinctive Character of the Present Age

As an introduction to the vast theme of the Holy Spirit's relation to the present age—which subject takes up the remainder of this volume—it would be well to indicate the four time-periods which mark off the Holy Spirit's activities throughout the whole of human history: (1) The Old Testament. As indicated before, the Spirit's relation in the former ages was sovereign. He came upon whom he would and for such purposes as God determined; He left them as freely as He came, when His designs were realized. If He abode with a king or a prophet, it was only because of the fact that such abiding was the immediate purpose of God, hence not in conformity to some age-characteristic of universal and unbroken indwelling of either good or useful men. In this first period, as previously stated, the Holy Spirit is seen as Creator, as the energizing power working in certain men who fulfilled a specific purpose of God's, and as Author of the Scriptures. (2) The period of transition. From the beginning of Christ's ministry upon earth as incarnate to the first preaching of the Gospel to Gentiles in Cornelius" house (Acts 10:44), there is indicated a period of transition: the Holy Spirit was offered by Christ to all who asked for Him (Luke 11:13), Christ promised to pray that the Spirit might come and be an abiding, indwelling presence within His own (cf. John 14:16–17), after His resurrection He breathed upon them the Spirit (John 20:22), they were to tarry in Jerusalem until endued with power by the Spirit (Luke 24:49), the Spirit came on Pentecost as prophesied, at which time Jewish believers (the gospel was still restricted to Jews at that time) were joined into one spiritual Body (Acts 2:47), the giving of the Holy Spirit was preceded by the laying on of apostolic hands in Samaria (Acts 8:14–17; cf. Heb. 6:2), and the Spirit "fell on" Gentile believers in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:44). Much in this transitional situation became permanent; but the final age-condition of receiving the Holy Spirit, as Christ had indicated it in John 7:37–39, was not established until Gentiles were received into the same spiritual Body with the believing Jews. There is no record respecting the laying on of any hands in Cornelius' house. Undoubtedly, this experience marked the

beginning of a new and permanent order for the present age. (3) The present age. Since this time is the theme of the greater portion of this volume and the major Biblical revelation respecting the Holy Spirit's undertakings, it will not be outlined here more than to state that in this period are unfolded the whole new reality which the Christian is as well as his daily-life responsibility and service, which life and service are to be wrought by the Holy Spirit in answer to a continuing faith. (4) The kingdom age. Again, to the end that repetition may be avoided, this theme which has constituted the subject of earlier pages in this volume (Chapter IV) will not be developed here. It should be recalled, however, that there yet remains an entire age of specific undertakings and benefits on the part of the Holy Spirit, which age is yet future.

The present age, which extends from the first advent of Christ onward to His return to receive His own, is distinct in several particulars from the other time-periods listed above.

I. An Intercalation

The age itself is an intercalation which is unaccounted for in all predictions of the Old Testament. These Old Testament predictions trace the course and final destiny of Israel, the nations, the angels, and the promised land; but each of these lines of prophecy passes over the present age of the outcalling of the Church as though it did not exist. It is restated as fundamental to a right understanding of all Biblical prophecy, then, that the present dispensation is not only unforeseen by prophets of old (cf. 1 Pet. 1:10–11), but is wholly unrelated to that which went before and as wholly unrelated to that which follows.

II. A New Divine Purpose

This age is distinctive also, being, as it is, the outworking of a wholly new divine purpose, namely, the gathering out (ἐκκλησία) from both Jews and Gentiles of a heavenly people, the Body and Bride of the glorified, resurrected Christ, which by divine transforming power will not only be qualified for residence in the highest heaven, but be qualified as well for everlasting association with the Members of the blessed Trinity. That Bride

will satisfy every ideal of the Bridegroom throughout all eternity. Naught but an infinite, divine undertaking could accomplish this. This incomprehensible age-purpose marks off this dispensation as being unique and unrelated to any other era in human history that has been or ever will be. In their attempt to unify the ages about one supposed covenant of divine grace and to blend the present dispensation into one unbroken sequence with the rest, theologians have lost the characterizing features of this period and by so much have failed to see the surpassing and historically unrelated position and glory of the Church, the Body and Bride of Christ.

III. An Age of Witnessing

This age is peculiarly an age of witnessing. Israel as a nation bore a testimony concerning the one God, Jehovah, to the people of the earth; but they had no gospel to proclaim, no great commission like the Church's, nor did they sustain a missionary enterprise. Even Christ, when restricted to His Israelitish ministry (cf. Rom. 15:8) as He was throughout His precross days, said of Himself: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24); and when sending His disciples forth with their specific message to their own people, He commanded that they should *not* go to the Gentiles nor enter into any city of the Samaritans, but "go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:5–6). Respecting that ministry to Israel alone, Christ gave no instructions on the meaning of the message they were to impart, well understood as it was from the Old Testament, though He entered into minute details relative to the manner of their going unto a still rebellious people (cf. Matt. 10:1–42). Over against this is the later command that these same disciples should go into all the world and preach such an innovation as the gospel to every creature, as a witness unto Himself in His new character of a crucified and risen Savior. This striking and far-reaching conrast should not be passed over lightly. He had likened the enterprise of this age to a sower going forth to sow, not a reaper. Similarly, the Apostle declares that the word of reconciliation "is committed unto us" (2 Cor. 5:18–19). In the future age there will be no need of an evangel, at least to Israel, saying to them "Know the LORD," for all shall know Him from the least unto the greatest (Jer. 31:34). It therefore becomes evident that the present age, bounded as it is by the two advents of

Christ, is distinctive in that it is an age of witnessing to the ends of the earth of the saving grace provided through the death and resurrection of Christ.

IV. Israel Dormant

Now Israel is dormant and all that is related to her covenants and promises is in abeyance. To them—not as a nation, but as individuals—the privilege of being saved unto heavenly glory along with individual Gentiles is extended in this day of God's heavenly purpose. No Jewish covenants are now being fulfilled; they are "scattered," "peeled," "broken off," and yet to be "hated of all nations" for Christ's name's sake. This is the one peculliar age in which there is "no difference" between Jew and Gentile, though in former times God Himself had instituted the most drastic distinction between these two classes of people.

V. Special Character of Evil

Evil attains a special character in the present time. Several reasons account for the fact that the Apostle writes of this as an "evil age" (Gal. 1:4, R.V. marg.). (1) Christ describes the evil character of this period in connection with the seven parables of Matthew, chapter 13. In this description He speaks of the influence of evil in relation to the falling of the seed, the darnel, the birds in the mustard tree, the leaven in the meal, and the bad fish. It is evident that His purpose was to assign a new and hitherto unexperienced character to evil as it appears in this age. (2) Likewise, the Apostle states that there is a mystery form of evil in this age which had already begun to work in his own day (2 Thess. 2:7). (3) Believers are said to maintain a warfare against the *cosmos* world, the flesh, and the devil. Doubtless the *cosmos* and the flesh exercised an evil influence in past ages. A special revelation is given in Ephesians 6:10–12, however, in which a conflict peculiar to this age has been shown to exist between the believer and Satan. (4) Satan himself bears the title of "god of this age" (2 Cor. 4:3–4, R.V. marg.). (5) So, also, the specific conflict of the "last days" of the Church on the earth presents a new form of evil in the world. And (6) the claim of Christ upon man's faith through His death and resurrection obliges all people to make a reasonable response and by so much creates the

possibility of a new and unprecedented sin—the sin of unbelief in the Savior.

VI. An Age of Gentile Privilege

According to a truth wholly peculiar to this age, the Gentiles are privileged to enter into the highest divine purpose and glory. Their estate before God in past ages is described in Ephesians 2:12: “That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Their estate before God in the coming kingdom age is likewise clearly and fully predicted, as found in Isaiah 14:1–2; 60:12. These passages read: “For the LORD will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And the people shall take them, and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and handmaids: and they shall take them captives, whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors.… For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.” At the judgment of the nations as described in Matthew 25:31–46, certain nations are to enter the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; but in this relation and position they must conform to the restrictions set forth in the Scripture quoted above from Isaiah. From such a comparison with past and future ages it is made certain that the present age has been marked off as one of peculiar privilege and benefit for Gentile peoples.

VII. The Work of the Spirit World-Wide

Even more evident than what has preceded is the truth that the present age is one in which the Holy Spirit exercises an influence over the whole human family, and especially over those who are saved and those who according to the eternal purpose of God are yet to be saved. As for this latter company, the Apostle writes that they are those “who are the called according to his purpose” (Rom. 8:28–30). This the seventh characteristic of the present age not only concludes the summarization set forth in this

chapter, but points to the major feature of the whole doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter VII

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE WORLD

THE PRESENT AGE, because of the extensive activities of the Holy Spirit, has rightfully been styled *the dispensation of the Spirit*. A proportionate treatment of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit as His Person and work are exhibited in the Bible will disclose the fact that at least ninety percent of the material which enters into Pneumatology is found in those portions of the Scripture which relate to the age of grace. This same proportion is of necessity reflected to some extent in the pages of this volume. This extended treatment will be pursued under three general divisions: (1) the Spirit as the Restrainer of the *cosmos* world, (2) the Spirit as the One who convicts the unsaved, and (3) the Spirit in relation to the Christian. The first two divisions are to be considered in this chapter.

I. The Restrainer of the *Cosmos* World

Though but one passage is found bearing upon the restraining work of the Holy Spirit, the scope of the issues involved is such as to command the utmost consideration. It contemplates the divine government over the forces of evil at work in the world throughout the present age. The passage, being somewhat veiled, has not received a uniform interpretation. It reads: “Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they

might be saved" (2 Thess. 2:3–10). Few passages present more vital truth concerning the future than this. After having declared the fact that the Day of the Lord (R.V.)—the thousand-year kingdom with all its introductory judgments (not, the Day of Christ, as in the A.V.)—cannot come until the final apostasy has been experienced and the man of sin has appeared, that man of sin is identified, here as elsewhere, by his wicked assumption of the prerogatives of Deity (cf. Ezek. 28:1–10). He is the lawless one (R.V.). The mystery of that lawlessness which he consummates was begun in the Apostle's day and would have been completed at an earlier time had not that lawlessness, promoted by Satan, been restrained. The Restrainer will go on restraining until He, the Restrainer, is taken out of the way. Then shall "that Wicked" one be revealed, and not before. But who is the Restrainer? The notion it is the church herself is corrected at once by the disclosure that the Restrainer is a Person, for the identification is of one who may be designated with the masculine gender. Likewise, the claim that this Person is Satan is as untenable, since Satan cannot be said to restrain himself. That the Restrainer is accomplishing a stupendous, supernatural task classes Him at once as one of the Godhead Three; and since the Holy Spirit is the active agency of the Trinity in the world throughout this age, it is a well-established conclusion that the Restrainer is the Holy Spirit of God. Some portion of this restraint is, no doubt, wrought through the Church, which is the temple of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 6:19; Eph. 2:19–22). Of this notable passage, Dr. C. I. Scofield states, "The order of events is: (1) The working of the mystery of lawlessness under divine restraint which had already begun in the apostle's time (v. 7); (2) the apostasy of the professing church (v. 3; Lk. 18:8; 2 Tim 3:1–8); (3) the removal of that which restrains the mystery of lawlessness (vs. 6, 7). The restrainer is a person—'he,' and since a 'mystery' always implies a supernatural element (Mt. 13:11, *note*), this Person can be no other than the Holy Spirit in the church, to be 'taken out of the way' (v. 7; 1 Thes. 4:14–17); (4) the manifestation of the lawless one (vs. 8–10; Dan. 7:8; 9:27; Mt. 24:15; Rev. 13:2–10); (5) the coming of Christ in glory and the destruction of the lawless one (v. 8; Rev. 19:11–21); (6) the day of Jehovah (vs. 9–12; Isa. 2:12, *refs*.)" (*The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1272).

It is clearly implied that were there no restraint in the world the tide of evil would rise to incomprehensible heights. This conclusion accords with

the Biblical declaration that the human heart is not only “desperately wicked” in itself, but is under the dominion of Satan (Jer. 17:9; Eph. 2:2–3). Over against this evidence, man has contended that he is fundamentally right and needs only to attain to culture, education, and refinement. The hour in which the present restraint is removed from the earth will demonstrate the truthfulness of the Word of God respecting the corruption of the human heart. Nothing needs to be imposed upon fallen humanity to set up the great tribulation in the earth: that tribulation will automatically result when the Spirit’s restraint is removed. The removal of the Holy Spirit is the reversing of Pentecost. On the Day of Pentecost He who had been omnipresent in relation to the world became resident in the world, and when He is removed He who is now resident will be again omnipresent in His relation to the world. This explains the seeming paradox that He who was already here on earth because infinite came on the Day of Pentecost, and He who is removed will still be present. So far as its being a mere inference that the Church—the Spirit’s present abode in the world—will remain here after the Spirit is removed, her departure with the Holy Spirit, though that departure is not expressly mentioned in this context, is a necessity. The most vital unifying fact respecting the Church is the truth that her members are possessed of the divine nature which is imparted through the operation of the Holy Spirit of God. Christians are, every one, indwelt by the Holy Spirit and His presence constitutes their sealing, which sealing, so far from being intermittent or temporary, is “unto the day of redemption.” It is an absurdity to contemplate the idea of a Christian who has not received the Holy Spirit, since the presence of the Spirit in the Christian is his most distinguishing feature. Should the Holy Spirit depart from the Church, she would instantly cease to be what she is; and should any church members, thus void of the Spirit, pass into the great tribulation, that company, being no longer the Church, would not involve the true Church in the hour of testing. In other words, since there can be no separation between the Holy Spirit and the Church, when the great tribulation is reached either the Holy Spirit must remain here with the Church, which is an unscriptural notion, or the Church must be removed with the Spirit from this world. Hidden in one of the Savior’s most precious promises is the assurance that the Spirit will abide forever with those in whom He dwells (John 14:16–17), and John himself writes in 1 John 2:27: “But the anointing which ye have received of

him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." From these declarations it must be concluded that any separation now or ever between the Holy Spirit and the believer is divinely prohibited. When the Spirit is removed, the Church will be removed with Him. She cannot be left behind.

The extent of the Spirit's restraint of the *cosmos* world has not been revealed. As implied above, the extent of the Spirit's restraint may be measured by comparing the world in its present more or less civilized relationships, its recognition and defense of human rights, and its patronizing attitude toward God and His Word, with the picture of the oncoming tribulation as seen in Revelation. A slight indication of the Spirit's present restraining power is to be seen in the fact that of all the profanity uttered by human lips, there is never a cursing in the name of the Holy Spirit. This restraint is not due to any conscious sentiment on the part of God-hating and God-defying men; it is due to a supernatural restraint wrought by the Holy Spirit Himself against whom man must not blaspheme. It is thus demonstrated that the Holy Spirit restrains the corruption of the world-system until that corruption has run its course (cf. Gen. 15:16), that He will go on restraining until He be taken out of the way, and that, when He is taken away, the unrestrained powers of darkness will constitute the trial and terror of the great tribulation. It is further indicated that of necessity the Church must depart with the Holy Spirit when He is removed from His place of residence in the world.

II. The One Who Convicts the Unsaved

Within the whole divine enterprise of winning the lost, there is no factor more vital than the work of the Holy Spirit in which He convinces or reproves the *cosmos* world respecting sin, righteousness, and judgment. The wholly unscriptural and untenable Arminian notion of common grace, which asserts that all men at birth are so wrought upon by the Holy Spirit that they are rendered capable of an unhindered response to the gospel invitation, has, with the aid of human vanity which owns no limitations in human ability, so disseminated its misleading errors that little recognition is given to the utter incapacity of the unsaved, natural man to respond to the

gospel appeal. Inattentive or uninstructed evangelists and zealous soul-winners too often go forth assuming that all persons anywhere and everywhere are able at any time to comply with the terms of the gospel, whereas the Scriptures teach that no man is able to make an intelligent decision for Christ apart from the enlightening work of the Holy Spirit. Evangelists and preachers are called upon to face, if they will, a supernatural factor in this program of winning the lost. Because of failure to understand this factor or because of unwillingness to be restricted thus to the sovereign working of the Spirit, men invent methods which prescribe human action as the terms upon which a soul may be saved, not recognizing the truth that the lost are to be saved, not when they do some prescribed action, but only when they believe on Christ as Savior. The evangelist's problem is not one of coaxing individuals to make some public demonstration; it is rather that of creating a clear conception of the saving grace of God. No individual is capable in himself of believing on Christ to the saving of his soul, apart from the enlightening work of the Holy Spirit by which he receives the vision of Christ as Savior and is inclined to receive Him by faith. Every sincere preacher senses this supernatural factor more or less, but not many are aware of its significant meaning. It becomes disconcerting to the evangelist's program of methods in soul-winning to confront an arbitrary supernatural situation over which he or the unsaved to whom he appeals has not the slightest control. The work of the Spirit in this particular sphere of influence is sovereign. It is the point where divine election is exercised and where it makes its demonstration. It is true that only the elect will be saved. It is true, also, that God may indite within the Christian that prayer which shall be an essential factor in the great work of inclining the lost to accept the Savior; but prayer does not determine the election of men: rather, prayer will itself be subject to the same sovereign Spirit, if prayed in the will of God. It is quite evident that human response to the gospel may be secured where there is no divinely wrought vision of Christ. Most emphatic, nevertheless, are the words of Christ when He said: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:40), for there is no small implication here that only those believe who have by Spirit-wrought vision seen the Son as their Savior. It is clearly asserted, too, that there can be no salvation apart from a

preliminary, preparatory enlightenment of the unsaved by the Holy Spirit. That such a work by the Spirit is required becomes evident from certain Scriptures which set forth the inability of the unsaved. Some of these are here presented.

1 Corinthians 2:14. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

This, the natural (ψυχικός) man—one in the Apostle's threefold division of humanity as presented in this context—is definitely the unregenerate person, and his incapacity is constitutional. Over this incapacity he has no control, nor can any human instruction apart from the Holy Spirit alter this inability. The unsaved in himself cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God. To him they are foolishness. He is incapable of even comprehending them. He remains thus impotent until he is wrought upon by the Holy Spirit.

2 Corinthians 4:3–4. "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."

Not only are the unsaved here said to be blinded with respect to the very gospel by which they might be saved, but that blindness is imposed upon their minds by Satan because he purposely would hinder the gospel from reaching them. No human appeal of itself may hope to lift this veil from the mind of the one who does not believe. It is a great misconception to speak of a "common grace" upon all men, in the light of such a revelation as this. Only inattention to the Word of God can account for this strange perversion of the truth.

John 14:16–17. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

One of the important facts regarding the Holy Spirit in relation to men in this age is that all that He accomplishes as well as any recognition of Himself is wholly outside the observation of the unsaved. With such limitations upon them, it is as unreasonable as it is unscriptural to suppose that they, unaided by the Spirit, are able to turn to God in saving faith. This

word of Christ plainly asserts that the world cannot receive the Spirit because it knoweth Him not.

Ephesians 2:1. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins."

The unsaved are declared to be spiritually dead, and truly from such there can come no living recognition of Christ.

John 6:39–40. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

There is an election of the Father's and not one of these will ever be lost. It is equally true that not every person "seeth the Son" (cf. John 6:40) by that vision which the Holy Spirit engenders; but immediately upon seeing Him as the Answer to every need they will have in time or eternity, the individual whom God thus calls is able to receive Christ as Savior.

John 6:44. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day."

As presented in this passage, the restrictions which rest upon the unsaved are as complete as can be. Only those can come to Christ whom the Father by His Spirit draws. Recognition should be made of a general or universal drawing which accompanies the preaching of the cross of Christ. This universal drawing is described by Christ in the following words: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (John 12:32); but the Savior does not say of any thus drawn, "And I will raise him up at the last day," for He will raise up just those whom the Father specifically designates and draws.

1 Corinthians 1:23–24. "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

Again the incapacity in the direction of the saving power of the cross of Christ for the unregenerate Gentile and the unregenerate Jew is asserted. The cross by which they alone might be saved avails for nothing to them, being to the Gentile "foolishness" and to the Jew a "stumblingblock." Over against this is the evidence of the work of the Holy Spirit in those who are

called of God. To them that same cross of Christ, which before was meaningless, at once becomes the ground of all the wisdom and power of God—wisdom, since by the cross God solved His greatest problem of how He could be just and yet be the justifier of the ungodly, and power, since by the cross all the infinite ability of God to save the lost is released from those restrictions which the sin of man imposed.

Romans 8:28–30. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

This vital Scripture may well be considered the central New Testament passage related to the doctrine of an efficacious call, but the deeper implication to be discovered in this context is the truth that only those thus called are able to respond. That is, apart from this call none will turn to God. Every sincere believer is conscious of the fact that had he not been moved in that direction by the Holy Spirit he would never of himself have turned to God for salvation through Christ. This passage asserts that those who are "the called according to his purpose" are the objects of an all-inclusive providence. Specifically, certain divine undertakings are here itemized as "working together" for the good of those thus called, namely, divine foreknowledge, divine predestination, divine calling, divine justification, and divine glorification. It should be observed that the divine call is here listed along with the most determining and far-reaching of all the divine achievements. In fact, the truth set forth in this context, it will be seen, is centered specifically upon the fact of the divine call. In the first instance, believers are designated as "the called according to his purpose," and, in the second instance, they are said to be called by God. The title, *the called according to His purpose*, may well include all of the elect, even those who are yet to be saved; for such a description applies to them and they are identified perfectly in the mind of God (cf. Eph. 1:4–5). However, the elect who are yet unsaved are blinded—equally with the rest—by Satan respecting the gospel until they are enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Foreknowledge and predestination are related to eternity past; glorification,

being perfectly assured through the faithfulness of God, is related to eternity to come. Thus the two remaining divine undertakings of this list—calling and justification—are left as the representation of that which God accomplishes in the present earthly experience of the one who believes. At once it will be noted that these two undertakings are exalted to the highest importance as the representation of all that God executes when He saves a soul here and now. Justification is easily the consummating act of God's saving grace in this world for the one who believes, though not because it follows other features of salvation in point of time. It consummates logically, but not chronologically, all other aspects of salvation in its first tense of the sinner's actual contact with God. On the other hand, the call of God marks the initial step in the actual process accomplishing the salvation of a soul. Thus the Apostle employs the alpha and the omega of the divine effort in applying salvation as a representation of all that lies in between. Now, finally, what is wrought when the divine call is issued? Is it merely the extending of an invitation which may or may not—as the Arminian supposes—be accepted according to the caprice of the human will? The text itself supplies the answer. *All* that are predestinated are called, and all who are called are justified. The language breathes out the absolute sovereignty of God and by so much might suggest that a divine call is no less than coercion; but the thought expressed in the word *call* is not less tan coercion but invitation, and the use of the term here is no exception, unless it be thought different in that both divine sovereignty and human free will coalesce in this particular instance. That which God the Holy Spirit undertakes is to enlighten the mind with regard to Christ as Savior, and to create in the innermost consciousness of the unsaved individual a desire for that salvation which Christ provides and to a degree that the individual thus impressed will certainly act in receiving Christ as Savior; but it will be observed that when so acting the individual exercises his free will to the last degree. It still remains true that "whosoever will may come," and it is equally true that apart from this divinely wrought inclination no lost person ever wills to come. God is thus declared in the Scripture to be One who, apart from any degree of coercion yet nonetheless with sovereign certainty and with the complete freedom of the human will unimpaired, is able to guarantee that, without the exception of one in all generations of humanity in this age, all who are predestinated will be called, all who are called will

be justified, and all who are justified will be glorified. The experience of the one thus called is such as to bring a new consciousness of the desirability of Christ and a supreme longing to claim Him as Savior. The degree to which this divinely wrought experience may develop, though doubtless varying with different individuals, will in every instance be abundantly sufficient to secure a perfect response and hearty cooperation of the individual's own will. The objective in this discussion is to demonstrate again that no unregenerate person unaided by the Holy Spirit will turn to Christ as Savior. Some preparation may thus be made in the direction of a right understanding of the one central passage bearing upon this work of the Holy Spirit in the innermost consciousness of the unregenerate person, namely,

John 16:7–11. "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."

It may first be noted that no such work of the Holy Spirit was, so far as the records go, undertaken in other ages of human history; and as Christ is the One who speaks with direct and absolute authority, it is significant that this crucial declaration falls from the lips of Christ Himself and in a context which, above any other wherein His words are recorded, is characterized as instruction to Christians. These words of Christ's are not addressed as instruction to the unsaved, they rather impart the most vital information to the child of God who would be intelligent and effective in his soul-winning service. With great clarity and emphasis the Savior asserts that the Holy Spirit, having come as now He is present in the world, will undertake a threefold, indivisible work in the mind and heart of the unsaved. Though reference is made to the *cosmos* world as the objective toward which the Holy Spirit's work is directed, the conviction that the Spirit accomplishes is of necessity individual and, according to all related Scriptures, is restricted to those whom "the Lord our God shall call." The determining word is ἐλέγχω, since it defines what it is that the Holy Spirit does in the mind and heart of the unsaved individual respecting sin, righteousness, and judgment. The A.V. translates this word by *reprove*, the R.V. translates it *convict*, and

still other scholars have translated it *convince*. In every instance in which this word appears, the word connotes the impartation of understanding regarding the subject in question. With this in view the translation by the word *enlighten* is perhaps the most satisfactory. It is not implied that this work of the Holy Spirit in the individual's heart is one of creating sorrow or remorse. So far from pointing the attention of the unsaved to themselves and their sinfulness over which they might mourn, the Spirit directs attention to Christ and to the truth that Christ has borne their judgments, that they need but to believe on Him to be saved. Such, indeed, is the good news which the gospel announces. The Scriptures never assert that the unsaved are hindered from being saved by failing to be sorry for their sins. The notion—wholly of human origin—that a due sense of one's sinfulness with its corresponding depression must precede the exultation which salvation secures is due, no doubt, to the supposition that the impelling motive in the unsaved is a consciousness of their wickedness, whereas the true motive which the Holy Spirit engenders is that, since all condemnation rightfully ours because of sin has been laid on Christ, the way is open to absolute forgiveness and to celestial peace. It is a manifestation of human perverseness when would-be gospel preachers stress the sinner's unworthiness in the hope that it will lead to salvation. It is possible for the whole doctrine of repentance to be misunderstood and perverted, supposing that repentance is a sorrow for sin rather than a change of mind about it. Basing their message upon this error, men have substituted a plea for depression of spirit in the place of the "glorious gospel of Christ."

The threefold ministry of the Holy Spirit to the unsaved as revealed by Christ is indivisible in the sense that the Spirit does not undertake one of the aspects of it and omit two, nor does He undertake two and omit one. If the Spirit works at all in the heart of the unsaved, He will do all that this threefold operation of the Spirit connotes. The need of this enlightening work of the Holy Spirit in the mind and heart of the unsaved is clearly indicated in the Word of God. Attention has been called above to the passages which aver that the unsaved are wholly incapable within themselves of turning intelligently to Christ as Savior. In 2 Corinthians 4:3–4 it is said that the mind—not the eyes—of those who are lost is blinded by Satan. This veil must be lifted else the light of "the glorious gospel of Christ" will not reach them. Similarly, in 1 Corinthians 2:14 it is written

that the unregenerate, natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, nor can he receive them. In John 14:17 Christ is recorded to have said of the *cosmos* world that it receiveth not the Spirit because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him. Again, it is recorded in Acts 26:18 that the first effect of the ministry of the Apostle to the Gentiles would be to "open their eyes," and Christ declared to Nicodemus that unless born from above he could not "see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). This total incapacity of the unsaved to understand, to see, to receive, or to believe the things of God is by divine provision overcome when the Holy Spirit enlightens with respect to sin, righteousness, and judgment. These divine undertakings may well be considered separately and more specifically.

1. Of Sin. This enlightenment is not of *sins*. Were it of personal sins it could accomplish no more than a deepening of remorse and shame, and would provide no cure. The Spirit's enlightenment is respecting one sin, and that is the failure to receive Christ and His salvation. This implies that the way of life through faith in Christ has been made clear unto those who are thus enlightened, and with that disclosure there was revelation of the new sin—a sin which before the death of Christ could not have been committed—namely, unbelief in Christ and the salvation He has secured. The student should concern himself with the implications as well as the direct declarations which are found in this passage. If it be inquired why the Spirit does not enlighten the unsaved with respect to his sins, the answer is that Christ has borne those sins and that God recognizes this perfectly. It seems all but impossible for men to accept the truth that all sin has been laid on Christ and that Christ has already endured their judgments in a manner which satisfies God even to infinity. Evidently, it is the Spirit's work to create this consciousness in the mind of the individual unregenerate person. It is this message which the Holy Spirit would promote and which He could use on the lips of the preacher; but too often the obligation of the unsaved is presented to them as though it were needful for them to persuade God to be good enough to do something regarding their sins. The gospel of good news declares that God *has* done everything, leaving the individual with but the one issue of belief or unbelief in what He has done. The gospel does not present something for the unsaved to do, it rather presents something for them to believe; and needful, indeed, is the work of the Holy Spirit in

enlightening those who are lost about the character and extent of the sin that "they believe not on me."

2. Of Righteousness. This passage presents the one and only instance in all of Christ's teachings when He speaks directly of imputed righteousness —that righteousness which so far from being a product of human effort and attention is the gift of God (cf. Rom. 5:17), in which the believer is now alone accepted of God (Eph. 1:6), and by which alone any person from this earthly sphere will enter heaven. It is wholly on the ground of this imputed righteousness that God justifies the ungodly. It is legitimately and actually the portion of every believer and on the all-sufficient ground that he is in Christ. Being a member in the Body of Christ, the believer becomes by absolute necessity all that Christ is, even the righteousness of God (cf. Rom. 3:22; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Phil. 3:9). It is not contended that the unsaved must comprehend the difficult doctrine of imputed righteousness; it is evident, however, that to put his trust in Christ he must abandon all confidence in self as being able to commend himself to God, and count that all that a condemned sinner will ever need before God is provided and awaiting him in Christ Jesus, who is the very righteousness of God. Since such a confidence is so foreign to the life, limitations, and experience of the natural man, it is essential that this vital truth be revealed to the unsaved by the Holy Spirit. This the Spirit does when He enlightens with respect to righteousness. Imputed righteousness is the major theme of the letter to the Romans, which letter is the central and exhaustive declaration of the gospel of the grace of God. It therefore follows that the fact of imputed righteousness is the central factor in the gospel of grace. Christ, too, has given the theme of imputed righteousness the central place according to this context. It follows that one who would so preach that this work of the Spirit may be accomplished will not only include the theme of imputed righteousness in his message, but give it the central place. The obvious fact that gospel preachers have almost wholly neglected this central truth forms no valid excuse for its continued neglect. As before indicated, no intelligent acceptance of Christ can be secured apart from some apprehension of this vital truth. It is precisely that understanding of Him, however, which the Holy Spirit imparts to the unsaved. In the sweet-savor aspect of His death, Christ offered Himself without spot to God (cf. Heb. 9:14). This offering of

Himself became a perfect and efficacious substitution for those who have no merit or virtue of their own. By His death on the cross Christ released His own *plērōma* and perfection, and so when the Father would clothe the one who believes with the fullness of Christ, that fullness is bestowed in perfect equity on the ground of the truth that it is provided and made available in the death of Christ. The death of Christ in its sweet savor aspect is as efficacious in the direction of securing merit as the non-sweet savor aspect of His death is efficacious in disposing of demerit. The sweet savor aspect of Christ's death is not some mere sentimental incident between the Father and the Son with no achievement in behalf of those for whom Christ died. Yet, as almost universally treated, there is no recognition of the value of this aspect of the saving grace of God. How very essential is the securing of merit for those who have none! And how complete is the provision in the sweet savor feature of Christ's offering of Himself without spot to God!

3. Of Judement. Since this feature of the Holy Spirit's work in the mind of the unsaved is so closely related to His enlightening work respecting sin —already considered—the enlightenment respecting judgment has been anticipated. While this ministry of the Spirit is said to bear directly on the judgment of Satan, it is something already accomplished by Christ in His death. It is not a warning regarding some future disposal of evil, but refers to the greatest of all judgments that ever was or will be undertaken, namely, when Christ became the Substitute for man in bearing the condemnation which the Father must impose upon those who are fallen and sinful. The individual may well conceive of himself as having been apprehended and drawn before the tribunal of divine judgment, as having been justly sentenced to death, and as having been taken out and executed—except for Another who stepped in and was executed in the sinner's room and stead. The execution belonged completely and only to the individuals who sinned. By the death of Christ, then, the sinner is placed on the other side of his own execution. Though alive and uninjured, the believing sinner may look back upon his own execution as accomplished (cf. 2 Cor. 5:14). Having believed upon Christ and having thus by faith entered into the value of His death, that judgment once borne by Christ can never be returned upon the one for whom Christ died. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). It is of this complete

substitution that the Holy Spirit, in the first instance of these three ministries, enlightens, when it is said: “of sin, because they believe not on me.” Again, it is to be observed that the gospel which the Spirit indites is a setting forth of something to be believed. It is now asserted in this third and final declaration that Satan, the prince of this *cosmos*, has been judged. The ground upon which Satan has held his authority over fallen men was the fact that divine condemnation rests upon them because of sin. In his claim over them, they were as his prisoners (Isa. 14:17), but the same Old Testament prophet, when anticipating what Christ would accomplish, stated —in words which later on Christ directly applied to Himself (cf. Luke 4:18–19)—that He would “proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound” (Isa. 61:1). It is probable that in this sense Christ triumphed over principalities and powers through the cross, as recorded in Colossians 2:15. The passage reads: “And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.”

Conclusion

Thus it is seen that the Holy Spirit reveals to the unsaved whom He calls the very essentials of the gospel of divine grace—the substitutionary death of Christ as that which has been accomplished, along with the all-condemning sin of not believing on the One who thus died, also the perfect standing provided in the same cross, which standing is no less than the righteousness of God imputed. Apart from this enlightenment, the individual unsaved person does not respond though confronted with all the persuasion human sincerity and eloquence may devise. It hardly need be pointed out again that any form of evangelism which ignores this work of the Holy Spirit and which assumes that the unsaved are capable within themselves of receiving the gospel and turning in intelligent, saving faith to Christ—though it may be that through human influence outward actions may be secured—lis doomed to superficial results and in great danger of hindering rather than helping those to whom it appeals. Christ must be received as the choice of the individual heart and this must be actuated by the innermost conviction of His Saviorhood—an understanding and choice

which could never be secured apart from the Spirit's enlightenment respecting sin, righteousness, and judgment.

The Holy Spirit in Relation to the Christian

Chapter VIII

Introduction to the Work of the Holy Spirit in the Believer

When considering the amount of Scripture pertaining to it, the Spirit's relation to the Christian is seen to be the major feature of the entire doctrine respecting the Holy Spirit. In the New Testament alone, where the truth regarding the Holy Spirit is given its fullest presentation, there is set forth, as noted above, both the fact that the Spirit restrains the world (which is largely disclosed in one passage) and the fact that He enlightens the unsaved (also a limited body of truth); but the whole unfolding revelation of the New Testament regarding the Holy Spirit occupies a great portion of the New Testament, insomuch that this age of the Church is also properly styled the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. The divisions of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as related to Christians contemplate two general features, namely, (a) the Holy Spirit's work in and through the believer (Chapters IX–XI) and (b) the believer's corresponding responsibility (Chapters XII–XVII). Before these major aspects of this truth are given constructive treatment, attention is called to the fact that at this point this thesis enters upon ground which is exceedingly vital, but which is as foreign to works on theology as though it did not exist. In fact, as the fountain source from which educated ministers have gained their knowledge of Biblical doctrine Systematic Theology is reprehensible because of its neglect of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and especially that vital feature of this doctrine which pertains to the believer's life and service by the enabling power of the Holy Spirit. There has been no recognition of the patent truth that the Bible contains three major rules of life which are addressed respectively to different peoples and applicable in different ages—no mention being made at this point, to be sure, of the divine government in those ages that came before the giving of the law by Moses (cf. Gen. 26:5), which ages could not have been benefited by Scripture records because they were not yet written. The three ages under consideration began with the age of the law, which was followed by the present age of grace, and this age, in turn, is to be followed by the thousand-year kingdom age. The Mosaic age obtained until the death of Christ (John

1:17), and the system of divine government for that age was in every respect adapted to Israel to whom alone it was addressed, who were contemplated as not yet of age and subject to tutors and governors (Gal. 4:1–3). The Mosaic system, though perfect in itself (cf. Rom. 7:12), is, in contrast to the high calling of the present age, termed the "weak and beggarly elements" into which a believer of today reverting to this system may be plunged (cf. Gal. 4:9) and to the loss, not of his salvation but, of his liberty in Christ (Gal. 5:1–4). To revert to the law is to fail to obey the truth (Gal. 5:7). Such error never comes forth from God (cf. Gal. 5:8), but from Judaizing teachers who "zealously affect" the child of God (Gal. 4:17). Though they encourage each other in so doing, theologians have no excuse for ignoring the change both in position and in the requisite corresponding manner of life which stupendous intervening events interposed between the Mosaic age and this age of the Church have wrought. These events are: (a) the introduction of a new and unforeseen age with its specific revelation concerning its character, (b) the death of Christ with all the new realities and relationships which it secures, (c) the resurrection of Christ with its New Creation Headship, (d) the present session of Christ with its limitless provisions, (e) the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost with His limitless blessings for all those in whom He dwells, (f) the inauguration of a new divine purpose in the calling out of a heavenly people from both Jews and Gentiles into one Body, and (g) the introduction of a new ethic or governing code adapted to a people who are perfected in Christ, clothed in divine righteousness, justified forever, and filled with the *plērōma* of the Godhead. The thoughtless, though zealous, imposition of a merit system of law upon a perfected people is most erroneous and is done only because theologians have suffered themselves to be bound by an indefensible covenant theory imposing upon God's right divisions of Scripture a man-made notion of unity throughout the Word of God.

Likewise, great intervening events will form a drastic cleavage between the human responsibility in this present age and the responsibility of the people in the age to come. These events are: (a) the removal of the Church and the termination in the earth of all that pertains to her, (b) the regathering and reinstating of Israel with the completion of her unfulfilled covenants, (c) the termination of Gentile times with their judgments, (d) the glorious return of Christ to judge both Jews and Gentiles and to set up His predicted

Messianic, Davidic, earthly kingdom, (e) the binding of Satan, (f) the Church as Bride and Consort of the King in her reign with Him over all realms wherein He exercises authority, and (g) the application of a new rule of life adapted to conditions created by these mighty changes. Again, theologians, though generally they make no recognition of a kingdom age or of the covenants and promises of God—sealed by His oath—which demand a realization of that coming age, seek to blend this vast body of Scripture into the one idea of a redeemed people embracing men of all ages. The Covenant theory can make no place for different divine purposes and corresponding ages of time. According to this teaching, Israel must merge into the Church and the Church must be the consummation of all previous earthly purposes. Regardless of misunderstandings in doctrine, however, it still remains true that there are new undertakings being consummated by the Holy Spirit, a new and divinely perfected people being called out today, a new obligation in life and service being announced for those called out, which responsibility can be discharged only by the enabling power of the indwelling Spirit. Turning, then, to the two main divisions of this theme as indicated above, consideration will be given to the Holy Spirit's work in and through the believer, first of all.

In addition to the two ministries of the Holy Spirit already attended (Chapter VII), there are still five more and they constitute the Spirit's relation to the Christian, these with the two presented above making a total of seven ministries of the Holy Spirit in this age. Of the five now in view, the first four may be classed in one group (as suggested earlier) since they represent the Spirit's undertakings in behalf of all who are saved. These are vital features of salvation, being wrought to infinite perfection for each believer at the moment he is saved. Likewise, these four ministries represent aspects of the Spirit's work which are never repeated, being accomplished once for all. The fifth in this series, which is also seventh when all the Spirit's ministries are contemplated, is that of the Spirit's filling—itself unique in that it is not a feature of salvation, for not all Christians experience it and it must be renewed constantly. In no particular are the distinctions between these seven ministries to be treated lightly. It is at this point, and for want of accuracy in the analysis of these truths, that sincere yet misinformed groups of Christians have separated themselves over questions of holiness and certain manifestations of the Spirit's

presence. Extreme claims among Christians and heretical religious professions are usually traceable to the neglect of some truth among Christian leaders, and it is especially evident that the present confusion among less instructed believers respecting the work of the Spirit in this age is due in large measure to the complete default of Christian leaders and instructors to give even elementary teaching regarding these vital and extended themes. Bible teachers and expositors generally have sought to overcome the effects of the neglect of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in usual theological disciplines by special emphasis upon these themes. The church of the present generation owes much to the Keswick movement of England and its extensive testimony in this and other lands. The inclusion of these subjects in modern Bible study conventions and by men able to speak with authority has done much to give these doctrines their rightful emphasis. A great theologian who has written massive treatises on the Person and work of Christ but who practically never ventures into the field of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit may be credited with such testimony as he has given, but must, at the same time, suffer discredit for the encouragement he has given to neglect of such vital truth on the part of all who follow him. That this presentation of Systematic Theology may not be thus challenged, the remainder of this volume is incorporated in this extended work. The five distinctive ministries of the Holy Spirit to the believer are now to be considered in the following order: (a) regeneration, (b) the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, (c) the baptism with the Holy Spirit, (d) the sealing of the Holy Spirit, and (e) the filling with the Holy Spirit.

Chapter IX

Regeneration and the Holy Spirit

In the incomparable purpose of God by which He is bringing "many sons unto glory" (Heb. 2:10) and to the end that Christ may be the first-born among many brethren (Rom. 8:29)—no less an undertaking than that of populating the third and highest heaven (hitherto the abode only of the triune God) with beings suited to that holy and exalted sphere and, indeed, sufficiently perfected to be the all-satisfying Bride of the Second Person—one vital step is that of constituting these beings partakers of the very nature of God. Such a structural change as this is essential in the very nature of the case. The new birth, then, is not a mere remedy for human failures: it is a creation by divine generation, a constituting of believers inherent, innate, legitimate sons of God. The human mind cannot approach the comprehension of that which is involved in the immeasurable realities of an actual sonship relation to God, which makes the Christian an heir of God and a joint heir with Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:17). In every feature of it, this is a work of God and is wrought as an expression of His sublime purpose and the satisfying of His infinite love for those He thus saves. Pursuing these intimations more fully, several facts may be observed:

I. The Necessity

Before the kingdom of God may be entered by a fallen individual from this human sphere, there must be a God-wrought metamorphosis in the form of a birth from above. Such a birth is specifically indicated by Christ in His words to Nicodemus: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6). In announcing these great truths about flesh and spirit, Christ did not address them to the lowest in the social order—such as obviously need to be improved; He chose to speak these words to a ruler and teacher in Israel who was without doubt the very flower of Judaism. At this point the question of what constituted the right relation of a Jew to God within the scope and purpose of Judaism might be asked. It is the Covenant theologian who advances at this point the assumption that the saints of the old order were regenerated and on the same basis of relationship to Jehovah as is accorded the saints of the New Testament. Such an assumption is needful if their theory is to be sustained.

But pertinent questions are in order: Why the direct and unconditional demand of a new birth upon one of the character that Nicodemus represented? Why the oft-repeated and emphasized account of the salvation of Saul of Tarsus who had lived in all good conscience before the law (Acts 9; 22; 26, etc.)? And why the salvation of the apostles, of three thousand Jews on the Day of Pentecost, and of the many priests who were obedient to the faith? Is it contended that not one of all these thus saved had answered before to the spiritual ideals of Judaism? Is it true that all these might have been as perfectly saved under Judaism as they later were under Christianity, but that everyone only accidentally declared his adjustment to God after the Christian faith was established? What, indeed, does the Apostle mean when he says: “But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster” (Gal. 3:23–25)? Why, also, should he pray for Israel and define their spiritual failure as he did when he said: “Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth” (Rom. 10:1–4)? And what did the same Apostle mean when in referring to the motives which actuated him at the moment of his own choice of Christ as Savior he said: “Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith” (Phil. 3:4–9)? Why in every contrast between any of the features of Judaism

and the features of Christianity is the former represented as insufficient from which the individual must be saved by adherence to the latter? The answer to all such questions will be found when it is determined that God was not doing precisely the same thing in Judaism as He is now doing in Christianity. God never said to Israel, “I will present you faultless before the presence of my glory.” It is doubtless in accord with humility to state that one assumes no higher place in God’s purpose than that accorded the Old Testament saints. But none of this is according to man’s election: it is a matter of God’s revealed and unalterable plan. God so emphasizes the difference between Israel and the Church that, when receiving Jews along with Gentiles into the Church, He recognizes no specific superior qualities in the Jew over the Gentile, but declares “there is no difference” (cf. Rom. 3:9; 10:12). However, if the Jew were already upon Christian ground, it is a most unreasonable procedure to lower him to the level of the Gentile position only to exalt him back to his original position again. Though in the Jewish age that people had covenant relations with Jehovah, it cannot be demonstrated that they were in any particular upon Christian ground. Regeneration, accordingly, is as much a necessity for Jew as for Gentile. Apart from it even Nicodemus could not see the kingdom of God.

II. The Impartation of Life

In the stupendous task of preparing and qualifying fallen, earthly beings for the company of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—even to be a suitable Bride for the Lamb—in the highest heaven and glory, the partaking of the divine nature by the impartation of the very life of God is one of the most important features of the whole transforming undertaking. The receiving of the divine nature means that the individual thus blessed has been born of God. God has become his legitimate Father and he is the Father’s legitimate son. This is a change so radical and so complete that there is thus achieved a passing from one order of being into another. Eventually in this great change the Adamic nature will be dismissed and the ego as a separate entity will represent little else than the stupendous fact of being a son of God and a rightful member in the family and household of God. The saved one will have become precisely what his new position in glory requires him to be. The basic metamorphosis which is achieved by a

birth from above—a generating wrought by the Holy Spirit—though actually now entered by all who are saved, is too often and for want of due consideration almost wholly misapprehended. The conception that regeneration by the Holy Spirit is an indefinite influence for good in the individual's present life is far below the conception set forth in the New Testament. There it is taught that a new and eternal order of being is created with indissoluble filial relations to the Creator of all things. The fact of the new birth, whether comprehended or not, is the basic and distinguishing feature of the Christian. The life of God which is eternal and which therefore Christ is has been imparted as definitely as the breath of natural life was breathed by God into Adam at the first creation. At least eighty-five New Testament passages aver that a Christian is a changed person by virtue of the fact that he has received the very life of God. Through infinite love, the Son of God was given by the Father that sinful men should not perish but have everlasting life (John 3:16). Christ said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6) and "I am come that they might have life" (John 10:10). So, also, "the gift of God is eternal life" (Rom. 6:23). That imparted life is said to be "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27). Though some slight evidence of this great change should be recognized while yet in this sphere, the full-orbed experience of the divine nature awaits the "manifestation of the sons of God." Certain present evidences of the abiding in the heart of the life of God may well be noted.

1. A Knowledge of God. From the heart with definite consciousness of His reality, the saved one will be able to say, "Abba, Father." Such a recognition of God as Father is wrought in the heart by Christ. Of this He said, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. 11:27–28). The rest here promised is that of the soul and is the result of coming to know God as Father. It is one thing to know about God, but quite another thing to know God. According to this great invitation, it is possible to come to know the Father by the gracious offices and effective working of the Son, and no soul has ever found true rest apart from this intimacy with God.

2. A New Reality in Prayer. Prayer is communion with God that has been based on confidence born of the knowledge of God. It is not natural to speak to one who is unknown and unknowable as is the case with the unsaved trying to pray; but when God is recognized and real to the heart, there is definiteness in every form of prayer and then, as at no other time or under no other conditions, the praying soul finds rest.

3. A New Reality in the Reading of God's Word. The Word of God is food only to those who have received the nature of God. As a newborn child cries for food, so will a normal Christian desire the Word of God. That Word is milk to such as are "babes" and "strong meat" to those prepared in heart to receive it.

4. A Recognition of God's Family. John places this to the front as a very dependable test of whether an individual is a child of God. He writes: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14). The Christian naturally delights in the fellowship of those who are saved. His love for them will be manifested in loving sacrifice for them. This is not human love, but an outworking of the love of God shed abroad in believing hearts from the indwelling Spirit (Rom. 5:5). In the same context mentioned above John states: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth" (1 John 3:16–18).

5. A Divine Compassion for a Lost World. The objects of the divine love are unchanged respecting their identity even when that love is reproduced in or is passing through the Christian. He will love, therefore, what God loves. This is indeed an extensive field of contemplation. Above all, the love of God for a lost world—that love which spared not His Son in consequence—will be wrought in the child of God as an unceasing burden for those who are unsaved. This constitutes a suffering in company with Christ, and for it there is great reward. "If we suffer [with Him], we shall also reign with him."

All of these experiences which have been indicated are naturally the expression of the new divine nature; but, like all Christian experience, it may be hindered and all but unobserved owing to some unspiritual condition that is allowed to exist in the heart of the believer. If the indwelling Holy Spirit who is the Reproducer of Christ in the believer is grieved, the power of His presence will not be made manifest. At this point, the danger should be recognized of judging anyone according to that one's experience or conduct. Even though every normal experience is enjoyed, yet how limitless is that which awaits the day of His manifestation!

III. Acquisition of the Nature of God

The basic fact of having a new divine nature imparted is of such a character that it must be recognized at once as a change that God alone may effect. Human effort is utterly foreign to the entire undertaking. Where would Nicodemus begin were he to attempt the achievement of his own birth from above? That alone which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Closely allied to the gift of eternal life is the impartation of the divine nature. Probably distinctions cannot be drawn between them. The child of God, receiving these realities, enters upon a career thereby in a realm of relationship which belongs to another order of existence. In truth, it is the highest form of existence—the vast reality and eternity of God. No comparison may be drawn between the acquiring of a human nature and the acquiring of the divine nature. The fundamental distinction, beyond that of their dissimilarity respecting inherent character, is the fact that the one has a beginning though no ending, while the other, being related to God, can have no beginning or ending. Relative to consciousness, the human nature is now an active reality to varying degrees, but the conscious experience of the divine nature, though something fully possessed, awaits the time of entrance into the heavenly life and abode. The increase of experimental consciousness that will break upon the child of God when removed from earth to heaven, when passing from a time mode of existence to an eternal mode, when "the power of an endless life" supplants all human limitations, is too vast for any present comprehension of it. In this earthly sphere, men are affected by prejudices, opinions, and estimations which constitute but a mere shadow of that which is true. In the coming sphere and position, all

things will be seen, and then not merely as added information may expand human capacity to understand but as God sees them, as God understands. It is then that the saved one will know even as also he is known (1 Cor. 13:12); that is, he will then know as God now knows. The phrase *as also I am known* must refer to God's present knowledge. By the enabling power of the Holy Spirit some measure of the experience of divine love, divine joy, and divine peace yet to come may be secured now. So, likewise, the knowledge of God and especially that part which He has caused to be written down in Scripture may be entered into by the same Spirit. But when the heavenly sphere is entered, there will be an entrance into unbroken and undiminished divine love, joy, and peace, and a larger understanding which is comparable to that of God Himself. All this will arise from the nature of God which is possessed and will be as unrestricted, within finite limits, as God is unrestricted. Herein lies a basis for the companionship of saints with God and with each other. Nothing can be hidden and nothing can be misunderstood. Motives will be as pure as God is pure and even the history of earth's sins, failures, and doubts will be seen only in that retrospect and understanding which belongs to God. The Christian's life in glory in all its outreach will be in the mold and pattern of that which is now deemed supernatural, namely, the *experience* to the full of the divine nature. Those who are saved are to be adapted to the sphere which is God's.

IV. Induction into the Family and Household of God

No earthly relation so unites members of the human race as does the family, and so this human kinship is the best available illustration of the heavenly association together of believers. Both the fact of father and son relationship and the fact of brotherhood appear. As indicated above, the Fatherhood of God is due to an absolute divine generation: though, as in the case of the birth of Christ, the generating is wrought by the Third Person, still the First Person is universally addressed as the Father of all who believe. The placing of an individual into the family and household of God is no mere adoption, though a believer is adopted in the sense that when born of God as His child he is at once advanced to the position of an adult son with all the privileges and responsibilities attendant on full maturity. The human practice of adoption, which merely establishes legal

responsibility over an otherwise unrelated child, imparts no parental nature and creates no actual oneness with the new parent. In human relationships, indeed, a father may by legal action repudiate his son and withdraw all responsibility toward his son, although he cannot prevent the son resembling himself in appearance, in disposition, or salient characteristics. In other words, the basic nature which generation imparts cannot be extinguished even in human spheres, just as it cannot be extinguished in divine spheres. Once a son of God always a son of God is a truth not only taught in the Scriptures, but sustained by every sonship experience known whether it be here on earth or in heaven. The family and household of God is composed of the actual and legitimate offspring of God. No such relationship is intimated between Jehovah and the Israelites. The whole nation Israel is likened to a son, but wholly as an expression describing Jehovah's care over them. The styling of a nation as a son is far removed from the generating of individuals into eternal, unalterable offspring of God. Membership in the household and family of God implies fitness for the position. For a brief time—the period of the Christian's life on earth after he is saved—the Father does get on with imperfections in His child and administers discipline; but in an eternity of reality which follows, the members of His family will demonstrate how to all infinity the saved ones have been "made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12).

V. Inheritance of a Son's Portion

Based on the actuality of sonship through the generating power of the Holy Spirit is the unavoidable fact of possession of a son's portion. The extent of that portion is indicated by the Apostle when he avers: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:16–17). The eternal sonship of Christ is in view here and into this heirship in which are included all the treasures of the universe, all the πλήρωμα of wisdom, and the infinity of authority and power, the newly constituted sons are brought as "joint-heirs with Christ." So long as the believer is detained in this world as a witness, but little use can be made of these heavenly

riches. They belong to another realm, and their enjoyment awaits the time of entrance upon the sphere to which these riches belong.

VI. God's Own Purpose to His Eternal Glory

Most arresting and encouraging is the revealed truth that all that enters into constituting a Christian what he is and what he will be in glory is wrought of God. The Apostle declares: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2:10). By so much every uncertainty about the ultimate outcome of regeneration is dismissed forever. Life's varying experience may present immediate problems; but the essential factors of salvation, preservation, and eternal glory are His to accomplish and are never made to depend upon human success, achievement, or merit. The Christian learns after he is saved— not before—that he has been "chosen in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world," that in due time and by the power of God alone he came into a saved relationship to God on the principle of grace, and that by the same divine power he will appear in glory—all in the unchangeable faithfulness of God. It is written of believers: "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:6). Great significance is to be seen in the description of a believer as one "called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28). That purpose of God is immediately defined in the context, which reads: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (vss. 29–30). To be "conformed to the image of his Son" indicates that divine sonship is to be realized on the part of the one who is saved—a sonship patterned after the very *image* of the Son of God. No word of God ever disclosed a higher estate and destiny than this; but it is yet added, "that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." Christ will indeed be First-Born in point of time and in character, the Source of all that enters into the Christian's eternal reality and glory; but the emphasis indicated here is rather on the fact that all those thus saved are His *brethren*, being begotten of God as

such and constituted actually and immutably the sons of God. Too often it is assumed that Christ came into the world so that men might have a new ideal for daily living, an example of an exalted character, or a new rule of life. When Christ said, however: "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10)—but one of about eighty-five passages bearing on this essential factor in the Christian's new being—He was speaking of an imparted life which no human being has ever received or possessed apart from the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit. With all reason, God appeals to the saved one for a daily life which is in accord with this high calling in Christ; but the need for holy living must ever be disassociated from "the gift of God [which] is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23). The possession of eternal life creates the true motive for holy living; certainly holy living will never impart divine life or substitute for a birth from above by the Spirit. A commendable daily life represents the purpose of the one who lives it; the gift of eternal life represents the eternal provision of God for man which He purposed in Christ Jesus. From this sublime truth the spiritual mind naturally advances to the contemplation of the fact that the divine purpose, like all the works of God, will yet be so realized and completed to infinity that God will be satisfied with it and be glorified by it. Thus it is concluded properly that salvation from its beginning in the eternal counsels of God, down through the provision of and exercise of redeeming grace, and on to its consummation in glory is wrought only by God and with the same purpose ever in view, namely, that it should redound to His eternal glory. He will of a certainty be glorified thus.

VII. The Basis in Faith

Reason alone would dictate the truth that, since salvation is altogether wrought of God, the individual who cares to be saved can sustain no other relation to it than to receive it in simple faith. Every aspect of salvation in its completed, past tense—release from sin's penalty, in its present tense—release from sin's power, and in its future tense—release from sin's presence, calls for dependence upon God. The great realities, namely, *forgiveness*, the *gift of eternal life*, and the *gift of righteousness* which is the

ground of justification (Rom. 3:22, 26; 4:5; 10:4), are the portion of those who do no more than to believe in Jesus as Savior. Two passages bearing upon this essential truth will suffice here: (a) John 1:12–13: “But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” It is to them that receive Christ, or believe on Him, that right both to become and to be the sons of God is accorded. This means that God’s answer to an individual’s faith in Christ is such that by the power of God he is born of God and thus becomes an actual son of His. The knowledge of the Savior upon whom faith must rest is gained from the word of God through the Spirit, hence Christ said that such are born of the Word which is symbolized by water and the Spirit (John 3:5) and the Apostle declares: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost” (Titus 3:5). (b) John 3:16: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” What statement could be more direct or conclusive than this? It is asserted that “whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Thus without exception all that enters into salvation, including the gift of eternal life, depends only on the one human requirement of believing on the Savior.

An excellent treatment of the doctrine of regeneration is included in Dr. John F. Walvoord’s book cited previously. Since this is so well stated and since the theme is so vitally important, these pages, though extended, are reproduced here.

In his introduction Dr. Walvoord states: “Few doctrines are more fundamental to effective preaching than the doctrine of regeneration. Failure to comprehend its nature and to understand clearly its necessity will cripple the efficacy of Gospel preaching. Both for the Bible teacher and the evangelist an accurate knowledge of the doctrine of regeneration is indispensable. The Biblical concept of regeneration is comparatively simple, and a study of its theological history is not entirely necessary to accurate preaching. The history of the doctrine, however, reveals its natural pitfalls and may warn the unwary of the dangers of a shallow understanding of regeneration. The doctrine of regeneration offers a rich reward to those

who contemplate its treasures and live in the light of its reality" (*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 140).

On the meaning of regeneration Dr. Walvoord writes:

> The word *regeneration* is found only twice in the New Testament (Mt. 19:28; Tit. 3:5), but it has been appropriated as the general term designating the impartation of eternal life. Only one of the two instances in the New Testament is used in this sense (Tit. 3:5), where reference is made to "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." The Greek word παλιγγενεσία is properly translated "*new birth, reproduction, renewal, re-creation*" (Thayer). It is applied not only to human beings but also to the renewed heaven and earth of the millennium (Mt. 19:28). In relation to the nature of man, it includes the various expressions used for eternal life such as *new life, new birth, spiritual resurrection, new creation, new mind, "made alive," sons of God,* and *translation into the kingdom*. In simple language, regeneration consists of all that is represented by eternal life in a human being. Theological usage of the word *regeneration* has tended to confuse rather than enrich the word. Other words such as *conversion, sanctification*, and *justification* have been either identified or included in the concept of regeneration. Roman Catholic theologians have regarded *regeneration* as including all that is embraced in salvation, not only justification and sanctification, but even glorification. Regeneration is taken to include the means, the act, the process, and the ultimate conclusion of salvation. Protestant theologians have been more cautious in extending the meaning of regeneration. The early Lutheran theologians used *regeneration* to include the whole process by which a sinner passed from his lost estate into salvation, including justification. Later Lutherans attempted a clarification of the doctrine by holding that justification did not include a transformation of life, thereby excluding sanctification from the doctrine of regeneration. The Lutheran Church continues to hold that infants are regenerated at the moment of water baptism, however, at the same time affirming that this regeneration signifies only their entrance into the visible church, not their certain salvation. Regeneration becomes then merely a preparatory work of salvation. On the subject of infant regeneration, the Lutheran theologian Valentine writes: "May the child be said to be *regenerated* by the act of Baptism? We may properly answer, Yes; but only in the sense that the established vital and grace-conveying relation, under imputed righteousness and the Holy Spirit, may be said to hold, in its provisions and forces, the final covenanted development" (*Christian Theology*, Vol. II, pp. 329–30). Valentine objects, however, to the statement that baptism regenerates children. Elsewhere, Valentine writes, "Justification *precedes* regeneration and sanctification" (*Ibid*, p. 237). It is clear that Lutheran theology does not use the term in the Biblical sense of impartation of eternal life. The Lutheran theology does, however, exclude sanctification from the doctrine of regeneration. Reformed theologians have failed to be consistent in usage also, and have shared to some extent the errors embraced by others. During the seventeenth century, conversion was used commonly as a synonym for regeneration. This usage ignored a most important fact, however—that conversion is the human act and regeneration is an act of God. Further, conversion, while usually related to regeneration, is not always so, as demonstrated by its use in connection with Peter's repentance and restoration (Lk. 22:32), as propheised by Christ. Even Calvin failed to make a proper distinction between regeneration and conversion. Charles Hodge, however, argues effectively for the necessary distinction in the meaning of these terms (*Systematic Theology*, Vol. III, pp. 3–5). Shedd agrees with Hodge and cites the following contrasts: "Regeneration, accordingly, is an act; conversion is an activity, or a process.

> Regeneration is the origination of life; conversion is the evolution and manifestation of life. Regeneration is wholly an act of God; conversion is wholly an activity of man. Regeneration is a cause; conversion is an effect. Regeneration is instantaneous; conversion is continuous" (*Dogmatic Theology*. Vol. II, p. 494). For the last century, Reformed theologians have agreed that regeneration properly designates the act of impartation of eternal life. As Charles Hodge states it: "By a consent almost universal the word *regeneration* is now used to designate, not the whole work of sanctification, nor the first states of that work comprehended in conversion, much less justification or any mere external change of state, but the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life" (*Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 5). In a study of the doctrine of regeneration, then, the inquirer is concerned only with the aspect of salvation related to the impartation of eternal life. Other important works which may attend it, be antecedent to it, or immediately follow it, must be considered as distinct works of God. —*Ibid*., pp. 140–43

So, also, of regeneration as an act of the Holy Spirit, Dr. Walvoord declares:

> Regeneration by its nature is solely a work of God. While sometimes considered as a result, every instance presumes or states that the act of regeneration was an act of God. A number of important Scriptures bear on the subject of regeneration (John 1:13; 3:3–7; 5:21; Rom. 6:13; 2 Cor. 5:17; Eph. 2:5, 10; 4:24; Tit. 3:5; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 2:9). It is explicitly stated that the one regenerated is "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:13). Regeneration is likened unto resurrection, which by its nature is wholly of God (John 5:21; Rom. 6:13; Eph. 2:5). In other instances regeneration is declared to be a creative act, the nature of which assumes it to be the act of God (Eph. 2:10; 4:24; 2 Cor. 5:17). It may be seen clearly, then, that regeneration is always revealed as an act of God accomplished by His own supernatural power apart from all other agencies. The work of regeneration is properly ascribed to the Holy Spirit. Like the work of efficacious grace, regeneration is often ascribed to God without distinction as to Persons, and in several instances is ascribed to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit severally. The First Person is declared to be the source of regeneration in at least one instance (Jas. 1:17, 18). Christ Himself is linked with regeneration several times in Scripture (John 5:21; 2 Cor. 5:17; 1 John 5:12). Again, the Holy Spirit is declared the agent of regeneration (John 3:3–7; Tit. 3:5). As in other great undertakings of the Godhead, each Person has an important part, in keeping with Their one essence. As in the birth of Christ, where all the Persons of the Godhead were related to the conception of Christ, so in the new birth of the Christian the First Person becomes the Father of the believer, the Second Person imparts His own eternal life (1 John 5:12), and the Holy Spirit, the Third Person, acts as the efficient agent of regeneration. The work of regeneration can be assigned to the Holy Spirit as definitely as the work of salvation can be assigned to Christ.— *Ibid*., pp. 143–44.

On the important truth that eternal life is imparted by regeneration, the same writer asserts:

> As the word itself implies, the central thought in the doctrine of regeneration is that eternal life is imparted. Regeneration meets the need created by the presence of spiritual death. The method of impartation is, of course, inscrutable. There is no visible method or

process discernible. By its nature it is supernatural and therefore its explanation is beyond human understanding. The Scriptures in presenting the impartation of eternal life use three figures to describe it. Regeneration is sometimes presented in the figure of new birth. As Christ told Nicodemus, “Ye must be born again” (John 3:7). In contrast to human birth of human parentage, one must be born “of God” (John 1:13) in order to become a child of God. According to James 1:18, “Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures.” The figure is eloquent in portraying the intimate relation of the child of God to his heavenly Father and in relating the kind of life the believer in Christ receives to the eternal life which is in God. Frequently in Scripture, regeneration is portrayed as spiritual resurrection. The Christian is revealed to be “alive from the dead” (Rom. 6:13), and God “even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ” (Eph. 2:5). Christ Himself said, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live” (John 5:25). The fact of our resurrection is made the basis for frequent exhortation to live as those raised from the dead (Rom. 6:13; Eph. 2:5, 6; Col. 2:12; 3:1, 2). Regeneration is also presented in the figure of creation or re-creation. We are “created in Christ Jesus unto good works” (Eph. 2:10), and exhorted to “put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4:24). The revelation of 2 Corinthians 5:17 is explicit, “Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.” The figure of creation indicates that regeneration is creative in its nature and results in a fundamental change in the individual, a new nature being added with its new capacities. The individual becomes a part of the New Creation which includes all the regenerated ones of this dispensation and Christ its Head. The new life given to the Christian is manifested in the new capacities and activities found only in those regenerated, forming the source and foundation of all other divine ministry to the saved. The important fact, never to be forgotten in the doctrine of regeneration, is that the believer in Christ has received eternal life. This fact must be kept free from all confusion of thought arising from the concept of regeneration which makes it merely an antecedent of salvation, or a preliminary quickening to enable the soul to believe. It is rather the very heart of salvation. It reaches the essential problem of absence of eternal life without which no soul can spend eternity in the presence of God. Regeneration supplies this lack of eternal life as justification and sanctification deal with the problem of sin specifically. It is a smashing blow to all philosophies which hold that man has inherent capacities of saving himself. Regeneration is wholly of God. No possible human effort however noble can supply eternal life. The proper doctrine of regeneration gives to God all glory and power due His name, and at the same time it displays His abundant provision for a race dead in sin.—*Ibid*., pp. 144–45

Again, that regeneration is not accomplished by means is well expressed by Dr. Walvoord as follows:

Reformed theology has definitely opposed the introduction of any means in accomplishing the divine act of regeneration. The question of whether means are used to effect regeneration is determined largely by the attitude taken toward efficacious grace. Pelagian and Arminian theologians, holding as they do to the cooperation of the human will and the partial ability of the will through common grace or natural powers, recognize to some extent the presence of means in the work of regeneration. If the total inability of man be recognized, and the doctrine of efficacious grace believed, it naturally follows that

regeneration is accomplished apart from means. Reformed theology in keeping with its doctrine of efficacious grace has held that the human will in itself is ineffectual in bringing about any of the changes incident to salvation of the soul. As related to faith, the human will can act by means of efficacious grace. The human will can act even apart from efficacious grace in hearing the Gospel. In the act of regeneration, however, the human will is entirely passive. There is no cooperation possible. The nature of the work of regeneration forbids any possible human assistance. As a child in natural birth is conceived and born without any volition on his part, so the child of God receives the new birth apart from any volition on his part. In the new birth, of course, the human will is not opposed to regeneration and wills by divine grace to believe, but this act in itself does not produce new birth. As in the resurrection of the human body from physical death, the body in no way assists the work of resurrection, so in the work of regeneration, the human will is entirely passive. It is not that the human will is ruled aside, nor does it waive the human responsibility to believe. It is rather that regeneration is wholly a work of God in a believing heart. All other means are likewise excluded in the work of regeneration. While regeneration is often preceded by various antecedents such as the work of common grace and accompanying influences, these must be sharply distinguished from regeneration. Even the work of efficacious grace, though simultaneous with regeneration, and indispensable to it, does not in itself effect regeneration. Efficacious grace only makes regeneration possible and certain. Regeneration in its very nature is instantaneous, an immediate act of God, and in the nature of an instantaneous act, no means are possible. The fact that regeneration is consistently revealed as an act of God and the Scriptural revelation of the doctrine of efficacious grace are sufficient evidence for excluding the possibility of the use of means in effecting regeneration.—*Ibid*., pp. 145–47

Of great import, especially to all evangelistic effort, is the word by Dr. Walvoord respecting the nonexperimental character of regeneration, which reads:

Until the matter has been considered carefully, it is a striking thought that regeneration is not experimental. In Christian testimony, much has been said of the experience of regeneration. If regeneration is instantaneous and an act of divine will, it follows that regeneration in itself is not experimental. It may be conceded freely that abundant experimental phenomena follow the act of new birth. The experiences of a normal Spirit-filled Christian may immediately ensue upon new birth. This fact does not alter the non-experimental character of regeneration. If it be admitted that regeneration is an instantaneous act of God, it is logically impossible for it to be experimental, in that experience involves time and sequence of experience. It may be concluded, therefore, that no sensation attends the act of new birth, all experience proceeding rather from the accomplished regeneration and springing from the new life as its source. In the nature of the case, we cannot experience what is not true, and regeneration must be entirely wrought before experience can be found. While the regenerated soul may become immediately conscious of new life, the act of regeneration itself is not subject to experience or analysis, being the supernatural instantaneous act of God. The non-experimental nature of regeneration if comprehended would do much to deliver the unsaved from the notion that an experience of some sort is antecedent to salvation, and, in turn, it would prevent those seeking to win souls of expecting in partial form the fruits of salvation before regeneration takes place. The popular notion that one must *feel* different *before* being saved has prevented many from the simplicity of faith in

Christ and the genuine regeneration that God alone can effect. The non-experimental nature of regeneration has also, unfortunately, opened the door for the teaching of infant regeneration as held by the Lutheran Church. It is argued that if regeneration is not experimental, there is no valid reason why infants cannot be regenerated. Even Shedd approves the idea of infant regeneration on the ground that regeneration is not experimental in the following statement: "Regeneration is a work of God in the human soul that is below consciousness. There is no internal sensation caused by it. No man was ever conscious of that instantaneous act of the Holy Spirit by which he was made a new creature in Christ Jesus. And since the work is that of God alone, there is no necessity that man should be conscious of it. This fact places the infant and the adult upon the same footing, and makes infant regeneration as possible as that of adults. Infant regeneration is taught in Scripture. Luke 1:15, 'He shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb.' Luke 18:15, 16, 'Suffer little children to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of God.' Acts 2:39, 'The promise is unto your children.' 1 Cor. 7:14, 'Now are your children holy.' Infant regeneration is also taught symbolically. (*a*) By infant circumcision in the Old Testament; (*b*) By infant baptism in the New Testament" (*Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 505–6). It is doubtful if any of the proof texts offered by Shedd really prove infant regeneration. While it is true that many Christians never know a crisis-experience to which the act of new birth may be traced, there is no certain Scripture warrant for affirming infant regeneration, at least in the present age. The normal pattern for regeneration is that it occurs at the moment of saving faith. No appeal is ever addressed to men that they should believe because they are already regenerated. It is rather that they should believe and receive eternal life. Christians are definitely told that before they accepted Christ they were "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1). The case of those who die before reaching the age of responsibility is a different problem. The proper position seems to be that infants are regenerated at the moment of their death, not before, and if they live to maturity, they are regenerated at the moment they accept Christ. Infant baptism, certainly, is not efficacious in effecting regeneration, and the Reformed position is in contrast to the Lutheran on this point. The doctrine of infant regeneration, if believed, so confuses the doctrine as to rob it of all its decisive character. No one should be declared regenerated who cannot be declared saved for all eternity—. *Ibid*., pp. 147–49

In concluding his thesis on regeneration, Dr. Walvoord writes of the *effect* of regeneration and indicates truth respecting a new nature, a new experience, and a new security. Of all this he says:

The work of regeneration is tremendous in its implications. A soul once dead has received the eternal life which characterizes the being of God. The effect of regeneration is summed up in the fact of possession of eternal life. All other results of regeneration are actually an enlargement of the fact of eternal life. While life itself is difficult to define, and eternal life is immaterial, certain qualities belong to anyone who is regenerated in virtue of the fact that eternal life abides in him.

In the nature of eternal life, it involves first of all the creation of a divine nature in the regenerated person. Without eradicating the old nature with its capacity and will for sin, the new nature has in it the longing for God and His will that we could expect would ensue from eternal life. The presence of the new nature constitutes a fundamental change in the person which is denominated "creation" (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15) and "new man" (Eph. 4:24). A drastic change in manner of life, attitude toward God and to the things of God, and in the

desires of the human heart may be expected in one receiving the new nature. The new nature which is a part of regeneration should not be confused with the sinless nature of Adam before the fall. Adam's nature was a human nature untried and innocent of sin. It did not have as its source and determining its nature the eternal life which is bestowed on a regenerated person. The human nature of Adam was open to sin and temptation and was peccable. It is doubtful whether the divine nature bestowed in connection with regeneration is ever involved directly in sin. While the Scriptures are clear that a regenerated person can sin, and does sin, the lapse is traced to the sin nature, even though the act is that of the whole person. This must not be confused with various statements to the effect that a Christian can be sinless or unable to sin. The state of sinless perfection can never be reached until the sin nature is cast out, and this is accomplished only through the death of the physical body or the transformation of the body without death at the rapture. Even the new nature, though never the origin of sin, does not have the ability sufficient to conquer the old nature. The power for victory lies in the indwelling presence of God. The new nature provides a will to do the will of God, and the power of God provides the enablement to accomplish this end in spite of the innate sinfulness of the sin nature. The state of being in the will of God is reached when the will of the new nature is fully realized. Eternal life and the new nature are inseparably united, the nature corresponding to the life which brings it into being.

While regeneration in itself is not experimental, it is the fountain of experience. The act of impartation of eternal life being instantaneous cannot be experienced, but the presence of eternal life after regeneration is the source of the new spiritual experience which might be expected. New life brings with it new capacity. The person who before regeneration was dead spiritually and blind to spiritual truth now becomes alive to a new world of reality. As a blind man for the first time contemplates the beauties of color and perspective when sight is restored, so the new-born soul contemplates new revelation of spiritual truth. For the first time he is able to understand the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit. He is able now to enjoy the intimacies of fellowship with God and freedom in prayer. As his life is under the control of the Holy Spirit, he is able to manifest the fruit of the Spirit, utterly foreign to the natural man. His whole being has new capacities for joy and sorrow, love, peace, guidance, and all the host of realities in the spiritual world. While regeneration is not an experience, it is the foundation for all Christian experience. This at once demands that regeneration be inseparable from salvation, and that regeneration manifest itself in the normal experiences of a yielded Christian life. Regeneration that does not issue into Christian experience may be questioned.

One of the many reasons for confusion in the doctrine of regeneration is the attempt to avoid the inevitable conclusion that a soul once genuinely regenerated is saved forever. The bestowal of eternal life cannot be revoked. It declares the unchangeable purpose of God to bring the regenerated person to glory. Never in the Scriptures do we find anyone regenerated a second time. While Christians may lose much of a normal spiritual experience through sin, and desperately need confession and restoration, the fact of regeneration does not change. In the last analysis, the experiences of this life are only antecedent to the larger experiences the regenerated person will have after deliverance from the presence and temptation of sin. Regeneration will have its ultimate display when the person regenerated is completely sanctified and glorified. Our present experiences, limited as they are by the presence of a sinful nature and sinful body, are only a partial portrayal of the glories of eternal life. Through the experiences of life, however, the fact of regeneration should be a source of constant hope and abiding confidence "that he which hath begun a good work … will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:16).—*Ibid.,* pp. 149–51

Conclusion

Regeneration is a most essential step in that preparation which must be made if individuals from this fallen race are to be constituted worthy dwellers within that highest of all spheres and made associates there with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It becomes one of the greatest facts in the whole universe. Its full extent and value will be seen not on earth or in time, but in glory and for all eternity.

Chapter X

The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit

From the doctrinal viewpoint or as a foundation for all truth respecting the relation between the Holy Spirit and the believer in the present age, there is no more characterizing or determining fact than that the Holy Spirit indwells every regenerated person. To fail to recognize the body of Scripture upon which this distinction in doctrine rests is to misapprehend one of the most essential factors in the Christian's being, to conceive of the Christian as totally unprepared for the high and holy requirements which are laid upon him, to open the door for the promotion of unscriptural assumptions relative to personal holiness, and to create unwarranted divisions in the Body of Christ. No student should pass over this aspect of truth lightly. No progress can be made in the knowledge of the Holy Spirit's relation to the believer until this feature in the doctrine of the Spirit is recognized and accepted as declared by the Sacred Text. The failure to discern that the Holy Spirit indwells every believer was the common and all but universal error of men two generations ago. That error was promoted in the early Keswick conferences and received and taught generally throughout Great Britain and America. However, American expositors of the last two generations have done much to recover this important doctrine from this and other similar misconceptions. The notion that the Holy Spirit is received as a second work of grace is now defended only by extreme holiness groups. In other words, it is more clearly understood than it was earlier that there can be no such a thing as a Christian who is not indwelt by the Holy Spirit. This truth is so emphatically declared in the New Testament that it seems almost impossible that any other view could ever have been entertained. It will be remembered that the ministry of the Spirit as One who indwells is but one of His present benefits and is not to be confused with His baptism, His sealing, or His filling. Of these other works, more will yet be presented. Though, as has been observed, the presence of the Holy Spirit in the believer may not be indicated by any corresponding revolutionary experience, His indwelling is nonetheless one of the most characterizing of all the features which constitute a Christian what he is (cf.

Rom. 8:8–9). The same indwelling of the Holy Spirit becomes, as well, an age-characterization. This is a dispensation of the Spirit, a period of time in which the Holy Spirit is the believer's all-sufficient Resource both for power and guidance. In this age the Christian is appointed to live by a new life-principle (cf. Rom. 6:4). The realization of the Spirit's presence, power, and guidance constitutes a wholly new method of daily living and is in contrast to that dominance and authority which the Mosaic Law exercised over Israel in the age that is past. In Romans 7:6 it is written: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." The phrase *newness of Spirit* is in contrast to the phrase *oldness of the letter*. These do not refer to spiritualizing and literal methods for interpretation of the truth; they rather indicate different divine economies which characterize two different dispensations. The age now past is marked off by the letter of the law, in which age no provision for enablement was ever made. The present age is distinguished as a period of the indwelling Spirit, whose presence provides every resource for the realization of a God-honoring daily life. The same distinction is presented in 2 Corinthians 3:6, which reads: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." So far from enabling, the law was a ministry of condemnation and death (cf. Rom. 7:4, 6, 10–11). Over against this, the indwelling Spirit is now an unlimited Resource who sustains in every aspect of human life. Recognizing the same contrast in principles by which men's lives in two different dispensations have been guided, the Apostle avers in Galatians 5:18: "But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Thus it is to be seen that because of the new provision made available every Christian from the least unto the greatest has been equipped with the needed sufficiency whereby every supernatural responsibility may be fully discharged to the glory of God. The Christian does face problems of adjustment, but his is never the problem of acquiring the Spirit or enablement. To walk by means of the Holy Spirit is a wholly new technique; since every child of God is charged with a life which is superhuman, however, each one without exception has received the Spirit and each one is therefore confronted with the necessity, if he would fulfill

the divine ideal, of living his life in the enabling power of the Spirit, new technique though it is.

The fact of the Holy Spirit's indwelling should be recognized in its own uncomplicated features. This ministry must be distinguished from other ministries which are His, regardless of the dependence which other ministries sustain to this one. Confusion arises more often than otherwise between the truth respecting the indwelling of the Spirit and that respecting His filling. The filling depends upon personal adjustments, which adjustments will be set forth in a later chapter of this volume; and because of this dependence upon adjustments human weakness may be manifested and thus the experience of the filling with the Spirit may not be secured at all, while in other cases the filling may be characterized as partial, variable, or complete. No imperfect filling with the Spirit is satisfactory to God, for He commands all Christians without any allowances to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18). The indwelling, being a feature of salvation and secured by saving faith, is common to all regenerate persons alike. The Holy Spirit is received but once and He never departs; but there are many fillings as need for them arise. The Spirit indwells without necessarily engendering an experience; but the filling is directed unto love, joy, peace, and the full measure of life and service. That the Spirit indwells every Christian is asserted by revelation and is demanded by reason. Consideration of these two widely different approaches to this truth is now in order, besides which there must be notice in due course of two related ministries of the Spirit, namely, anointing and sealing.

I. According to Revelation

The contemplation of the truth relative to the Holy Spirit's indwelling should be with due recognition of His other ministries to the believer, for not one of them is complete within itself, but hinges of course upon the Spirit's presence. However, in the interest of a true evaluation, an analysis of each ministry is required separately. Each must be considered in its own peculiar and individual character. The Scriptures abundantly sustain the truth of the Spirit's indwelling, which ministry is to be examined here. The major passages are now to be taken up in their order by books, every one in its context.

John 7:37–39. “In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)”

This prediction spoken by Christ before His death anticipates the present age and asserts that in this age all who *believe* receive the Holy Spirit when they believe. In other words, the Spirit is received on precisely the same condition and at the same moment as salvation is achieved. Two operations of faith are not implied; the sole human instrumentality in salvation is believing and that complete salvation which is thus secured includes the coming of the Spirit to indwell the one who is saved. Being an essential feature of salvation, the human condition for indwelling, when that aspect of soteriological truth is considered separately, is believing and only believing. It therefore follows from this passage that the Holy Spirit is given to all who believe and when they believe. The Spirit was not yet given when Christ spoke, nor could He be given until Christ was glorified (cf. John 16:7). Incidentally, a very clear distinction is drawn here between the saints of the former dispensation and those of the present. New and far-reaching realities certainly belong to those who are identified with the glorified Christ.

John 14:16–17; 1 John 2:27. “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you … But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.”

Here the same implication, which under due consideration cannot be misconstrued, is present, to the effect that each Christian has received the Holy Spirit; but an added truth is advanced which is of immeasurable import to doctrine of the Spirit’s indwelling, namely, that, having taken up His abode in the believer, His presence is never removed. He abides there forever. As important as it is in itself, a correct manner of life does not enter

into the terms upon which the Spirit indwells, any more than it enters into the terms of salvation. However, a holy life does enter into the terms upon which the child of God may be filled with the Spirit. It is the very presence of the Holy Spirit, to be sure, which calls for a holy life. When correcting the Corinthian believers respecting their unspiritual practices, the Apostle said: “What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s” (1 Cor. 6:19–20). The dread lest the Holy Spirit might depart from the heart has been a deep sorrow to multitudes in past generations. Their unwarranted exercise of soul was well expressed in a verse of a hymn by William Cowper often sung:

Return, O Holy Dove, return,
Sweet Messenger of rest:
I hate the sins that made Thee mourn,
And drove Thee from my breast.

It is doubtful whether the passages under consideration could be more positively denied than they are by this bit of poetry.

Acts 11:17. “Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?”

This passage records Peter’s account of the first preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. That which arrested the Apostle’s attention on that memorable occasion of which he speaks is that the Gentiles, as had the Jews at Pentecost, received the Holy Spirit when they believed on Christ. That reception was and is a part of salvation itself. The indwelling presence of the Spirit is God’s gift to those who believe.

Romans 5:5. “And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”

A more literal rendering of this Scripture is to the effect that the love of God gushes forth from the believer’s heart, and that divine love proceeds from the Holy Spirit who is given unto him to dwell within. This text is the first in order out of several which declare specifically that the Spirit is given alike to all who are saved. The universality of the gift of the Spirit is asserted here in the use of the pronoun *us*, which word cannot by any right

interpretation be made to represent a select or particular group of Christians. If it be contended, as too often it is, that there are saved ones who have not received the Holy Spirit, the answer found here, as likewise in other passages yet to be considered, is that the pronoun *us* cannot be limited, for it represents *all* who are saved.

Romans 8:9. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

This declaration is dogmatic and final. If any man have not, which means as an indwelling presence, the Spirit of Christ — distinctly a title of the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit come from Christ and sent into the world (cf. John 16:7)—he is none of His. The ground of this statement is most reasonable. Among other things and quite above many things, the Christian is characterized by the fact that he has received the divine nature. No such being could exist as a Christian who does not possess the divine life which is essential to his newly created self. That new life is often declared to be none other than the Holy Spirit.

Romans 8:23. "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

Again a universal meaning inheres in the word *ourselves*. This term can refer to no class or group within the Christian fellowship; it reaches to all. And the positive averment is that all have the first-fruits which only the presence of the Holy Spirit secures.

1 Corinthians 2:12. "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God."

Similarly, as above, the pronoun *we* attests an all-inclusive company of believers. It is God's purpose that everyone of all who are saved shall be instructed relative to those truths which can enter the human understanding only by divine revelation. No consideration could be given even for a moment to the assumption that the Spirit's ministry of teaching, which is set forth in this context (cf. vss. 9–16), is intended only for a restricted company within all those who are saved. It follows that, if it is God's purpose for all His children alike to know the glorious revelations He has in store for them, they must alike be in close and vital relation to the Holy

Spirit their Teacher. God could not expect any believer to make progress in the knowledge of Himself or to be informed about His will for them if, perchance, that believer were not in possession of the Spirit, the divine Teacher who alone reveals the things of God. This great provision and necessity is declared in no uncertain terms when it is said: “Now we have received … the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.”

1 Corinthians 6:19–20. “What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.”

This passage serves again to answer completely those who contend that the Spirit is given only to a favored group, and especially does it answer the claim that He is given only to those who are yielded and faithful in their lives. This appeal, cited above, is to believers in criticism of whom the Apostle has declared that they are carnal (cf. 3:1–4), fornicators (cf. 5:1), disregarding their right relation to God and to each other (cf. 6:1–8); yet they are, all the same, intreated to turn from these unholy ways on the ground of the fact that their bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit. It will not do to reverse this appeal, as some do, and assert that Christians like the Corinthians, if they turned from their sins, would be rewarded by the presence of the indwelling Holy Spirit. The direct reason for invoking a holy life is that believers are already temples of the Spirit. Therefore, it is not a question of securing the Spirit by a holy life, but rather of a holy life being expected from one who has received the Spirit. This is the fundamental order of the grace relationship to God. The Mosaic merit system would say, “Be good so that ye may become the temples of the Holy Spirit”; grace says, “Ye are the temples of the Holy Spirit, therefore be good.”

1 Corinthians 12:13. “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.”

The same unworthy Corinthians are again said to have all been “made to drink into one Spirit” — not some of them, but *all* of them. In this same verse it is also declared that these same carnal believers have, every one, been joined to the Lord by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is not more

difficult to believe that all believers are indwelt by the Spirit than it is to believe that all have been baptized by the Spirit into the Body of Christ. Both truths are clearly taught in the New Testament and in neither case is the work wrought because of personal worthiness in the child of God, but simply in answer to the faith which results in salvation—that gracious work of which both the indwelling and the baptism of the Spirit are integral parts.

2 Corinthians 5:5. "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit."

An earnest is a partial payment which is given in advance and which guarantees the final payment of the whole. The divine blessing which the presence and power of the indwelling Spirit secures, being an earnest, guarantees the full and final realization of all God's measureless provisions for the believer in glory. In business transactions, similarly, a down payment binds the whole with assurance that it will be paid in full and that it will be paid in the same kind. Not only does the gift of the Spirit assure the fulfillment of every promise which God has made, but it indicates the character of that which is yet to come. The Spirit is designated an *earnest* in three New Testament passages–2 Corinthians 1:22; 5:5; Ephesians 1:14—and it would be unwarranted indeed to assume that this foretaste of all of heaven's glories is withheld from even one of the least of all saints. His abiding presence is assured the Christian, since He Himself must indwell to be the Earnest which He is.

Galatians 3:2. "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?"

The assurance given in this text is that the Galatians had received the Spirit in answer to saving faith, that is, as a feature of their salvation. Thus it is taught again that the Spirit becomes the indwelling presence in every individual who is saved and at the moment he is saved.

Galatians 4:6. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

This determining Scripture is wholly contradicted by the theory that the Spirit is given in answer to personal sanctification. Rather it is because of the fact that believers are *sons* that the Spirit is given unto them, and this procedure of necessity must include every son.

1 John 3:24; 4:13. "And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit

which he hath given us … Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit."

These passages serve to seal and confirm the truth that the Holy Spirit being given unto *us* is given to all who are saved. Not a single one born of God could be excluded.

The conclusion to be drawn from this clear and extended body of Scripture is that the Holy Spirit is a living presence in every Christian; on the basis of this determining fact other relationships between the Spirit and the believer are built. It is evident that once a misinterpretation of this basic truth arises there will also come misconceptions of those other ministries of the Spirit which are built thereon.

Certain passages, because of their dispensational setting or because of their wording, have been assumed by some to contradict the body of Scripture which declares that the Holy Spirit indwells and is a permanent presence in every Christian. A discussion of the doctrine of the indwelling of the Spirit would be incomplete apart from a consideration of these passages.

1 Samuel 16:14. "But the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him."

In an age when the Holy Spirit did not indwell the saints universally and when He exercised sovereign freedom in entering and leaving those upon whom He came, it was wholly in order for the Spirit to leave King Saul and especially as a judgment upon him.

Psalm 51:11. "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me."

Thus within the same dispensation as that of King Saul and doubtless remembering God's judgments upon the former king, David prays that he may be spared the same judgment. He knows that the Spirit might in complete freedom—so far as any promise to the contrary was concerned—leave him never to return. Evidently, David was conscious to some extent of the advantage and blessing which the presence of the Spirit meant to him.

Luke 11:13. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"

Because it is located in the New Testament and because it was spoken by Christ, many have concluded that this passage must be incorporated into the

general doctrine of the Spirit's relation to the Christian. Great error and misunderstanding have thus been engendered. There are two widely separated provisions with no reconciliation between them at this point in Pneumatology and there is no occasion to attempt their reconciliation. The passage under consideration conditions reception of the Holy Spirit upon asking, whereas the Christian, as has been seen, receives the Holy Spirit without any asking as a part of his salvation and when he believes. The Spirit, consequently, is now given to those who do no more than believe. In the dispensational divisions of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which were declared at the beginning of this volume, it was pointed out that the period between the baptism of Christ and the Day of Pentecost was characterized by transition, and in that period Christ offered the Spirit to those who would ask for Him. This provision of His was so in advance of the relation which the Spirit sustained to the saints in Old Testament times, to which relationship the apostles were in some measure adjusted, that there is no record they ever ventured on to this new ground; accordingly at the end of His earth-ministry, Christ said: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever" (John 14:16). This introduces an entirely different relationship to the Spirit. The disciples were not now to receive the Holy Spirit in answer to their own petition, but in answer to the petition of Christ. Thus it is indicated that the Holy Spirit has now been given because of Christ's prayer and to all who believe. As 1 Samuel 16:14 and Psalm 51:11 serve to demonstrate that the experience of the Old Testament saints cannot be made the norm of Christian experience, in like manner Luke 11:13, which was for the disciples between Christ's baptism and the Day of Pentecost, cannot be made the norm of present experience.

Four passages yet remain to be considered which are often supposed to teach that the Spirit is received as a step or experience subsequent to salvation. These Scriptures fall within the present divine relationship of the Spirit. They are:

Acts 5:32. "And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him."

The use of this text to prove the Holy Spirit is given only to those who are obedient to the will of God in their daily lives is possible only when there is failure to recognize that the adherence here indicated is that of the

unsaved to the gospel of their salvation. The context clearly sustains that interpretation and, besides, obedience to the gospel as a requirement for salvation is enjoined in other New Testament passages. The Apostle writes of the vengeance that shall fall on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ (2 Thess. 1:8). To make the reception of the Holy Spirit to depend on obedience in daily life is to ignore the whole body of Scripture already presented in which He is seen to be present in every believer, and then to assign to the Christian the ability to be obedient within his own strength, whereas the faithful life is lived only through the power that the indwelling Spirit provides. Who, indeed, would ever comply with the requirement of obedience if that adherence were exalted, as it would have to be, to the last demand of infinite righteousness?

Acts 8:14–20. "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."

There is introduced by this passage what would seem to be an exception to all other direct teachings by which it is established that the Holy Spirit is bestowed in this age as a gift upon all who believe and when they believe. An exception of such a character would, because of its contradictory nature, be most serious. That the passage records an exception to the present order, indeed, is freely admitted. It is well to note, however, that, as before indicated, the final order for this age and for people other than the Jews was not established until the experience in Cornelius' house as recorded in Acts 10:44–46. The introduction of the Spirit's relation to Jews who received Christ was accomplished on the Day of Pentecost, and intimations in various passages suggest the importance which the Spirit assigns to this event. As certainly as the Spirit was to be given in due time to Samaritans and to Gentiles, as certainly as they had no part in Pentecost, and as surely

as it was important in the gift of the Spirit to avoid a superior attitude on the part of Jews over Samaritans and Gentiles, it was necessary to mark the initial reception of the gospel by each of these groups with a distinctive emphasis on the ministry of the Spirit in their behalf. There is no claim made whatever that here in Samaria was a repetition of Pentecost; it is merely to point out that no ground was allowed believing Jews—altogether prone to look askance at Gentiles—for the assumption that they, having had the experience of Pentecost, were superior to all others. It is of significance when Peter declares that the manifestation of the Spirit in Cornelius' house was a reminder to him of Pentecost (Acts 11:15). The record respecting Samaria as given in the above passage, then, is of a special demonstration of the Holy Spirit and to the end that the gospel might be sealed to the Samaritans with undiminished power. A notable and much needed exception to the order of this age was thereby introduced.

Acts 19:1–6. "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."

In the first place, the term *disciple* is not synonymous with the term *Christian*. A disciple is a follower or learner, and furthermore to be a disciple of John the Baptist was far removed from being saved through faith in Christ, crucified and risen. The Apostle, having missed certain realities in these twelve men, which realities belong to regenerated persons, inquired, *Upon believing* did ye receive the Holy Spirit? This is a more accurate rendering (cf. R.V.; also Eph. 1:13), and this question drew out the answer which at once revealed their unsaved condition. Thereupon the Apostle turned their attention to Christ as the one to trust, and having believed they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, signs following this exceptional case too as in the previous ones cited and for the same reasons.

Ephesians 1:13. “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.”

All the difficulty which this passage seems to present is due to a misleading translation. The passage can be read, *Upon believing ye were sealed* (cf. R.V.). Believing is the logical, but not the chronological, cause of the sealing. Believers are sealed when they believe and because they believe.

II. In Relation to Anointing

Since the Spirit’s indwelling and His anointing are in reality the same, the three references to the Holy Spirit as an anointing should be included in this chapter. By the same conclusive arguments from revelation as given above, the anointing is seen to be, like the indwelling, a present fact in every believer’s life. These passages include:

2 Corinthians 1:21–22. “Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.”

Four immediate results of the Spirit’s indwelling are herewith suggested: (a) The baptism with the Spirit places the believer in Christ; thus each child of God is said now to be “stablished … in Christ” (1 Cor. 12:13; 6:17; Gal. 3:27). (b) Likewise, by giving us the Spirit, God hath anointed us. (c) Again, God through the Spirit hath sealed us (Eph. 4:30), and the Spirit Himself is the seal. (d) So, also, God is here said to have given us the Spirit as an “earnest,” and since an earnest is a part of the purchase money, or property, given in advance as security for the remainder, the Spirit is seen to be the earnest of the whole heavenly inheritance which belongs to every believer through infinite grace (2 Cor. 5:5; Eph. 1:14; 1 Pet. 1:4).

1 John 2:20 (*R.V.*). “And ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things.”

Here, again, it is implied that every Christian, being anointed, is indwelt by the Spirit and therefore is in the way of knowing those “deep things” of God which are alone imparted by the indwelling Spirit (1 Cor. 2:10, 12, 15; John 16:12–15).

1 John 2:27. "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him."

In this passage, the important truth disclosed is that the anointing abides. The Spirit actually may be grieved (Eph. 4:30), but He is never grieved away. He may be quenched, or resisted (1 Thess. 5:19), but He never departs (John 14:16).

By all this it is demonstrated that there is no Scripture which contradicts the clear witness of the New Testament to the truth that all believers are permanently indwelt by the Holy Spirit once they believe.

III. According to Reason

As certainly as it is urged upon all who are saved to live a supernatural life, so certainly are all in need of that enabling power which the Holy Spirit supplies. God has not mocked even one of His redeemed ones by placing a superhuman task upon him without at the same time providing the resources whereby he may do all His will. It may therefore be the testimony of reason that every believer has received the Holy Spirit. It is not claimed that every believer is filled with the Spirit, thereby to attain all of God's will for him. The filling depends upon human adjustments to the Spirit within and these too often fail. On the other hand, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is God's responsibility toward His child with no human condition involved other than that faith shall be exercised which secures salvation with all of its features. Since it is so completely His undertaking and since He is ever faithful in all that is His to do, there could be no such thing as a Christian who is not provided with all the resources by which he may do God's will. Again, a protest is registered against the notion that by self-strength and effort the believer is ever able to make himself fit for the receiving of the Holy Spirit. This could not be true since the strength to do the will of God is available only by the new plan for daily living under grace derived from the fact of the indwelling Spirit. Christ declared, "Apart from me ye can do nothing," but a merit system ever contends that quite apart from Christ the individual must do everything in order to merit His presence and blessing.

Reason, therefore, dictates that since a holy life is as much demanded of one Christian as another and since there are not two standards for daily life —one for those who have the Spirit and one for those who have not—and also since every requirement addressed to the believer is supernatural in its scope, the Holy Spirit must be given to all alike. The fact that God addresses all Christians as though they possessed the Spirit is sufficient evidence that all have the Spirit.

A summarization of the teachings of the Bible on the fact of the indwelling Spirit is made by Dr. John F. Walvoord as follows:

> While the indwelling of the Holy Spirit begins at the same moment as other tremendous undertakings by God for the newly saved soul, a careful distinction must be maintained between these various works of God. Indwelling is not synonymous with regeneration. While the new life of the believer is divine and by its nature identified with God's life, the possession of divine life and divine presence are distinct. The work of baptism by the Spirit is also to be distinguished from indwelling. Baptism occurs once and for all and relates to separation from the world and union with Christ. Indwelling, while beginning at the same moment as baptism, is continuous. As will be indicated in the ensuing material, the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit does have a most intimate relation to the sealing of the Holy Spirit, the presence of the Holy Spirit constituting the seal. Probably the most difficult distinction is that of the indwelling and filling of the Spirit. The two doctrines are closely related, yet are not synonymous. Filling relates wholly to experience, while indwelling is not experimental, in itself. In the Old Testament period, a few saints were filled temporarily without being permanently indwelt by the Spirit. While filled with the Spirit, Old Testament saints could in one sense be considered also indwelt, but not in the permanent unchanging way revealed in the New Testament. In the Church age, it is impossible for anyone to be filled with the Spirit who is not indwelt. Indwelling is the abiding presence of the Spirit, while the filling of the Spirit indicates the ministry and extent of control of the Spirit over the individual. Indwelling is not active. All the ministry of the Spirit and experience related to fellowship and fruit issues from the filling of the Spirit. Hence, while we are never exhorted to be indwelt, we are urged to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18). The importance of the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christian cannot be overestimated. It constitutes a significant proof of grace, and of divine purpose in connection with fruitfulness and sanctification. The presence of the Holy Spirit is our "earnest" of the blessing ahead (2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:14). The presence of the Spirit not only brings all assurance of God's constant care and ministry in this life, but the unfailing purpose of God to fulfill all His promises to us. The presence of the Holy Spirit makes the body of the believer a temple of God (1 Cor. 6:19). It reveals the purpose of God that the Spirit be resident in the earth during the present age. To surrender this doctrine or to allow its certainty to be questioned strikes a major blow at the whole system of Christian doctrine. The blessed fact that God has made the earthly bodies of Christians His present earthly temple renders to life and service a power and significance which is at the heart of all Christian experience.—*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 173–75

IV. In Relation to Sealing

Much truth which pertains to the Christian's salvation presents that which in its essential character is more an advantage to God than it is to the one who is saved. This is especially true of the fact of the Spirit's sealing, which sealing serves as a classification and an identification peculiar to heaven and the outworking of the divine purpose. It is the very presence of the Holy Spirit in the believer which constitutes the seal. Thus this aspect of truth is closely related to the doctrine of the Spirit's indwelling. Reference is made to the Spirit's sealing in three New Testament passages—2 Corinthians 1:22; Ephesians 1:13 and 4:30. These passages read: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. … In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise. … And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." It will be observed that this is a work of God since there is no appeal to any person, saved or unsaved, to pray for or to strive for this reality. Since it belongs to all believers, it is evidently wrought by God at the moment one is saved and as an essential factor in salvation. The rendering of Ephesians 1:13 by the words "After that ye believed, ye were sealed" is misleading. The more correct translation (cf. R.V.) would be: "When ye believed, ye were sealed." Naturally only those who believe are sealed and thus the act of believing becomes logically, though not chronologically, the cause of the sealing. There is a very vital assurance in Ephesians 4:30 relative to the eternal character of the sealing and thus of the salvation of which it forms a part. The future consummation of salvation when the body is redeemed is in view. Based as it is upon the merit and worthiness of Christ, salvation is as secure and as enduring as it is because of the foundation on which it stands. It is therefore no new or incredible idea that the sealing of the Spirit would mark off the full measure and intent of God with respect to those who are saved according to His purpose (cf. Rom. 8:28). Though there is no corresponding experience connected with the sealing of the Spirit, this peculiar ministry is, nevertheless, real and should call forth ceaseless praise to God as faith lays hold of that which God has revealed.

Chapter XI

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit

Since by the Spirit's baptism the greatest transformations are wrought in behalf of the believer, it is to be expected that Satan, the enemy of God, will do all within his power to distract, misdirect, and confuse investigation respecting this specific ministry of the Holy Spirit. This harm Satan has been permitted to do. Not only is there need that all the false conceptions be corrected which have reached the masses of unsuspecting people, but special attention is demanded on the part of those who would be instructed lest they themselves fail to comprehend the precise truth which the doctrine embraces. No further explanation than the influence of Satan is needed for the otherwise inexplicable disarrangement and ignorance of, together with a corresponding prejudice toward, this specific doctrine. It is the strategic point at which Satan can accomplish most in obliterating the effect of the present truth. This nullifying of the truth is seen in at least three most important fields of doctrine, namely, the believer's positions and standing in Christ, his eternal security, and the ground of the only effective motive for a God-honoring daily life.

In attempting to arrive at a right understanding of the essential character of this ministry of the Holy Spirit, four general divisions of the subject will be considered: (1) the meaning of the word βαπτίζω, (2) the determining Scriptures, (3) the thing accomplished, and (4) its distinctive character.

I. The Word Βαπτιζω

More than passing significance should be attached to the fact that the same word βαπτίζω is used in the New Testament both for real and ritual baptism, thus signifying a bond of relationship between these two aspects of truth. The word would hardly be employed properly had it a separate unrelated meaning in the one instance. The basic word of this root, Βάπτω, in its primary import connotes a dipping and occurs but three times in the New Testament—Luke 16:24; John 13:26; and Revelation 19:13. In its secondary meaning, which is to dye or stain—that usually accomplished by dipping, but not always so—the word appears but once and that in the third

passage cited above, which reads, “And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.” The same event and situation are presented in Isaiah 63:1–6 wherein among other details it is written: “Where-fore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment” (vss. 2–3). The garments of the returning Messiah are not dipped in a vat of blood, rather they have been sprinkled and stained with blood; yet this is still described by βάπτω in the LXX. In like manner, the word βαπτίζω has both a primary and secondary meaning. In its primary sense it indicates an intusposition, a physical envelopment in an element, which element has power to influence or change that which it envelops. In its secondary meaning, however, βαπτίζω, as in the case of the secondary meaning of βάπτω, departs somewhat from the original physical aspect and refers to one thing being brought under the transforming power or influence of another thing. None could speak with more authority respecting the precise meaning of βαπτίζω than Dr. James W. Dale because of his extensive research. He defines this word in its secondary meaning thus: “Whatever is capable of thoroughly changing the character, state, or condition of any object, is capable of baptizing that object; and by such change of character, state, or condition does, in fact, baptize it” (*Classic Baptism*, 2nd ed., p. 354). Such a definition is most important since the great majority of New Testament usages of this word are wholly within its secondary meaning. In the course of his great works on the subject of baptism, Dr. Dale asserts that the word is, in his opinion, never used in the New Testament in any other than its secondary meaning. Here it should be noted that the same distinction obtains between the Greek words βάπτω and βαπτίζω as between their English equivalents, namely, to *dip* and to *immerse*. A dipping is a momentary contact involving two actions, the putting in and the taking out, while immersing implies but one action, that of putting in. In the strict and proper use of the words, regardless of the all but universal careless way in which they are employed, ritual baptism is never an immersion, which immersion would result in death by drowning. What has commonly been termed an immersion is better described by βάπτω in the primary meaning of that word. No physical

intusposition certainly is in view when the Scriptures speak of a baptism unto repentance (Matt. 3:11), a baptism unto the remission of sins (Mark 1:4), a baptism unto the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19), Christ's own being baptized by drinking the cup of suffering (Matt. 20:23; Luke 12:50), a baptism of Israel unto Moses (1 Cor. 10:2), a baptism wrought by the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart, that is, the baptism of a believer into the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13). These baptisms, let it be repeated, represent no physical intusposition and must be classed as belonging to the secondary use of βαπτίζω. Not one could be properly classed as a use of βάπτω, either in its primary or secondary meaning. They could not be merely a dipping into an element for they all present the estate as permanent. When a believer is by the Spirit baptized into Christ, the thing most to be desired is that he shall never be taken out again. To be baptized unto repentance is to be brought under the influence of repentance—not for a moment, but abidingly; to be baptized unto the remission of sins is to be brought under the power or value of the remission of sins—not for a moment, but abidingly; to be baptized unto the name of the triune God is to come under the power of God—not for a moment, but abidingly; to be baptized unto Moses as Israel was by the agency of the cloud and the sea was to be brought under the leadership of Moses, which leadership had not been accorded him before—not for a moment, but abidingly; to be baptized unto Christ's death and resurrection is to become so identified with Him in that death and resurrection that all their values are secured—not for a moment, but eternally. Christ's suffering of anguish was not a momentary dipping down into suffering. That baptism which results from the advent of the Spirit into the heart with His heavenly influences is not for a moment, but endures forever. To be baptized into Christ's Body is to come under the power and Headship of Christ; it is to be joined unto the Lord, to be identified with Him, to partake of what He is and what He has done—not for a moment, but unalterably.

It may be said in concluding this portion of the chapter that to be placed in Christ by the baptizing agency of the Holy Spirit results in a new reality of relationship in which the one thus blessed comes under the power and Headship of Christ, which position supplants the relationship to the first Adam and is itself a new organic union with the Last Adam, the resurrected

Christ. In this instance, as in other baptisms, the word βαπτίζω is used only in its secondary meaning apart from a physical intusposition, for it secures the merit, the dominating influence, and Headship of Christ.

II. The Determining Scriptures

Those Scriptures in which the Holy Spirit is related to baptism are to be classified in two divisions. In the one group, Christ is the baptizing agent, yet the Holy Spirit is the blessed influence which characterizes the baptism. In the other group of passages, the Holy Spirit is the baptizing agent and Christ as the Head of His mystical Body is the receiving element and by so much that blessed influence which characterizes the baptism. Six passages are to be identified as belonging to the first group, namely, Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5 and 11:16. Though there is repetition involved, these passages—all of which happen to present the testimony of John the Baptist respecting Christ—are quoted in full: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11) ; "I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost" (Mark 1:8); "John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire" (Luke 3:16); "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost" (John 1:33) ; "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1:5); "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" (11:16). By the authority of Christ the Holy Spirit is given to all those who believe, and to come under the Spirit's power and influence, as every Christian does when he believes, is to have been baptized by that influence. However, this universal blessing of the indwelling Spirit is to be distinguished from some supposed second work of grace subsequent to salvation, which experience, as claimed by extreme holiness groups, is accompanied by manifestations which are

supernatural. It has already been demonstrated from the New Testament that the Holy Spirit is received as Christ's gift by all who believe and when they believe. This gift is the new birthright and, being possessed by all, indicates that all who are saved are under the power of the Holy Spirit, which fact is, according to the strict meaning of the word βαπτίζω, a baptism. It could be said on the ground of this meaning of the word that any person coming under the influence of Satan is by so much baptized by Satan. This particular baptism related so closely to the Holy Spirit is quite removed from the baptism wrought by Him when bringing believers into the Body of Christ, which reality is now to be considered.

The second classification of passages presents the Holy Spirit as baptizing agent and the Body of Christ or Christ Himself as the receiving element. These passages constitute a distinct testimony by themselves, which is to the effect that by the operation of the Holy Spirit the believer is organically and vitally joined to the Lord and thus has become a partaker of the standing, merit, and perfect worthiness of Christ. Since these passages bear on the baptizing ministry of the Holy Spirit or real baptism as over against ritual, they should be given specific consideration. Doubtless some disagreement might arise over what passages should be included in this list; but where the results of the baptism are such as could never be accomplished by a mere ritual baptism, it is evident that reference is being made to a real or Spirit baptism: indeed, aside from those Scriptures already considered which assert that the presence of the Spirit in the believer is a special baptism wrought by Christ in bestowing the Spirit, the remaining passages must refer either to a real or a ritual baptism. As a general rule, it will be found that no Scripture refers to both real and ritual baptism. An exception will be indicated later when Ephesians 4:5 is considered. These passages are:

1 Corinthians 12:12–13. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

As nearly as any Scripture will be found to present didactic definitions, this passage defines the Spirit's baptism. It is a joining of the believer to, the bringing into, the Body of Christ—in other words, the forming of that

organic relation between Christ and the believer which is expressed by the words *in Christ* and which is the ground of all the Christian's positions and possessions. The context of this passage sets forth the absolute unity or identity which obtains between Christ and the members of His Body. The members are a unity, being in one Body, and in its larger meaning this Body when joined to its Head is also one unity—the Christ. This revelation, which is a vital feature in the Pauline doctrine of the one Body, is most illuminating, emphatic, and convincing. However, this emphasis upon unity which verse 12 deposes is only to prepare the way for the revelation of how members are joined to this Body. They are said to be *baptized* into this Body by one Spirit. The reference to one Spirit is but the continuation of that which has been declared time and again through the preceding portion of this chapter, namely, that it is by the one and selfsame Spirit the varied gifts are wrought. Thus, also, though many are baptized into the Body of Christ, it is wrought by the one Spirit in every instance. The central truth is that the one Spirit baptizes all—every believer—into the one Body. What is thus accomplished for every believer is a part of his very salvation, else it could not include each one. The investigation into that which this baptism accomplishes is reserved for the next part of the chapter. That believers are all made to drink into one Spirit is an added testimony to the fact of the indwelling of the Spirit, which indwelling, as has been seen, is a matter of baptism. The universality of both the baptism into the Body and the indwelling is asserted by the repeated use of the word *all*, which term is inclusive of both Jews and Gentiles who believe.

Galatians 3:27. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

According to this revealing declaration the baptism which is into Christ has resulted in the vital union which is here described by the phraseology *have put on Christ*. On this passage Dean Alford writes, along with a quotation from Chrysostom: "Not '*have been baptized*, ' and '*have put on*,' as A.V., which leaves the two actions only concomitant: the past tenses make them identical: as many as were baptized into Christ, did in that very act, put on, clothe yourselves with, Christ. The force of the argument is well given by Chrysostom: 'Why did he not say, "As many of you as were baptized into Christ, were born of God?" for this would naturally follow from having shewn that they were sons. Because he lays down a far more

startling proposition. For if Christ is the Son of God, and thou hast put Him on, having the Son in thee, and fashioned after His likeness, thou wert brought into one family with Him and one type'" (*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., at Gal. 3:27). It is important to note that in the preceding verse—"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus"— the fact of sonship is declared and it is this precise numerical company that by baptism into Christ have put on Christ. The phrase *as many of you* is properly a reference to *all of you* who have been begotten of God. These have been joined to Christ thus. It is clear from other Scriptures that this baptism is wrought by the Holy Spirit and that Christ's Body, or Christ Himself, is the receiving element. It is impossible for one who is joined to Christ not to have *put on Christ* with all His merit and standing. The error of such as make this effect to stem from ritual baptism is exceeded only by those who make it merely an emotional or energizing experience. This baptism is wrought by the Holy Spirit and is altogether positional and therefore vital.

Romans 6:1–4. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

Having declared that the believer is eternally justified—for justification is as enduring as the merit of Christ on which it stands—the Apostle enters the question of whether anyone thus saved and secure should continue in sin, thereby yielding to the sin nature, that grace may abound. The answer of inspiration to this question will be the reply of every regenerate person, namely, "God forbid." It is not consistent nor is it necessary to go on bearing fruit unto the sin nature. Respecting the point of its necessity, the truth revealed is to the effect that in the death of Christ the believer's sin nature has been judged. "How shall we that are dead to sin [that is, who died in Christ's death], live any longer therein?" It is true that Christ died "for our sins," that He was buried, and that He rose from the dead that men might be saved (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3–4) ; but it is equally true—and Romans 6:1–10 now under consideration has only to do with this added fact—that Christ died *unto sin*, meaning the nature (cf. Rom. 6:10; Col. 2:11–12). In this

context the judgment of the sin nature on the cross is indicated by various phrases or statements—"dead to sin" (vs. 2), "planted [or, conjoined] together (with Him) in the likeness of his death" (vs. 5), "our old man is [better, following R.V., was] crucified with him" (vs. 6), "if we be dead with Christ" (vs. 8), "he died unto sin [that is, the sin nature] once" (vs. 10). By all of this it is not implied that the death of Christ resulted in the destruction or termination of this nature (the word καταργέω of verse 6, translated *destroyed*, is better rendered *annulled*—cf. R.V.) ; it is rather that the death of Christ unto sin has wrought a judgment against the sin nature in the sight of God, to the end that the Holy Spirit who indwells the believer may be made free to deal with the judged nature, restraining or nullifying it in response to the believer's dependence upon the One indwelling to interpose and control that nature. This aspect of the death of Christ and the believer's identification with it is all to the one end that "we should walk in newness of life." "Like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness [meaning the new power of Christ's resurrected] life" (vs. 4), which is the new provision for a walk in and by the enabling Holy Spirit, He Himself being set free to render aid because of Christ's judgment death unto sin. The Christian's union with Christ, achieved by the Spirit's baptism unto Him, is the ground of the perfect identification with Christ in all that His death unto sin accomplished. Coming thus into the value and under the power of Christ's crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection is a baptism in the secondary meaning of that word. Those baptized into Christ are baptized into His death, are buried with Christ by their baptism into the Savior's death. No ordinance is intimated by these expressions, nor is there any obligation being imposed that justifies an attempt to enact what is here set forth. This passage, with that which follows in the context, presents the central statement respecting the basis of the Christian's victory in daily life over the sin nature. This is its objective and its meaning. To discover in it only the outward form of a ritual ordinance, as many have done, is to surrender one of the most priceless assets in the whole field of Christian doctrine and by so much (for many) to abandon the hope of any life well-pleasing to God; for if this context means the one thing it cannot mean the other.

Colossians 2:9–13. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and

power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses."

The passing reference to baptism which this Scripture presents will not be understood apart from the entire context. As related to the rite of circumcision, the Apostle divides the human family into three classes, namely, the "Uncircumcision"—the Gentiles, "the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands'—the Jews, and "the circumcision made without hands"—the Christians (cf. Eph. 2:11; Col. 2:11). That circumcision which characterizes the Jew and which the Gentile lacks is "made by hands," while the circumcision which the Christian has received is "made without hands" and is a spiritual reality. Four times the Bible speaks of circumcision in connection with the heart—Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:6; Ezekiel 44:7; Acts 7:51—before mention of the blessing brought to Christians when the body of the sins of the flesh was put off and that by the circumcision of Christ. As the human body manifests the life which is in it, in like manner the sin nature manifests itself by "sins of the flesh." Christ's circumcision, here referred to, is not that which was made with hands when He was eight days old, but His death unto the sin nature. There is a striking similarity to Romans 6:1–10 to be found in the passage just considered, and this similarity concerns the reference to Christ's burial and resurrection as factors providing immeasurable value for, and influence over, the believer. Securing the results which they do, the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ are in their most absolute sense a baptism. The transformations which are here indicated, as they were also in Romans 6:1–10, could never be produced by any ritual baptism and to read ritual baptism into this passage is again to ignore the limitless realities for which Christ died, was buried, and rose again. It is to substitute a human effort for one of God's most glorious achievements. Doubtless, it is easier for those who comprehend but little of these great realities to substitute a tangible, physical undertaking such as ritual baptism for the deeper, unseen, and spiritual values of the real baptism. However, regardless of human

limitations, the significance of this passage does not descend to the level of an impotent ritual.

Ephesians 4:4–6. “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.”

In the midst of these seven unifying agencies, and not the least of them, is “one baptism.” At once the question may arise in many minds whether reference in this instance is to real baptism by the Spirit placing believers into the Body of Christ or to ritual water baptism. Some contend that the latter baptism is in view and that the passage teaches there is but one right mode of such baptism. To impose such limitations on the text is deplorable. There is nothing in the passage to support a mode of baptism. The unqualified statement that there is but *one* baptism becomes a very demanding problem to those who have elevated water baptism to the place where it must be a separate, independent, and diverse baptism—something, therefore, which is wholly unrelated to the Spirit’s baptism. Some contend that, since real baptism so outweighs the ritual in importance, the ritual baptism is not to be mentioned at all in comparison with real baptism, here or elsewhere. Still others claim that the Apostle does not here contemplate ritual baptism, reckoning he only asserts that in the realm of spiritual forces which unify there is but one baptism and this of necessity would be the baptism with the Spirit. Yet further to be considered is a class of interpreters who hold that the Spirit’s baptism occurred once for all and in behalf of all the Church on the Day of Pentecost, and that it is not a thing wrought at the time someone is saved. This conception, which so little articulates with the New Testament Scripture bearing on the theme, does not challenge the *fact*, though it attempts to change the time, of the Spirit’s baptism so plainly mentioned here in Ephesians. The larger portion of the Christian church, however, in so far as they consider the subject at all, assert that ritual baptism is a sign or outward symbol of the Spirit’s work and thus the two combine to form what is called here *one* baptism. Among the arguments advanced in support of the conviction that the one baptism is that of the Spirit by which believers are joined to the Lord and by which they gain all possessions and positions, the one most effective observes that this reference to one baptism is given as one of seven unifying agencies. It is easily discerned that the baptism by the Holy Spirit into one Body

engenders the most vital and perfect union that could be formed among men; on the other hand, if the history of the church on earth bears a testimony to the course of events at all, it is to the effect that ritual baptism has served more than any other one issue to shatter that manifestation of organic union which Christian fellowship is intended to exhibit. On the right interpretation of Ephesians 4:5, Dr. John W. Bradbury, Editor of the *Watchman-Examiner*, the leading Baptist journal of this day in America, writes the following as a special contribution to the present discussion of Ephesians 4: "The corporate concept of the Church is as essential as the individual one. The 'body' of Christ is held together 'in the bond of peace' by keeping the 'unity of the Spirit' (v. 3). The thought that the Church is a 'body' whose life is uniformly identified with the Holy Spirit is illustrated by what we know of an organism such as the human body having the human spirit as a sign of life. We have, therefore, in the *ecclesia* a body having God's Spirit, evidencing such through professing 'one hope … one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God … in all.' The emphasis on 'one' is in opposition to corporate diversity in the 'body' of Christ. As to 'hope,' 'Lord,' 'faith,' 'God,' there will be little, if any, difference among true believers. But in regard to the word 'baptism' there is a difference, because most people have only one viewpoint as to baptism and that is, an ordinance. But in this passage, where ordinances are not before us but the truth concerning the organism called 'the body of Christ,' we have baptism mentioned in equal terms with 'hope,' 'Lord,' 'faith,' 'God.' This signifies that the 'baptism' referred to is that of I Corinthians 12:13—'For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.' " Likewise, on the belief that the one baptism of Ephesians 4 is not ritual baptism, Dr. Merrill Frederick Unger writes:

> Erroneously, Spirit baptism is made a once-for-all operation at Pentecost (Acts 2), and in Cornelius' house (Acts 10), and then said to have ceased. During this present age, it is maintained, there is no baptism with the Holy Spirit. 1 Corinthians 12:13 is construed as referring back to those events. Such Scriptures as Romans 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12; Galatians 3:27; 1 Peter 3:21 are made to refer exclusively to water baptism. The "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5 is also strongly asserted to be water baptism, and that alone. Dr. I. M. Haldeman, adopting this position, comments thus on Ephesians 4:5: "If it be Holy Ghost baptism, water baptism is excluded. There is no authority, no place for it. No minister has a right to perform it; no one is under obligation to submit to it. To perform it, or submit to it,

would be not only without authority, but useless, utterly meaningless. If it be water baptism, Holy Ghost baptism is no longer operative. Baptism must be either the one or the other, Holy Ghost or water. It cannot be both. Two are no longer permissible" (*Holy Ghost Or Water*?, p. 4). Others, adopting the opposite extreme position, while rightly insisting that Ephesians 4:5 refers to Spirit baptism, drastically rule out any practice of water baptism for the Church Age. Although they find ritual baptism, of course, regularly practised in the early church (Acts 2:38; 8:12, 13, 16, 36; 9:18; 10:47, 48; 16:15, 33; 18:8; 19:3, 5) and mentioned in 1 Corinthians 1:13–17, this practice is thought of as confined to the early "Jewish" church, and discontinued by the Apostle Paul, when the "real" New Testament church was begun late in the book of Acts. This position must be rejected. The basic fact, which is ignored, is that the Church actually began with the baptism with the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 1:4; 2:4, 47 with 11:16; 1 Cor. 12:13), and that water baptism was regularly administered, not only in the early so-called "Jewish" church, but also long after in fully established "Gentile" churches (Acts 18:8; 1 Cor. 1:13–17).

The Apostle, in speaking of the "one baptism" in Ephesians 4:5, to be sure, is speaking of Spirit baptism, which is likewise the case in Romans 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12; Galatians 3:27. But when he describes this momentous operation of the Spirit as the "one baptism," and as one of the seven essential unities to be recognized and kept in maintaining Christian oneness and concord, does he necessarily imply that water baptism is no longer to be administered? Did he not mean merely to say, "There is only one [spiritual] baptism"? His theme is no more water baptism in Romans 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12; Galatians 3:27 than in Ephesians 4:5. In these passages the holy Apostle is not considering ritual baptism at all. The sublimity of the thought, the context of the argument, the exalted nature of the spiritual verities taught are strongly in support of this position. He is speaking of something infinitely higher—not of a mere symbolic ordinance that is powerless to effect intrinsic change, but of a divine operation which places us eternally in Christ, and into His experiences of crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection. It is to be feared that man, in reading water baptism into these sublime passages, has put them into ecclesiastical "stocks" and tortured and twisted until they screamed out some confession never written in them. To be sure, this tortuous, corrupting process began very early, perhaps even within the lifetime of the great Apostle. But it seems evident, if historical and philological facts are but allowed to speak, that a first-century reader, uncorrupted as to the truth, would never have thought of reading water baptism into these passages. To him they meant Spirit baptism, and that alone. Their very mold would have hindered him from associating them with any ritual use of water. His whole concept of the meaning and mode of baptism would have been utterly foreign to the Apostle's words concerning "death," "burial," and "resurrection." It would never have occurred to him to connect these figures with water baptism.

Baptism, referring to the Levitical ceremonies of the Old Testament (Heb. 9:10), had come to have a wide meaning of "ceremonial cleansing, or ritual purification by water, and that by sprinkling or pouring," centuries before the Christian era. Fairchild, with full array of facts, and unanswerable logic, conclusively proves this established usage of βαπτίζω from the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, Josephus, and the Greek New Testament (Edmund B. Fairchild, *Letters on Baptism*, pp. 32–122). Dale, with brilliant and exhaustive scholarship, employed with consummate skill in minute, scientific examination of every phase of this subject, thus concludes his monumental work on the study of baptism among the ancient Jews: "Judaic baptism is a condition of Ceremonial Purification effected by washing … sprinkling … pouring … dependent in no wise, on any form of act, or on the covering of the object" (James W. Dale, *Judaic Baptism*, p. 400). Dale concludes his great work on the study of John the

Baptist's baptism with these words: "This same βάπτισμα is declared by word and exhibited in symbol, by the application of pure water to the person in the ritual ordinance. This is Johannic Baptism in its shadow. … Dipping or immersing into water is phraseology utterly unknown to John's baptism" (*Johannic Baptism*, p. 417). Biblical, historical, and philological proofs abound, therefore, that John the Baptist "ceremonially purified" (baptized) by sprinkling or pouring, that Jesus was so baptized (consecrated) unto His Priesthood (Ex. 29:4; Ps. 110:1; Matt. 3:15; Heb. 7:9, E. E. Hawes, *Baptism Mode Studies*, pp. 81–109), and that early Jewish and Christian baptisms knew no other mode (James W. Dale, *Christic and Patristic Baptism*, pp. 162–240). With all of this great weight of established usage of the word βαπτίζω behind him, made crystal-clear as a result of his intimate knowledge of Judaism, as a trained Rabbi, how unthinkable it is that the great Apostle would have so violated every principle of established usage of language and custom of centuries, as to have made βαπτίζω in such passages as Romans 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12; Galatians 3:27; Ephesians 4:5 refer to any mode of water baptism, indeed, to water baptism at all!—"The Baptism with the Holy Spirit," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CI, 244–47

1 Peter 3:21. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The peculiar tendency with many to assume that ritual baptism is implied whenever the word βαπτίζω occurs has led to much confusion. In the light of its relative importance, it would be more reasonable to imply that real baptism is in view until it is made certain that ritual baptism is indicated. Two points are to be noted in this passage: (1) that the baptism mentioned is saving in its effect and (2) that it is related to the resurrection of Christ, which is vitally true of real baptism but not directly true of ritual baptism.

Mark 16:16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Again baptism is mentioned as though it had saving power. The reference evidently is to real baptism. On this passage Dr. G. Campbell Morgan writes: "*He that believeth* (that is the human condition) *and is baptized* (that is the divine miracle) *shall be saved*. When the negative side is stated, baptism is omitted, as being unnecessary; for he that disbelieveth cannot be baptized. If it is water baptism, he can; but if it is the baptism of the Spirit, he cannot" (*The Spirit of God*, pp. 181–82).

As a summarization of these seven passages bearing on the Spirit's baptism, it may be observed that 1 Corinthians 12:13—which is not only the first of them chronologically but also the central testimony regarding the Spirit's baptism—declares directly what that baptism accomplishes. In the second—Galatians 3:27—the Spirit's baptism is said to result in the putting

on of Christ. In the third—Romans 6:1–10—identification with Christ in His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection as a judgment of the sin nature is in view, and to the end that the believer may walk in resurrection power in spite of the sin nature. In the fourth passage—Colossians 2:9–13—the same influence of Christ's death (contemplated now as a spiritual circumcision), burial, and resurrection is again said to be a baptism. In the fifth passage—Ephesians 4:4–6—the Spirit's baptism is set forth as one of the unifying elements in the Body of Christ. In the sixth and seventh passages—1 Peter 3:21; Mark 16:16—this baptism is related to salvation as a most vital feature of it. Since by the baptism with the Spirit the believer is joined to Christ, more than a hundred passages which include the phrases *in Christ* or *in him* (that is, Christ) should be added to this list for exhaustiveness.

It may prove advantageous to call attention again at this point to the secondary meaning of βαπτίζω—the meaning which so largely obtains in the New Testament—which signifies that apart from a physical intusposition one thing baptizes another thing when its power and influence are exerted over that other thing. Christ gives the Holy Spirit to all believers to indwell them, to comfort them, and to enable them; thus the believer comes under the power and influence of the Holy Spirit. Such a gift is note a baptism into anything physical, but is that form of baptism which a dominating power and influence secures. To be joined to Christ by the Spirit's baptism is not a physical envelopment in Christ or in His Body; it is nevertheless a true baptism in that the one thus joined to the Lord has not only been wrought upon by the Spirit who baptizes, but that he comes under the immeasurable values of all Christ is and all He has done, being in Christ. The importance of a due recognition of all that enters into the secondary meaning of βαπτίζω can hardly be overestimated. The larger portion of theologians have more or less definitely related ritual baptism to the work of the Holy Spirit as a shadow or symbol is related to substance and reality. Other theologians, it would seem, have all but lost the secodary meaning of this great word in a sectarian effort to defend a mode of ritual baptism.

III. The Thing Accomplished

One of the greatest disclosures in the New Testament is confronted at this point in the discussion: no less a theme than the whole Pauline doctrine of the Church, the New Creation, with its Headship in the resurrected Christ. Though this great line of truth has had an extended treatment under Ecclesiology, it must be introduced again, being, as it is, so vital a feature in the doctrine of the Spirit's baptism. Regardless of its fundamental place in Pauline theology, this phase of Ecclesiology is almost wholly neglected by Covenant theologians, and for the obvious reason that their ideal of one covenant which unifies the whole Bible is shattered by revelation of a new Headship and its New Creation. The indictment, before mentioned, which is to the effect that the entire doctrinal aspect of Christ's resurrection—central in Pauline theology—is neglected, is most serious and damaging. The scope and importance of the doctrine of the Spirit's baptism, then, is to be seen from the thing it accomplishes.

1. Organic Union. The divine illustrations of this union engendered between Christ and the believer include that of the branch grafted into the vine (Rom. 11:17) and that of the joining of a member to a human body. It is readily recognized that human surgery does not attempt such an achievement as the latter, but then this determines nothing in the value of the figure as a setting forth of the union which the Spirit forms. An intensity of *inness* is secured when the believer is joined to Christ which, though wholly superhuman, is, nevertheless, feebly illustrated by these human figures. Both the branch and the body's member become living, organic parts of that to which they are joined. This new relationship as established in the case of the branch and the member results in the life of the vine or of the body being run *into* the branch and the member; it also results in the branch and the member being *in* the vine and the body. This twofold result is expressed by Christ in seven of the smallest yet most meaningful words ever uttered. They afford a miniature expression of one of infinity's masterpieces. The seven words are: "Ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). As before indicated, two mighty ministries of the Holy Spirit are here recognized—that of forming Christ in the believer or the regenerating work ("I in you") and that of placing the believer in Christ or the baptizing work He performs ("Ye in me"). No human language can describe these two

realities, either with respect to the heaven-high character of these blessings or with respect to their eternal duration.

2. The Fourfold Prayer of Christ. No little wonder is created when it is observed for the first time that Christ made the same declaration twice in His last priestly prayer. Twice He said, “They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world” (John 17:14, 16). Why, indeed, should any word of the Son to the Father be repeated? The answer is that by so doing there is recorded an emphasis, in this case one which exalts the truth of the believer’s separation from the *cosmos* world system. If, however, the Savior should repeat the same request four times, as actually happened here in the same priestly prayer, the emphasis exceeds all bounds and demands attention to an incomparable degree. These are the four similar petitions He offered in this one prayer: “That they may be one, as we are” (vs. 11), “That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us” (vs. 21); “That they may be one, even as we are one” (vs. 22); “That they may be made perfect in one” (vs. 23). This fourfold stress exalts the thing for which He prayed above other features of this prayer regardless of their all having a supernatural character. The Lord is asking the Father to accomplish a very definite thing. In spite of notions to the effect that men have the responsibility of answering this prayer, the request is for the Father to do this very thing; and when the nature and the scope of the thing are considered, there is complete evidence that God alone could answer this prayer. There are three vast unities set forth in the Bible-the unity between the Persons of the Godhead; the unity between the Persons of the Godhead and the believer, in which unity each Person is said to be in the believer and the believer to be in each Person; and the unity between believers themselves. All three of these unities are referred to by Christ in this priestly prayer as recorded in verses 21 to 23. However, the unity of believers is the basic request of this portion of His prayer. He presents the oneness between the Persons of the Godhead and the believer as the grounds for the unity between believers. They will be one, therefore, when this prayer is answered because they are “in us,” that is, the Persons of the Godhead. It would be impossible for believers to be in the Persons of the one Godhead and not thereby be constituted one in themselves; but still the realms of infinity are reached when the Savior prays that the believers may

be one in relation to each other "as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee" (vs. 21). What mind can conceive or what language can express the reality declared when it is prayed by the Son, whose prayer cannot go unanswered, that the Father create a unity between believers which is on the plane of the unity existing between the Persons of the Godhead! The truth of the triune existence of God is a sublime mystery, so its exaltation is a reality which lies wholly within the sphere of infinity. In the light of this fact, the conclusion must be reached that, as measured by God Himself, there is achieved through His creative power a supernatural union between Christians which is similar to that which unites the Persons of the Godhead. How tragic that for want of due instruction Christians in the main have never heard of such a relationship! And how deplorable the misunderstanding which conceives of this unity as mere membership in human ecclesiastical organizations!

This fourfold prayer of the Son of God was first answered on the Day of Pentecost when all believers then living were baptized by the Holy Spirit into one Body—the Body of Christ—and were all made to drink into one Spirit, to the end that a unity might exist between the Persons of the Godhead and the believers. To this original company and by the same operation of the Holy Spirit, all who have been saved from that day until now have been joined to Christ when they believed and as a feature of their salvation. Thus and only thus is the prayer of Christ being answered.

3. The Only Ground for Imputed Righteousness. That there is a righteousness which the believer may possess wholly apart from any works or effort of his own and as a gift from God (cf. Rom. 5:17) is pure revelation and devoid of any confirmatory experience; besides, this bestowed righteousness is the only righteousness which God accepts in time or eternity. He Himself, being infinitely righteous, can receive nothing less than that which He is personally. Since present salvation is unto eternal and intimate association with God in His abode up in the highest glory, the necessity of being qualified for that sphere with a perfection which goes beyond human ability to provide is obvious. Thus the Apostle writes: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12). Respecting that righteousness which is God's gift through His Son, Abraham is the divinely

ordered pattern. Though the head of the Jewish race, he does not represent the Jew under the Mosaic Law since the law was not then given; he rather depicts a believer of the present age under the grace relationship as himself under a similar relationship. Practically every illustration employed by the Apostle to set forth the grace of God as that is now exercised toward those who have no merit is drawn from the life and experience of Abraham. In response to God's promise about a son, Abraham believed, or amened, God and his faith became the ground of imputed righteousness. That righteousness which was bestowed on Abraham in answer to his faith is bestowed now upon all who exercise the same belief in the Word or promise of God. It is written: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. 4:23–24). Of Israel it is said that they failed to secure this righteousness since they sought it by the works of the law and not by faith; but some Gentiles who followed not after the righteousness which is of the law, or a basis in personal merit, found the perfect righteousness of God through believing on Christ. Israel's failure—as that of uncounted members of churches today—is to be found in the fact that they are "ignorant" respecting the whole provision of imputed righteousness and are going about to establish their own personal righteousness as a ground for God's acceptance of them, not knowing that Christ answers every need of the meritless and is Himself the "end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. 9:30–10:4). To be in Christ is to be possessed with the righteousness of God which Christ is and which answers every need for such a character both in this life and in that which is to come. The unsaved are not in Christ, nor is Christ in them; but when one of these believes on Christ as Savior, he instantly comes to be in Christ by the baptizing ministry of the Holy Spirit and Christ comes to be in that one by the regenerating ministry of the Holy Spirit. This great twofold operation of the Holy Spirit fulfills the prediction of Christ given in His farewell to the disciples in the upper room, namely: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). The determining words of this operation are *in Christ*, or the synonymous *in Him*, *in the Beloved*, and it is just that incomparable position in Christ which is secured by the baptism of the Spirit into Christ; for it is impossible that any should be in Christ and not partake of what Christ is, He who is the

righteousness of God. Because of their apparently insignificant character, the words *in Christ* or *in Him* are passed by unnoticed; yet, as in the following passages, all that is declared of the Christian is made to depend solely on the fact that the one so blessed is in Christ: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1); “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (1 Cor. 1:30); “Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. … For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (2 Cor. 5:17, 21); “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ … to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved” (Eph. 1:3, 6); “But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ” (Eph. 2:13); “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power” (Col. 2:9–10). Added to these Scriptures are all passages which relate acceptance, righteousness, and justification to the act of believing.

In an earlier treatment of the doctrine of imputed righteousness as something secured by the baptism of the Spirit, it has been pointed out that attaining to the righteousness of God is not only realized on the ground of the believer’s position in Christ, but that the gift of righteousness is based upon the sweet-savor aspect of Christ’s death by which He as Substitute for those without merit offered Himself without spot to God, thus releasing His own merit that it might be available on a righteous ground to all who believe.

4. Due Recognition of the Union. Having in the first three chapters of the letter to the Ephesians declared the positions and possessions of all who are in Christ Jesus, the Apostle makes it his appeal to those thus blessed that they endeavor “to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” They are not told to *make* a union, but rather to keep the union which the Spirit has made. This will be done only as the individual child of God recognizes and loves every other child of God. Such recognition and love does not create a unity but does tend to keep the unity that exists. This unity is

manifested in seven factors which the Apostle himself names: “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all” (Eph. 4:4–6). All these features are unifying in their character and none more so than the “one baptism” by the Spirit by which individual believers become members of one spiritual Body. Ritual baptism, as before indicated, has no power in itself to form a unity, but, on the contrary, has served more than other issues to break up observance of the unity which God has made.

When reproving the Corinthian Christians respecting the sins or failures which were present because tolerated in their assembly, the Apostle placed as first on his list of things subject to reproof their divisions and sectarian spirit. Such divisions are the very opposite of the Christian grace of keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. This correction by the Apostle stands first in the Corinthian correspondence since in the divine estimation the keeping of the unity of the Spirit is of primary importance. Sectarianism is thus seen to be most displeasing to God and a violent disregard for that which God has wrought. As the keeping of the unity of the Spirit is a personal responsibility, in like manner the correction becomes a personal consideration.

5. The Ground of Appeal for a Holy Life. There is an immeasurable difference between what God may do for the believer and what the believer may do for God. The order of truth in the great doctrinal epistles as they reflect the revelation under grace is first to declare what God has done for those who believe to the saving of their souls and then to appeal to such to walk worthy, or as it becomes those thus saved. This order cannot be reversed or disregarded without great confusion and injury. To attempt to be good in order that one may be accepted of God is not only hopeless but is legal in character and, as to the results obtained, will prove to be as weak as the flesh to which the appeal is made. On the other hand, to beseech men to walk worthy of a completeness and perfection in Christ to which the Spirit has brought them, is to place before them the highest of all activating motives. The new problem in every Christian’s life is not how good one must be to be accepted of God, but how good should one be who is accepted of God. Such conformity to the highest heavenly ideals becomes

gracious in its character since its demands are the voluntary expressions of a grateful heart and not a forced compliance to law as the basis of any relation to God whatsoever. No enablement is ever offered from God under law, but a God-honoring life is possible under the provisions of grace.

IV. The Distinctiveness

As a consummation of that which has gone before and been implied in previous discussion, the several aspects of truth which are peculiar to this theme may now be presented in order. The primary facts that this ministry —unlike the works of regeneration, indwelling, and filling—is not mentioned in the Old Testament, that it was not in operation before the Day of Pentecost, and that there is no anticipation of it in the age to come restrict it to the present age and its benefits are seen to be exclusively the portion of the Church, the New Creation; in fact, that which the Church represents in her exalted heavenly glory is almost wholly due to this specific ministry of the Holy Spirit. That a company should be called out one by one from both Jews and Gentiles, each individual of which is perfected in the absolute fullness or πλήρωμα of Christ, who is Himself the πλήρωμα of the Godhead bodily (cf. John 1:16; Col. 1:19; 2:9–10), thus in every respect to be fitted for the highest glory, is an innovation which Covenantism cannot admit. On the baptism with the Holy Spirit each member in the Body of Christ depends for every qualification by which he is “made meet to be” a partaker “of the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. 1:12). It is tragic, indeed, when these great realities are neglected, if not rejected, only because some man-made system cannot make a place for them. What privation both in the knowledge of the truth and its sanctifying power has been suffered by those who have been thus dispossessed of the revelation! Thanks should be given to God that those who are saved, of whatever system of theology they may be a part, do possess these blessings whether they realize it or not; for such is the character of their salvation. In mercy God has never limited His blessings to that which the believer understands. In explaining the distinctiveness of real baptism, then, certain salient truths should be emphasized once more.

1. Not Regeneration. The Holy Spirit's work in regenerating results in the impartation of the divine nature which is "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27), while the Spirit's baptism results in the believer's being placed in Christ. As already asserted, there is the widest distinction to be drawn between that which Christ expressed when He said "Ye in me"—the result of the Spirit's baptism, and "I in you"—the result of the Spirit's regeneration.

2. Not Indwelling. The indwelling Spirit, the gift of Christ to every believer, is, in the strict though secondary meaning of βαπτίζω, a form of baptism. Christ thus baptizes every believer by the gift of the Holy Spirit when the believer is saved. Six passages have been cited in this connection: Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16. Each of these passages distinctly asserts that Christ is the baptizing Agent and by His baptism the individual believer is brought under the influence which the presence of the Holy Spirit engenders. The gift of the Holy Spirit to indwell, which gift is universal and is bestowed at the moment of salvation and then as an integral part of salvation, should not be misconstrued because of a very common error, namely, that of supposing the Spirit is received subsequent to salvation and by a restricted number of people who "tarry" or "seek" a second blessing. The benefits which the indwelling Spirit secures are the portion of all believers and are not the manifestations which result from the Spirit's filling. Over against this misinterpretation, there is a group of passages already cited—notably 1 Corinthians 12:13; Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:3–4; Colossians 2:11–13; Ephesians 4:5; 1 Peter 3:21; Mark 16:16—which represent or suggest the Spirit as the baptizer and Christ, or His Body, as the receiving element. This is that which is termed real baptism because wrought by the Holy Spirit, placing the believer in Christ and thus securing for him the merit and standing of the Son of God.

3. Not Filling. It will be observed that the Spirit's baptism is more confused with the Spirit's filling than it is with any other of the Spirit's ministries. Though the examination of the ministry of the Spirit's filling has not yet been undertaken, it being the next and final main division of this volume, certain obvious contrasts between the Spirit's baptism and filling may well be designated. First, as for permanence, the baptism by the Spirit

into Christ is wrought but once, when the believer is saved (and remains an unchangeable reality for time and eternity), while the Spirit's filling may be subsequent to salvation and often repeated. Second, there is no experience or feeling related to the Spirit's baptism of the believer into Christ, but all spiritual manifestations of blessing and power are directly related and due to the Spirit's filling. Third, Christians are never enjoined to be baptized by the Spirit into Christ since that is the portion of all who believe, but every child of God is exhorted to be getting filled constantly by the Holy Spirit. Fourth, as declared above, every believer is baptized by the Spirit into Christ, but not every believer is necessarily filled with the Holy Spirit. Fifth, the Spirit's baptism into Christ results in the believer's being vitally joined to Christ for all eternity, while the filling of the Spirit results in outward manifestations and blessings for the present. The baptism establishes the Christian's standing, therefore, while the filling tends to improve the Christian's state. The baptism is a feature of salvation, while the filling is related to service and rewards. Sixth, the Spirit's baptism into Christ is wrought when the terms of salvation are met, while the terms governing the filling of Christians are such as enter into the believer's right relation to the One who has saved him, day by day.

Conclusion

Both the word of introduction and the concluding portion of Dr. Merrill Frederick Unger's article *The Baptism with the Holy Spirit*, already cited, may serve as the closing of this discussion relative to the Spirit's baptism of the believer to place him into Christ. Dr. Unger writes:

> The baptism with the Holy Spirit is one of the most vital and important of Scriptural doctrines. Its vast significance can readily be appreciated when it is realized that it is that divine operation of God's Spirit which places the believer "in Christ," in His mystical Body, the Church, and which makes him one with all other believers in Christ, one in life, the very life of the Son of God Himself, one in Him, a common Head, one in sharing His common salvation, hope, and destiny. Indeed, but a cursory consideration will reveal the paramount import and the sweeping ramifications of this vital Bible theme, affecting, as it does, so intimately and vitally the believer's position and experience, his standing and state. The astonishing thing, however, is that a subject of such momentous importance, with such far-reaching effects upon Christian position and practice, should suffer so woefully at the hands of both its enemies and friends. From its enemies it has suffered not so much from open hostility or opposition, as from chronic neglect. It is simply ignored, or at most treated superficially. Those who reject dispensational teaching, who posit an "all-time grace covenant," who make no adequate distinction between the "assembly" of Israel in the wilderness in the Old Testament and the Church as the Body of Christ in the New Testament, simply do not know what to do with it. It remains, and must continue to remain, a Scriptural conundrum to all such. If this doctrine has suffered at the hands of its enemies, it has especially been wounded in the house of its friends. Large groups of earnest and well-meaning, but poorly-taught, Christians, in evident reaction against the neglect and omissions which have attended this truth, have taken it to heart, according to it great emphasis and prominence. In their zeal and enthusiasm, however, they have not always confined themselves to clear and accurate Scriptural statement. Indeed, it would be difficult to find a Biblical theme used at once to teach deeper spiritual living, and yet at the same time subject to more misconception, misstatement, and confusion than this one. Nowhere in the whole range of Biblical theology is there greater need for precise and correct statement of vital truth than in the field of this doctrine. …
>
> Having traced in detail the doctrine of the baptism with the Spirit as presented in the Scripture from all the material at hand, put in orderly arrangement, the following results and conclusions are offered: (1) The baptism with the Holy Spirit is a theme of paramount import, vitally affecting the believer's life and walk, his standing and state, his positions and possessions in Christ. (2) The baptism with the Spirit is one of the most abused and confused subjects in the whole range of Biblical theology. (3) The cause of the confusion is centered in confounding this doctrine with regeneration, with the receiving of the Spirit, with the indwelling, with the sealing, with a "second blessing," with the filling, and with water baptism. (4) The dire results of the confusion are: divisions, misunderstandings, disunity in the Body of Christ, obscuration of the gospel of grace, perversion of the truth of the believer's union with Christ, and sad hindrances to holiness of walk and life. (5) Careful study of *all* scriptures bearing on the subject has disclosed that the baptism with the Holy

Spirit is merely one of the various ministries performed by the Holy Spirit since He came into the world: that *every* believer the moment he believes in Christ is regenerated, baptized, indwelt, and sealed for all eternity, and has the duty and privilege of continually being filled for life and service. (6) No instance in the Gospels or the Acts, when seen in proper dispensational perspective, is at variance with this truth. That there is no ground in all the Word of God for the error of the baptism with the Holy Spirit being considered as a "second experience" after regeneration becomes patent. (7) Water baptism is not in view at all in Romans 6:3, 4; Galatians 3:27; Ephesians 4:5; Colossians 2:12, and to read it into these passages is to becloud the truth, and to increase the confusion.

With these various truths given their proper emphasis, the doctrine of the baptism with the Holy Spirit is at once lifted out of the haze and fog of error that have so obscured it, and, in its majestic purity and grand simplicity, becomes one of the most precious and vital factors in Christian unity. No wonder the great Apostle cries out for the "one baptism" as one of the indispensable sevenfold unities to be kept in realizing the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3–6)! Who can begin to imagine the mighty transformation that would take place in poor, distraught, divided Christendom, if suddenly all the confusion and obscuration were torn away, and the full blaze and fullorbed glory of the truth of every Christian's oneness in Christ by the baptizing work of the Spirit burst upon the consciousness of all God's people? Blessing, revival, fellowship, and power such as the Church has never experienced, perhaps since Apostolic days, would be the inevitable result. Is it to be thought of, then, as amazing that this vital doctrine should always have been the special target of the most subtle Satanic *assaults?* That this is the case now should inspire to intrepid boldness and uncompromising fidelity in its proclamation and defense, in view of the sublime glory of the imperishable truth it represents.—*Op. cit*., CI, 232–33, 497–99

The Believer's Responsibility

Chapter XII

INTRODUCTION TO THE BELIEVER'S RESPONSIBILITY

SINCE THEY are void of experimental features, the ministries of the Spirit to the believer already cited—regeneration, indwelling, sealing, and baptizing—have served to establish the truth related to the Christian's positions and possessions. This body of truth may well be termed that which is fundamental and primary in all doctrine respecting the Christian; but there is also that which is rightfully termed *practical* features of truth. These comprehend the believer's responsibility in thought and action toward God, toward his fellow men, and toward self. With regard to importance, there could be no comparison between these two aspects of doctrine though in the one instance all is accomplished completely when one believes and in the other instance there is ceaseless obligation resting upon the convert; yet the situation, all the same, which every pastor confronts in the individual life to which he ministers is within the sphere of the less important, practical phase of doctrine. It may well be called *life truth* since it concerns the outliving of that which is infinitely true and certain in the sphere of *positional truth*. How helpless the would-be soul doctor must be who in his courses of training has never heard even one intimation of the specific instruction which God addresses to the believer, or of the divine plan so extensively taught in the New Testament whereby the Christian may be more than conqueror over evil forces through the power of the indwelling Spirit! Seminary instructors, however, cannot be expected to teach subjects and courses—no matter how important—of which they in turn had never heard in the days of their own education and which they have consistently ignored thereafter.

I. Intelligent Motives

The Christian who is perfected forever, being in Christ, has, nevertheless, a life of imperfection to live so long as he is in this world. The new problem which he confronts, as several times before stated, is not one

of how he should live that he might be accepted and perfected before God, but rather of how he, an accepted and perfected person, should live after these stupendous realities are accomplished by the grace and power of God. Until this vital distinction is comprehended and received, there will be no progress made in the extensive field of truth which directs the Christian's life and service. Until positional truth is recognized and received to the extent that the saved one acknowledges that he is saved and perfected in the sight of God on no other ground than that, on his part, he has believed on Christ to the saving of his soul, and, on God's part, he is justified, being both forgiven and constituted righteous through the immeasurable twofold substitution of Christ—bearing condemnation because of the believer's demerit and offering Himself as the source of merit—there can be only confusion and misunderstanding about the true motivating principle in the Christian's daily life. It could not be denied truthfully that the mass of professing Christians have been deprived of the knowledge of positional truth and because of this have never conceived of any other idea of Christian conduct than that they are obligated to make themselves acceptable to God by their own works of righteousness. Naturally, being so deprived of the knowledge of positional truth they are correspondingly ignorant of the true basis and motive for life truth. This one distinction between positional truth and life truth constitutes one of the most vital contrasts between law and grace. It is declared that the Jew failed because he sought his righteous standing before God by means of the works of the law, being "ignorant" of the truth that God has provided all the standing and merit in and through Christ that His holiness could ever require. Because of this ignorance, the Jew went about "to establish his own righteousness" and did not "submit" or come under the bestowed righteousness of God, Christ being "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Over against this, some Gentiles—to whom the law was never addressed and who had therefore never attempted to be owned of God through law-works of righteousness—attained instantly to the bestowed righteousness of God when they received Christ as Savior through faith in Him (Rom. 9:30–10:4). The question of motive in the Christian's daily life is paramount in this discussion. The body of truth now to be considered concerns the daily life of the believer, and no issue is more determining than that of the reason or principle which actuates the one who would attain to a God-honoring life

in the way God appoints through the power of the indwelling Spirit. The Holy Spirit cannot cooperate or engender any reality of experience when the very basis of a grace relationship to God is ignored. How, indeed, could the Holy Spirit empower a life which is wholly misguided and wrong in its objectives, methods, and motives? His benefits, of necessity, have significance only for those who recognize and believe that they are perfected once-for-all by simple faith in Christ as Savior and that their new obligation is not to make themselves accepted but rather to walk worthy of the One in whom they are accepted. In John 15:1–16 the words of Christ relative to abiding in Him are recorded. In this context a fundamental distinction must be drawn between the believer's *union* with Christ and his *communion* with Christ. Too often it is supposed that in this passage Christ is teaching that the branch, which represents the Christian, must maintain its union with the vine, which represents Christ. That communion, however, is in view throughout the passage is clearly indicated. In verse 2 it is written: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit," and the words *in me* declare the perfect union of the fruitless branch to Christ. The obligation upon the branch is to continue in the relation to Christ which makes communion possible, whereby the divine life or energy may flow into the branch so that fruit may be borne. Salvation, which is union with Christ, and the perfect standing which it secures continue always, since such benefits depend only on the believer's position in Christ. However, the believer is ever facing the facts of his own weakness and of the masterful foes which are against him; and only by keeping Christ's commandments, which means adjustment to His perfect will (cf. John 15:10), is the way kept clear for the needed divine power to flow into the believer as sap flows into the branch. This passage illustrates the importance of a right objective and method in the Christian's life if he is to be made spiritual through the imparted divine energy. Though in perfect and unalterable union with Christ, the believer will be fruitless except he remains in that obedient relation to Christ wherein the power of the Spirit may be realized in and through him. Christ declared in verse 10 that He kept His Father's commandments and abode in His love, and this is asserted as the pattern for the believer thus to abide in Him. Certainly, Christ was not striving to keep saved by doing anything required to that end; He did, however, keep in perfect communion with His Father through obedience to His will. Union with Christ is God's undertaking and is

wrought for, and continues as the portion of, the one who merely believes; communion is the believer's undertaking—a specific plan of life which calls for an intelligent purpose and method of life, adapted to the precise will of God, on the part of the one who is saved.

II. Prescribed Obligations

Because of the superhuman requirements which rest upon the believer, the Spirit's filling unto supernatural power is demanded. This anticipates the right and true understanding of the Scriptures as well as the needed adjustments which secure divine power.

Three times the Apostle has divided the human family into threefold classification. (1) As respects their essential character in relation to God, he identifies the unsaved Gentiles as the "Uncircumcision," and declares of them, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12). In the same context (Eph. 2:11–12), the Apostle distinguishes the Jew as one who has received the "Circumcision in the flesh made by hands," which physical change sealed to the Jew the covenant promises of Jehovah (cf. Gen. 17:11). But in addition the same Apostle states that the Christian is set apart with a "circumcision made without hands" (Col. 2:11), which Scripture, as before noted, recognizes his vital union with Christ whereby he is partaking of all heavenly blessings, having been identified with Christ in His death, burial, and resurrection. The same threefold division is set forth in 1 Corinthians 10:32, which reads: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God." (2) As respects their supernatural relationships they are classified according to their attitude toward the written Word of God. In this, as earlier pointed out, they are *natural* men, which is a reference to the unsaved of this age whether Jew or Gentile, *carnal* men, which term identifies the saved man, Jew or Gentile, who is living or walking after the flesh, and *spiritual* men, which terminology indicates the Jew or Gentile who is walking with God in subjection to His revealed will and in dependence upon His power. (3) Finally, the Apostle divides men into three classes in respect to the exercise of divine law or authority over them. In 1 Corinthians 9:20–21 this is disclosed, which

passage reads: “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.” In this grouping, first the unsaved Gentiles of all ages and unsaved Jews of the present age are to be recognized as ones who are not under the Mosaic Law; but then at the time of the writing of the Scriptures in previous centuries all Jews had, and indeed until nearly that time when apostolic or Christian Scripture began to be formulated, their rightful place under the law. This, the old classification of Jews under the law, constitutes the second division here—men under the law. In the present age, to be sure, in which the Jew is recognized along with the Gentile as one without merit before God, all mankind is equally without law. The third division of men is that of Christians, whether Jew or Gentile, in which group the Apostle places himself as one who is neither under the law nor without the law but the rather *inlawed to Christ*. “The law of Christ” (cf. Gal. 6:2) is contained in His teachings of Christians about their responsibility as having been perfected through the saving grace of God. The phrase “my commandments,” significantly enough, was not used by Christ until His Upper Room Discourse. The body of truth included therein is augmented by that which is presented in the epistles of the New Testament, written as they were by men commissioned unto the very task by Christ. All together there is presented a peculiar obligation adjusted in character to the perfection which the believer sustains in Christ. Never by one exception is this ground of appeal ignored. Full recognition is taken of the revelation that the least of believers is partaking of the πλήρωμα of the Godhead (cf. John 1:16; Col. 1:19; 2:9–10). The directing of the life of one already complete in Christ is technical to the last degree; yet all this has been unobserved to a distressing extent by theologians of past generations. These grace teachings are clear and apparent, and their neglect or the persistent confusion of them with other relationships cannot easily be explained.

The Holy Spirit in enabling the child of God to fulfill all the will of the Father for him in his daily life can be expected to work advantageously only within the range of that which God requires of the believer. If through misguided ignorance the Christian sets himself to keep the Mosaic order

when God has faithfully warned him that the keeping of the law is not His will for him and that God has saved him from the law, he must not expect any cooperation of the Holy Spirit in pursuing such a course of error. Naturally, the Bible does not address itself to people who lived and whose obligations were completed before its text was written; however, it does address itself to the people of the age of law which began with Moses and ended with the death of Christ, it does address itself to people of the present age, and it also contemplates an age to come. Thus altogether three great rules of life are written down and each corresponds perfectly with the character of the divine purpose in the age to which it is related. Covenantism, which has molded the major theological conceptions for many generations, recognizes no distinctions as to ages, therefore can allow for no distinctions between law and grace. This dominating attitude of Covenantism must account for the utter neglect of life truth in all their works on theology. No more representative theological dictum from the Covenant viewpoint has been formed than the Westminster Confession of Faith, which valuable and important document recognizes life truth only to the point of imposing the Ten Commandments on Christians as their sole obligation, and in spite of the teachings of the New Testament which assert that the law was never given to Gentile or Christian and that, as said before, the latter has been saved and delivered from it (cf. John 1:16–17; Acts 15:23–29; Rom. 6:14; 7:1–6; 2 Cor. 3:11, 13; Gal. 3:23–25). Let it be restated that the Holy Spirit can be depended upon to enable the believer only as the believer's life and effort are conformed to God's will and plan for him in this age.

III. Dependence Upon the Spirit

Yet again it needs to be emphasized that the divine plan for the believer's daily life incorporates the issue of method by which that life shall be lived. Two procedures are possible, namely, dependence upon one's own ability and dependence upon the power of the indwelling Spirit. These two methods are wholly incompatible, or, to use the Apostle's language, they are "contrary the one to the other" (Gal. 5:17). Any attempt to combine two opposing principles will end in failure. Certainly any attempt to live by heavenly standards when depending upon human resources will be a

disappointment even though motivated by the greatest sincerity. It is the work of the Holy Spirit to empower the believer, not only in choosing an intelligent manner of life which does not attempt to establish union with Christ but rather understands the need to maintain communion with Christ, never attempting other rules of life than that addressed to the heavenly citizen, but also in confronting the vicissitudes of daily life as he commits it all to Him with the consciousness of man's inability and of His infinite ability. Thus is set forth the fundamental truth that the faith method of life, which stands wholly apart from human strength, is that alone which secures or realizes the Spirit's power and achievement.

IV. Word of God

The attitude of any person toward the Word of God is a certain indication of the innermost character and reality of that person's spiritual state. Recognizing this basic truth the Apostle states that all men of this age are divided, as before indicated, into three classes, namely, (a) the natural man —the ψυχικός man who is unregenerate, (b) the spiritual man—the πνευματικός man who is saved and empowered by the Holy Spirit, and (c) the carnal man—the σαρκικός man who is regenerated as being in Christ, but who is living in the sphere of the flesh. So vital is this grouping of all men that the Scriptures bearing on these distinctions should be given specific attention. The natural man, it will be seen, cannot know the things of the Spirit of God, the spiritual man discerns all things, and the carnal man can have only the milk of the Word and cannot have the "strong meat." The central passage reads, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ. And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" (1 Cor. 2:14–3:3). The declaration respecting the natural man regarding his incapacity to know the

things of God is of great import as an explanation of the religious situation in the modern world. No injury to the effect of God's truth is more harmful in its extent than that wrought by unregenerate men who, on the ground of human scholarship, are allowed to interpret and define the things of God. Men can hardly be saved who deny the only ground upon which any soul may be redeemed. That great denominations, once known as Christian, are under the direction of educated men who renounce the very ground of salvation by grace through the death of Christ is obvious. Instructors in colleges and universities are almost without exception committed to an unproved hypothesis which brands God's Word as untrue and attempts an inane solution of the problem of origin only because of the basic incapacity of the natural, unregenerate man to receive the things of the Spirit of God. These things are "foolishness" to the unsaved, yet highly educated, man and he cannot—not being in vital relation to the Spirit of God—know them. It still remains true that salvation with all the light it imparts is gained only through faith in a crucified and risen Savior, and no amount of education or ecclesiastical prominence will serve to dispel the spiritual darkness of unregenerateness. On all spiritual themes the opinion and dictum of the unsaved are not only as nugatory as the prattle of a child, but become as injurious as the stand and influence of the false teacher can make them. The basic need of unregenerate man is not education or culture—of great value as they are in their place—but salvation. A sincere student will judge the opinions and utterances of a man on the ground of his primary consideration —is he saved and thus entitled to speak as one enlightened by the Holy Spirit?

The spiritual man is the theme of the remainder of this volume. Suffice it to say at this point that he is called spiritual because he manifests a right adjustment to the Holy Spirit who indwells him. This manifestation includes the enlightenment given to such by which the spiritual man may come to know the Word of God.

The carnal man, to whom a more extended consideration will yet be given, is such because he, though perfectly saved and safe in Christ, is, nevertheless, walking after the flesh. In the portion of the context now under contemplation which describes him (1 Cor. 3:1–3) he is addressed as a *brother*. When this title is used of a spiritual relationship it refers only to one who is definitely a child of God by a birth from above. In the same

context it is asserted also that a carnal man is in Christ. These determining words must not go unobserved, because they afford the strongest possible evidence that he is saved and safe. His union with Christ is established, and since it depends on the imputed merit of Christ it can never be broken. The communion of the carnal believer, however, is disturbed by the fleshly manner of his life. More serious than all else, since he receives only the "milk of the word" he is deprived of the sanctifying power of the Scriptures and thus yields to envying, strife, and divisions. Whereas the spiritual man "walks in the Spirit," those who are carnal "walk as men," that is, as the unsaved walk. Instead of a "walk in love," they prefer divisions and separations, violating the essential command that they "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Of all the various evils in the Corinthian church against which the Apostle lifts his voice, the sin of sectarianism is first to be mentioned. The intense sinfulness of sin is indicated here as fully as everywhere else in the New Testament. The sectarian, then, if saved at all, is a babe in his spiritual development. Every discourse which glories in his separate grouping of professed believers is properly classed as *baby talk*. There is but one Body and one Spirit. Each Christian is called upon to love every other Christian on the basis of the unity of the one Body and the kinship in the one family of God. The fact of divisions and the promotion of them are an outward expression of the deeper sin of loveless carnality. One outstanding feature of carnality as here depicted by the Apostle is the separation of one believer from another. This is usually precipitated by the one of the two who deems himself holier than the other, being to that degree void of humility or consciousness of his own unspiritual manner of life. Aside from those specific instances when the church must exercise discipline over erring ones of their number, the carnal man may well be left confidently in the hands of God. As the Apostle warns, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand" (Rom. 14:4). A charitable attitude toward erring believers is sure to be engendered in the heart of the one who deals faithfully and truly before God with his own spiritual condition. By various terms the Bible teaches thus that there are two classes of Christians: those who "abide in Christ" and those who "abide not," those who are "walking in the light" and those who "walk in darkness," those who "walk by the Spirit" and those who "walk as men,"

those who “walk in newness of life” and those who “walk after the flesh,” those who have the Spirit *in* and *upon* them and those who have the Spirit *in* them but not *upon* them, those who are “spiritual” and those who are “carnal,” those who are “filled with the Spirit” and those who are not. All this has to do with the quality of daily life in saved people, and is in no way a contrast between the saved and the unsaved. Where there is such an emphasis in the Bible as is indicated by these distinctions there must be a corresponding reality. There is, then, the possibility of a great transition for those who are carnal into the reality of true spiritual living. The revelation concerning this possible transition, with all of its experiences and blessings, is taken seriously only by earnest believers who are faithfully seeking a God-honoring daily life. To such there is boundless joy and consolation in this gospel of deliverance, power, and victory.

It is probable that there are grades of differences within the group known as *spiritual* and within the group known as *carnal*. Some who are classed as spiritual may be more spiritual than others in their group, while some who are classed as carnal may be more carnal than others within their company; but into these shades of distinction the New Testament does not enter. This silence is reasonable. Any relationship to God which is less than a complete adjustment must of necessity be classed as carnal to some extent. It might be more accurate to state that carnality extends over a very wide range of human experience, while spirituality, though latitude be allowed for varied personalities, for varied degrees of educational discipline, and for varied environments, is, nevertheless, standardized to the extent that the experience of the Spirit’s filling is accorded to all within that group. It will be remembered, however, that the aspect of the Spirit’s manifestation which enters the field of Christian service must be, and is, adapted to the peculiar individual requirements that are appointed by the Holy Spirit. The believer is not an automaton, but exhibits all the seemingly infinite variations found in human characteristics and personality. Nor is he sustaining relations to a God who is no more than the embodiment of inflexible laws. As an earthly parent may recognize the peculiar temperament of an individual child, so God, but to an infinite degree of effectiveness, recognizes the whole field of issues which a particular person presents. What better interpretation can be made of the text “But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law” (Gal. 5:18) than that the life is not only personally directed by the Holy

Spirit to its last detail, but is contact with a living Person rather than mere conformity to a set of rules? No attainment in Christian experience is more effective or far-reaching in its instructive value than that of coming to know God—not merely to know about Him, but to experience the rest to the soul which such intimate acquaintance with God engenders. In this connection, the importance of not separating Matthew 11:27 from 11:28 may be seen. The passage when connected reads, “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” Spirituality cannot be defined properly as conformity to a set of rules; it is communion, cooperation, and compliance with a sovereign Person. The principle of law may easily become a major hindrance to the spiritual life. God does indicate in His Word that particular manner of life which becomes the spiritual believer and God recognizes the believer’s limitations in understanding; but it may be noted too that all such directions for proper conduct may be observed by the Christian rather unwillingly, or out of a sense of necessity, or without the slightest consciousness of a relation to God as His child. To be a spiritual Christian, however, is to walk with God in unbroken, vital companionship and communion in the enabling power of the Holy Spirit.

V. A Spiritual Transformation

As there is a great transition from the estate of the unsaved to that of the saved, there is also a transition for the Christian from the carnal to the spiritual state. The former change is wrought by God in answer to saving faith in Christ, while the latter is brought about by a natural release of the Spirit’s power in the believer when needed adjustments are made, which power has all been possessed though not necessarily experienced from the moment of salvation. It is possible that the one saved through faith may, at the same time, be yielded to God and thus enter at once upon a true spiritual experience; but a spiritual state is not a once-for-all achievement: it must be sustained by the Spirit’s renewal. It would seem that the Apostle Paul entered into a Spirit-filled experience three days after he was saved and in connection with the visit of Ananias (Acts 9:17–18); yet the Apostle did not

fully understand the conditions upon which he might be spiritual, from all appearances, since at a later time he passed through the experience recorded in Romans, chapter 7. There he states, “But how to perform that which is good I find not.”

A serious distortion of doctrine has been promoted by zealous but unthinking persons to the effect that the terms of salvation must include, in addition to faith in Christ, a complete surrender to His authority. As important as it is in its place, however, surrender is an issue which belongs only to the child of God. Advocates of this idealism should consider that the demand for surrender—as is true of every other human obligation which men are wont to add to simple faith—does not once appear in the upwards of one hundred and fifty passages in which salvation is said to depend on faith or belief alone. If surrender, or any other condition, is added, these passages become not only wholly inadequate but actually misleading. John 3:16 does not read “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him *and surrenders to him* should not perish, but have everlasting life,” yet those words or their equivalent must be added there as in all other similar Scriptures if any such text is to be depended upon for directions concerning the way of salvation. It remains true, consequently, that there are well-defined conditions upon which the carnal believer may become spiritual and that these are wholly unrelated to the one requirement by which those who are lost may be saved. The fact that Christians are too often carnal is recognized and deplored, and sermonic exhortations are many times addressed to them; but there is little teaching to show *how* the carnal believer may become spiritual. The Apostle surely did not lack for ideals or for desire to realize them when he said, “But how to perform that which is good I find not.” Still, he had not at the time gained the knowledge of God’s plan and provision for the spiritual life. This, indeed, was later revealed to him since he, above all others, has set forth the spiritual life in all its marvelous reality and declared the precise conditions upon which it may be experienced.

VI. The Terminology Used

Three phrases are used in the Word of God to represent the Spirit-filled life, namely, *the Spirit upon you*, *he that is spiritual*, and *filled with the*

Spirit. In the first instance—the Spirit upon you—a distinction is to be made between the Spirit dwelling in the believer and His coming upon the Christian. Anticipating the relationship that would obtain between the Holy Spirit and the believer after His coming into the world on Pentecost and declaring the relationship which the Holy Spirit then sustained to the disciples throughout the dispensation in which He was speaking, Christ said: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" (John 14:16–17). To this is to be added the further instructions given the disciples after He had breathed on them and said "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22), namely, that they were to tarry in Jerusalem—that is, undertake no mission or service—until the Spirit came *upon* them (Luke 24:49). Later, He said that, the Spirit coming *upon* them, they would be His witnesses unto the uttermost part of the earth (Acts 1:8). The reference to the Spirit descending *upon* the believer is thus seen to be identical with His filling. In the second instance—he that is spiritual—reference is made to the estate of the one who is Spirit-filled. He alone is to be esteemed spiritual (1 Cor. 2:15). In the third instance—filled with the Spirit—the phrase indicates a full and unrestrained manifestation of the indwelling Spirit. The Spirit's filling is not a receiving of the Holy Spirit since that was accomplished as a part of salvation, nor is it a receiving of more of the Spirit. He is a Person and no person is subject to subdivision, nor could a person be more or less present in any given location. By a more complete release to Him of the believer's life and being, however, the Holy Spirit who indwells the believer may secure a larger sphere of manifestation. To be filled with the Spirit is to have the Spirit fulfilling all that He came into the heart to do. This truth is far removed from the notion that the Holy Spirit is to be received as "a second work of grace" or "a second blessing." The Spirit-filled life is a realization in actual experience of what has been possessed from the moment one is saved. Ephesians 1:3 reveals the truth that every spiritual blessing is secured when one is saved. That verse reads: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." Of all the five ministries of the Spirit to the believer—regenerating, indwelling, sealing, baptizing, and

filling—the last-named is alone commanded and expected of the believer. The implication is that this ministry, quite unlike the other four, depends upon human cooperation and adjustment. It is clear that beyond the one responsibility of believing on Christ unto salvation, no obligation rests upon the Christian respecting the first four ministries named. The command to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18), being addressed to the child of God, not only indicates that it is an experience subsequent to salvation, but that the Christian's own faithfulness determines the degree of filling. In the preceding chapter of this volume the filling of the Spirit has been contrasted with the baptism with the Spirit. Because of the prevalent confusion of these ministries of the Holy Spirit, especial emphasis has been laid upon the distinction. Little more need be added to what has already been presented other than to point out again the facts that the Spirit's baptism is wrought of God for all believers when they believe, that it engenders no corresponding experience by which its reality may be identified, and that it is in no way related to Christian service or action. Over against this set of facts are the truths that the filling of the Spirit depends upon human faithfulness, that not all believers are so yielded to God as to be filled, that it is the source of all right Christian experience, and that it is the sufficient force behind all Christian life and service. Here it should be noted that in His filling the Holy Spirit causes the one whom He rules to manifest the individual's own personality, to exercise the gifts for service possessed by him—divinely bestowed as they are, and to achieve the work and to fill the place which God has designed for him. Too often it has been supposed that the Spirit-filled life would cause one to conform to some standardized experience, manner of life, or service. Yet there is nothing related to the believer more vital or more to be cherished than individuality. It is not the Spirit's procedure in and through the believer to disannul individuality, but to work through individuality to the glory of God. The Spirit-filled believer is God's normal, though he may not be God's usual, Christian. To be Spirit-filled is not to have gained some extraordinary concession from God; it is to be enabled normally to fulfill the will of God in the sphere of that which is divinely intended for each individual. It could not itself be extraordinary since it is enjoined upon every Christian and, apart from it, all must remain carnal. It is everywhere to be seen in the New Testament that God expects all who witness for Him to be empowered for this service by the filling of

the Spirit. And so while there may be sacrifice in the path, the prevailing note for Spirit-filled men is that of joyous experience and overflowing peace. According to Romans 12:2 the yielded life makes full proof of the good, acceptable, and perfect will of God. God's dealing with the early church is certainly the pattern for all believers since the records have been incorporated into the Sacred Text with that obvious purpose. From these records it will be seen that it is the divine ideal for each individual believer to be filled with the Spirit before beginning any Christian service; and as the early Christians were refilled in preparation for each mission, in like manner it should be true with believers today. As before noted, the disciples were bidden to tarry in Jerusalem until they be endued with power from on high (Luke 24:49). It was a waiting until the Spirit came *upon* them. To them the Savior said: "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you" (Acts 1:8). The significant words, "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost," precede the record of each important service they rendered. The entire family—Zacharias, Elisabeth, and John the Baptist—are all said to have been filled with the Spirit; and unto Christ in the sphere of His humanity—which humanity is the most definite example left for the believer—the Spirit was given without measure (John 3:34), and the phrase, He "being full of the Holy Ghost" (Luke 4:1), qualifies all the things that He did.

In the light of examples which are set before the Christian and of the heaven-high calling he has respecting the character of his daily life, it is not strange that all without exception are commanded to be filled with the Spirit.

In concluding this extended introduction to the more detailed consideration of the Spirit-filled life to follow, it is important to note that three times in the New Testament the effect of strong drink is put over against the Spirit-filled life (Luke 1:15; Acts 2:12–21; Eph. 5:18). As strong drink stimulates the body's physical forces and men are prone to turn to it for help over the difficult places, so the child of God, facing what seems like an impossible responsibility in his heavenly walk and service, is directed to the Spirit as the source of all sufficiency. Every moment in a spiritual life is one of unmeasured need and superhuman demands, and the supply of enabling power or grace must be constantly received and employed. "As thy days, so shall thy strength be." To be filled with the

Spirit is to have the Spirit fulfilling in us all that God intended Him to do when God placed Him there. To be filled is not the problem of getting *more* of the Spirit: it is rather the problem of the Spirit getting *more* of Christians. None shall ever have *more* of the Spirit than the anointing which every true Christian has received. On the other hand, the Spirit may get control of all of the believer and thus be able to manifest in him the life and character of Christ. A spiritual person, then, is one who experiences the divine purpose and plan in his daily life through the power of the indwelling Spirit. The character of that life will be such as to manifest Christ. The root cause of that life will be nothing less than the unhindered indwelling Spirit (Eph. 3:16–21; 2 Cor. 3:18). The New Testament is clear respecting just what the Spirit would produce in a fully adjusted life, and all of this revelation taken together forms the Bible definition of spirituality. These undertakings in a believer's life are distinctly assigned to the Spirit, and so are His manifestations in and through the Christian.

There is a twofold development to the Spirit's work in and through the Christian, namely, the negative aspect and the positive aspect. Following the present introduction without more delay, these two aspects will be considered in successive chapters.

Chapter XIII

Power to Overcome Evil

The individual is a Christian when rightly related to Christ; the Christian is spiritual when rightly related to the Spirit. Spirituality contemplates two achievements, namely, overcoming evil and promoting that which is good in the believer's life and experience. The one is negative—a disannulling of evil, the other is positive—a realization of the supernatural qualities and accomplishments which belong to a superhuman manner of life. Though so widely different in their immediate aim, both lines of work are essential and to some extent inseparable, though it is quite conceivable that a deliverance from evil might be attained without also a manifestation of the Spirit's power in the sphere of vital achievements for good. The reverse surely could not be true, that is, the experience of the Spirit's power for good would not be enjoyed if evil were not overcome to some degree. But on the other hand it is hardly to be expected that the Holy Spirit, when free to work in the child of God, would not do all that He desires; and both aspects of spirituality, to be sure, belong to His undertaking. Here arises what seems to be a paradox: Evil cannot be overcome apart from the energizing power of the Spirit, yet all this latent power cannot be experienced where evil is not being overcome. The answer to this problem is found in the truth that the Holy Spirit who indwells, when trusted to do so, will accomplish both ends of spirituality and in such relation to Himself as may be necessary. No burden, therefore, is placed upon the Christian to order or arrange respecting the Spirit's undertakings; the Christian is rather enjoined to maintain nothing but a right dependence upon the Spirit regarding all His work in the individual heart. Since evil is ever arising in the heart because of the active power of the sin nature, the power of the Holy Spirit is ever needed to overcome it; and since the obligation to live and serve to the glory of God is always present, the same enabling power of the Spirit is unceasingly required. A poorly thought-out and eccentric notion obtains, namely, that spirituality is achieved when there is a cessation of some outward forms of evil, that spirituality consists in what one does *not* do. Spirituality, however, is not suppression alone; it is also expression. It is not only restraining self; it is the outliving of Christ who indwells. The unregenerate man would not be saved if he ceased sinning; he would still be

without the new birth. The Christian would not become spiritual should he abstain from worldliness; he would lack the positive manifestations of the Spirit. Spirituality is primarily an output, a vital living, and a fruitful service for God. However, both the negative and the positive aspects of the spiritual life are essential and each must be given due consideration here. The central passage, to which reference must often be made, is Galatians 5:16–23. In this Scripture there is first an unfolding of the Spirit's work toward the evil flesh and in spite of all the opposition that the flesh engenders. This portion reads, "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:16–21). Over against this, the portion which records a positive, constructive, spiritual output from the believer's life wrought by the Spirit reads: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law" (Gal. 5:22–23). Attention may now be given to one of these features of a spiritual life.

The Christian experiences an unceasing, simultaneous, threefold conflict —with the world, the flesh, and the devil. The Christian's life is likened to a race, a walk, and a warfare. In the race (Heb. 12:1–2) the weights which the world would impose must be laid aside, in the walk (Rom. 8:4; Gal. 5:16–17) the power of the flesh is to be overcome, and in the warfare (Eph. 6:10–12) Satan and his hosts are to be vanquished. The conflict with the world is outward and calls for drastic separation therefrom, the conflict with the flesh is inward and calls for a complete reliance upon divine strength and for an intelligent and worthy understanding of the innermost forces of human life, the conflict with Satan is largely in spiritual realms and involves the same utter dependence upon the sufficient power of the indwelling Spirit. Satan is the most powerful, the most iniquitous, the most despotic, the most delusive, and the most deadly foe. Conflict with the world is

against influences, conflict with the flesh is against inward desires, but conflict with Satan is against a person, unrelenting and cruel, a person who, were he not compelled to gain permission from God for all that he does toward the saints (cf. Job 1:11–12), would destroy every Christian in a moment of time. It is no meaningless figure of speech which declares that Satan as a roaring lion goes about seeking whom he may devour. At no moment of life is the child of God free from anyone of these foes, at no moment of life is he able to face even one of these foes, and at no moment of life is he without the infinite enablement of the indwelling Holy Spirit who is given to him as his resource in this immeasurable impact against evil. Christ said, "Without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5). Over against this, as the other side of the picture, the Apostle declares, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13). Again, he declares, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2). Not one of these foes is superior to the Holy Spirit. To discover this, to believe this, and to claim His sufficiency by an attitude of faith is the key to a victorious, God-honoring life. It is an *attitude* of faith and not one act either of faith or crisis experience. Fighting "the good fight of faith" means to maintain a reliance upon the Spirit to fight the foe. This conflict continues as long as there is a foe. Never in this life is the influence of the world eradicated, never is that of the flesh, and never is that of Satan. These foes may well be given an individual and more comprehensive examination.

I. The World

Second in scope only to the revealed truth regarding Satan is the confusion, ignorance, and misunderstanding which obtain relative to the facts disclosed in the New Testament about the Satan-ruled, *cosmos* world system. The truth respecting Satan and his *cosmos* system is clearly set forth in the Scriptures; in spite of this, far more than a normal neglect and perversion of these doctrines exists. By this distortion of truth much danger is engendered for the believer lest he himself, reflecting the ignorance of his day, be unaware of the nature, power, and design of these foes. The truth respecting Satan and his world system has been examined at length under

Satanology, a subdivision of Angelology. A return to the contemplation of these doctrines is required in the order and course of this chapter.

In the New Testament, the English word *world* is a translation, for the most part, of three widely different Greek terms: αἰών, used fortyone times when referring to time, denotes an age; οἰκουμένη, used fourteen times, denotes the inhabited earth; and κόσμος, used one hundred and eighty-six times, indicates a vast world system. The word *cosmos* (its opposite is chaos) means an order, system, and arrangement which is such because it is so determined by a master mind. Over this system is the one whom Christ three times designated "the prince of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). As before set forth at length, the world system is that project the realization of which actuated Satan in the beginning when he departed from the will of God (John 8:44; Isa. 14:12–14), which world system God has permitted Satan to realize to the end that it may be judged, along with its prince, for what it will have demonstrated itself to be. Beyond and aside from the evident divine permission for this system to run its course, including the evil which it incorporates, God is exercising His own undiminished authority over His creation. Strictly speaking, Satan has created nothing. All that he utilizes, he has appropriated from that which is in no way his own. The precise knowledge of all that enters into the satanic *cosmos* system will be gained only as the contexts are examined in which the word *cosmos* occurs. It is this, the specific study of what is one of the greatest doctrines of the New Testament, which many worthy men have failed to pursue; and, because this body of truth is so little apprehended, the great company of believers are unaware of the enmity which the world system sustains toward God and His people. James writes: "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God" (James 4:4). This reference to adultery is tied in here with a spiritual usage and therefore means a forsaking of right love and loyalty toward God, substituting in their place the things of this Satan-ruled world. James says again that Christian responsibility is a call to keep oneself "unspotted" from the world (1:27). It is of great advantage to the Christian to know the nature and extent of the *cosmos* world system. It includes governments ruled by force and motivated by greed (Matt. 4:8–9; Luke 4:5–6); yet the believer must live under, and to a large extent share in, and pray for these

governments. Their laws are said to be ordained of God. This satanic system has its educational standards and ideals which resist and ignore every fact and feature of revelation. “The world by wisdom knew not God” (1 Cor. 1:21); yet the child of God must sustain a relation to the world system and its education in various ways. This world system professes to defend, or at least to tolerate, its own religious ideals, which ideals are no more than a recognition of ethics coupled with a denial of every feature of the saving grace of God made possible through the sacrificial blood of Christ; yet the believer is called upon to associate with men who thus interpret the Christian faith and to keep in such relation to them that he can testify to them. Similarly, the world system presents its own sort of entertainment. The world and “worldly” Christians turn to so-called “worldly” things because they discover in them an anesthetic to deaden the pain of an empty heart and life. The anesthetic, which is often quite innocent in itself, is not so serious a matter as the empty heart and life. Little is gained toward true spirituality when would-be soul doctors have succeeded in persuading the afflicted to get on without the anesthetic. If these instructors do not present the reality of such consolation and filling for heart and life as God has provided, the condition will not be improved. How misleading is the theory that to be spiritual one must abandon play, diversion, and helpful amusement! Such a conception of spirituality is born of a morbid human conscience. It is foreign to the Word of God. It is a device of Satan to make the blessings of God seem abhorrent to young people who are overflowing with physical life and energy. It is to be regretted that there are those who in blindness are so emphasizing the negatives of Christian truth as to create the impression that spirituality is opposed to joy, liberty, and naturalness of expression in thought and life when such are in the Spirit. Spirituality is not a pious pose. It is not merely a “Thou shalt not,” “Thou shalt.” It flings open the doors into the eternal blessedness, energies, and resources of God. It is a serious thing to remove the element of relaxation and play from any life. We cannot be normal physically, mentally, or spiritually, if we neglect this vital factor in human life. God has provided so well that our joy can be full. It is also to be noted that one of the characteristics of true spirituality calls for it to supersede lesser desires and issues. The Biblical, as well as practical, cure for “worldliness” among Christians is so to fill the heart and life with the

eternal blessings of God that there will be a joyous preoccupation and absentmindedness relative to unspiritual things. A dead leaf that may have clung to the twig through the external, raging storms of winter will silently fall to the ground when the new flow of sap from within has begun in the spring. The leaf falls because there is a new manifestation of life pressing from within outward. A dead leaf cannot remain where a new bud is springing, nor can worldliness remain where the blessings of the Spirit are flowing. The preacher is not called upon to preach against "dead leaves." He has a message of the imperishable spring. It is of the outflow of the limitless life of God. When by the Spirit ye are walking, ye *cannot* do the things that ye otherwise would.

The line of demarcation between the things of God and the things of the *cosmos* world is not always easily discerned. At this point, it is imperative that the Christian should be led of the Spirit. However, the conflict with the world, with its glitter, tinsel, and delusions, is very real. The Apostle John writes: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever" (1 John 2:15–17). The child of God is not of this sort of world. Twice in His last prayer connected with the upper room Christ said: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John 17:14, 16). So, again: "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one" (1 John 5:19, R.V.). It therefore becomes the Christian to live in separation from the world. This he can do only through being empowered and directed constantly by the Holy Spirit. John again declares in his first epistle, "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (5:4–5). It is evident from the fact John refers in verse 5 to faith in the Son of God as the way to victory over the world that he is there contemplating the Christian's deliverance from the *cosmos* world system, which deliverance is wrought when the Christian is saved (cf. Col. 1:13); but it is equally true to say it is by faith or confidence in the power of God that he is delivered from the influence of the *cosmos* world from day to day. The latter deliverance from

the world day by day seems to be that to which reference is made in the last half of verse 4, “and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” Since the line of demarcation between the believer’s spiritual walk and the choice of the *cosmos* world often is so difficult to draw, and because the world’s attractions and demands are so impelling if not prevailing, divine sufficiency must be claimed at all times and under all circumstances.

II. The Flesh

In some instances the word σάρξ, translated *flesh*, is synonymous with the word σῶμα, translated *body*; the word *flesh* is more often employed with reference to the whole of the unregenerate man—spirit, soul, and body. It thus assumes an ethical and psychological meaning which does not inhere in the word *body*. A physical body is denominated *flesh* whether dead or alive, whereas the term *flesh* in its ethical meaning includes not only the body but also that which makes it a living thing—the unseen reality which expresses and manifests itself through the body. A very complex situation is thus confronted wherein the living factors of human existence—spirit, soul, Adamic nature, heart, kidneys, mind, sensibility, will, and conscience—are all integral parts. This complexity, which in some features of it defies human analysis, has had the required treatment under Anthropology previously. Thus—to repeat briefly from Volume II—as a feature of the immaterial part of man is included a nature which is prone to sin. It is in reality the original human nature which has been injured, and as such has been reproduced throughout all succeeding generations. By his first sin the first man became at once a different order of being than that which he was made by creation, and the law of procreation obtained, which is to the effect that the species reproduces after its kind. That Adam’s offspring was fallen is confirmed and demonstrated by the act of murder on the part of his first-born. Being derived from Adam, this fallen nature is rightfully termed *the Adamic nature*. Failure to recognize this nature as an unalterable and universal feature in all human existence does not change the fact, and it is the part of wisdom to acknowledge it and should be the plan of one’s life to be adjusted to it. Four more or less common errors should be identified and avoided: (1) that man is not evil by nature, (2) that children are born into the world unfallen, (3) that the Adamic nature may be eradicated, and (4) that

the Adamic nature may be controlled by the power of the human determination and will. Being an integral part of a human being, this evil nature cannot and will not be dismissed until the body itself in which it functions is redeemed, or until the separation between the body and the immaterial elements of soul and spirit is achieved by death. The Adamic nature is the dominating factor in all that enters into the flesh. That nature remains undiminished and unimpaired in each believer after he is saved and becomes one of the three great foes of the spiritual life. With the reception of the divine nature which is imparted through regeneration, the Christian becomes a complex being, possessing two natures—not, two personalities—with a corresponding complexity of life, for unless the evil nature is controlled by more than human competency it will assert itself to the dishonor of God. It is not within the range of human will power, even when fortified by the best resolutions, to control the Adamic nature. The conflict must be turned over to the indwelling Holy Spirit with constant and unrelenting faithfulness. To gain the victory the believer must maintain an *attitude* of faith to the end that he may be saved from the reigning power of sin, just as he was saved by an *act* of faith from the guilt and penalty of sin. In every aspect of the situation it is plain that one must live by faith. The life which a justified person should live is, because of his superior foes and because of his own impotency, an impossibility apart from the divine enablement which is realized in answer to faith. Salvation into safety from eternal judgment and salvation into sanctity are both a work of God. Human determination can avail no more in the one than in the other. The fact that the unregenerate possess a fallen nature is generally admitted. The misunderstanding is with regard to the Christian. The Bible teaching is clear, and yet some professing Christians are misled into assuming that they do not any longer possess the tendency to sin. This question may be discussed both from the experimental and from the Biblical standpoint. Experimentally, the most saintly of God’s children have been conscious of the presence and power of a fallen nature. This may be called the normal consciousness of the devout believer. Such a consciousness is not an evidence of immaturity: it is rather the evidence of a true humility and clear vision of one’s own heart. It does not imply a lack of fellowship with God occasioned by grieving of the Holy Spirit through sin. Who can hate sin more than the one who is *aware* of its presence and power? And who is in

greater danger of its havoc in his spiritual life than the one who in unwarranted presumption has assumed that the disposition to sin has been removed? The contention that one has no disposition to sin must be based upon a shocking lack of self-knowledge respecting the motives and impulses of the heart, or, if not, such an assumption is made through failure to comprehend the true character of sin itself. If an individual can convince himself that sin is something different from *anything* he ever does or is inclined to do, beyond indeed anything he ever thinks, feels, or undertakes, he can doubtless convince himself that he has not sinned at all. If, in his own mind, one can modify the character of sin, he can, by that very process, relieve himself from the *consciousness* of sin. There are not a few such people in the world today. Truth of a spiritual nature cannot stand when based upon human experience. It must be based upon revelation. Sin is not what some prejudiced, misguided person *claims* it to be; it is what God has *revealed* it to be. Sin has been well defined, from a study of the whole testimony in the Word of God, as "any violation of, or want of conformity to, the revealed will of God." It is *missing the mark*. But what mark? Surely the *divine* standard. The believer may ask, Have I done *all* and *only* His will with motives as pure as heaven and in the unchanging faithfulness of manner characterizing the Infinite? God has provided the possibility of a perfect victory; but Christians have all too often failed in its realization. If possessed with any degree of the knowledge of God and self-knowledge, they are aware that too often they are far from sinless in the eyes of God. The consciousness of sinfulness at times in their life has been the testimony of the most spiritual believers of all generations, as they have been enabled to see the Person of God in contrast to themselves. Job, the upright in heart, abhorred himself before God. Daniel, against whom no sin is recorded, said "My comeliness was turned in me into corruption."

The central passage bearing upon the truth that the believer possesses two natures and that one of these, the sin nature, cannot be governed even by the will power of a regenerate person is found in Romans 7:15–8:4; but before the passage is quoted some general introductory words are in order. This Scripture presents a conflict between two aspects of the ego which the believer represents. The word *I* appears in two quite different and conflicting uses, but all within the one personality of the Apostle whose experience is here recorded. The controversy is real, being waged as it is

between two natures—the original fallen nature which is prone to evil and which for convenience may be styled *the old*, and that which in the same person answers to his saved self and which may be called *the new*. For the time being and for the best of reasons, the saved self is hypothetically contemplated apart from the indwelling Holy Spirit. The vital question is whether a Christian, of himself and merely because he is saved, has power to contend victoriously with his sin nature. No more subtle or deceptive battle is possible. In this conflict between the saved man possessed of a new nature and his fallen nature, the saved man with his holy aims is utterly defeated. Being saved, now he has high and holy ideals, and yet because of his inability to realize these he becomes a "wretched man." Quite in contrast to this sort of battle is the conflict described in Galatians 5:16–17, which passage reads: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit [lit., by means of the Spirit], and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Here victory over the flesh is assured if it is fought in reliance upon the Holy Spirit. In this passage it is also disclosed that the believer's old nature and the Holy Spirit are always "contrary" the one to the other. These two can never by any selfdiscipline of the old nature be brought into the slightest agreement. What is true respecting the disagreement between the Holy Spirit and the old nature according to Galatians 5:16–17 is equally true of the disagreement between the new nature or saved self and the old nature according to the Romans passage under consideration. Of the two passages, it should be observed that the one records a total failure and the other a total victory, the essential and impressive difference between them being that in the one instance the limited strength of the saved self has wrought in conflict with the old nature unto total defeat and that in the other instance the Holy Spirit when followed has wrought in conflict with the old nature unto total victory.

Various interpretations of Romans 7:15–25 have been advanced, all of which fail in a greater or less degree to account for the situation which the context sets forth. The more common and more erroneous type is one advanced, for example, by Philip Mauro which contends that the Scripture records here an experience of the great Apostle before he was saved. The fallacy of this interpretation is evident. No such experience could really

have occurred in the Apostle's life, nor could it happen in the experience of any unregenerate person. On the contrary, the Apostle declares that before he was saved he lived in all good conscience and before the law as one blameless (Phil. 3:6). Beyond the dictation of a feeble conscience the unsaved entertain no such ideals or purposes as these of Romans 7 to walk well-pleasing to God. God is not in all their thoughts. Finally and conclusively, the same ego of Romans, chapter 7, is continued unaltered into chapter 8 and its Christian emphasis. The difference being indicated between chapters 7 and 8 is not one of salvation, but deliverance from the power of sin and death which is ever the legitimate fruit of the sin nature.

This record is plainly that of the experience of the Apostle Paul. It describes that through which he passed when with less understanding of his own self he had attempted to realize heavenly ideals in life by relying on his own strength of purpose and will. It would be inconsistent for those who have never striven by any means, false or true, to reach such ideals to look down with pity on one who is at least on the way to discover his own limitations and the limitless resources which are resident in the indwelling Spirit.

Having determined that this passage records the struggle of a child of God, it is of real value to note that he, though saved, possesses a fallen nature, and his deliverance is not by eradication but by the overcoming power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:2). From each reference to the old "I" as well as from the parallel phraseology which is found in the passage, namely, "sin [nature] that dwelleth in me" (vss. 17, 20), "In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" (vs. 18), "Evil is present with me" (vs. 21), "sin which is in my members" (vs. 23), "I myself serve … with the flesh the law of sin" (i.e., the nature—vs. 25), it is evident that the writer possessed a fallen nature. The portion of this passage which leads up to the question "Who shall deliver me?" as read with some comment interjected is as follows: "For that which I [because of the old nature] do I [because of the new] allow not: for what I [the new] would, that do I [the old] not; but what I [the new] hate, that do I [the old]. If then I [the old] do that which I [the new] would not, I consent unto the law [or, will of God for me] that it is good. Now then it is no more I [the new] that do it, but sin [the old] that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me [the old] (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform

that which is good I find not. For the good that I [the new] would I [the old] do not: but the evil which I [the new] would not, that I [the old] do. Now if I [the old] do that I [the new] would not, it is no more I [the new] that do it, but sin [the old] that dwelleth in me. I find then a law [not, a law of Moses], that, when I [the new] would do good, evil [the old] is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members [the old], warring against the law of my mind [the new, that delights in the law of God], and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin [the old] which is in my members. O wretched [Christian] man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

The nature of this conflict is evident as is also the complete failure being recorded. How to perform that which is good is a problem which every serious Christian faces, and while thousands of preachers are occupied with telling their congregations that they should be good, practically none are telling them *how* to be good. This failure is due to the neglect of Christian life truth in institutions where men are trained for the ministry. This neglect is not due to any want of explicit Scripture bearing upon it, or to any lack of provision on the part of God to the end that believers may be victorious in life and service. The great Apostle discovered what uncounted others have discovered, namely, that, when he would do good, evil—the sin nature with its disposition to sin—was present with him. His own efforts to realize those high ideals, which are the natural accompaniments of a regenerate estate, were ineffective. Thus in uttermost distress he cried, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" By a gruesome, yet meaningful, figure the Apostle likens his fallen nature to a corpse lashed to him which he must carry wherever he goes.

The answer to the problem is twofold: he will be delivered *through* the saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ (7:25) and *by* the personal intervention of the Holy Spirit (8:2). The actual or experimental deliverance is by the Holy Spirit, but such a deliverance is made possible only through that which Christ has wrought in His death as a veritable judgment of the sin nature. Though considered earlier, this theme arises at the present point again and for careful examination, since it is a major factor in all Spirit-empowered living and service. Inasmuch as this aspect of Christ's death has constituted the central theme of the preceding chapter in the Roman letter, the Apostle is justified in building his argument upon it and that without

further analysis of it. As before stated, the Holy Spirit, being holy, could not be free to do anything with the sin nature unless first it be judged by God and in a manner all-satisfying to Him. Every barrier to infinite holiness must be removed. In this connection it may be observed that the Holy Spirit is free to regenerate the unsaved without judgments or the infliction of a single blow, and on the ground of the truth that Christ died for the sins of the one whom the Spirit would save. The regenerating work of the Spirit is thus seen to be "through Jesus Christ our Lord." In like manner, Christ having died a judgment death unto the sin nature, the Spirit is free to deliver unceasingly "through Jesus Christ our Lord." Christ's death unto sin, meaning the nature, is described in Romans 6:1–10 and consists in the believer's cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection with Christ. All that the believer is, even to his sin nature, came under that substitution, which substitution has become a perfect judgmental satisfaction secured on the part of God against that nature. Since the entire structure of the divinely arranged plan whereby the believer may live above the power of the flesh to the glory of God is grounded absolutely and solely on the truth that Christ died unto the sin nature as an all-satisfying judgment of it, this fact becomes at once the primary issue, the gospel of deliverance, the good news respecting a finished work for the believer which in point of importance and scope of achievement is second only to that saving work of the Holy Spirit which is based on the finished work of Christ for the unsaved. For his own sake and for the sake of others to whom he may be called to minister, the student should be aware of four immeasurable realities: (1) that every Christian being possessed as he still is of the flesh is called upon to wage a ceaseless warfare against the old nature, (2) that every Christian is indwelt by the Spirit and is thus equipped with power to be victorious over the flesh, (3) that Christ has died the judgment death required against the sin nature, and (4) that the deliverance from the power of the flesh is wrought on the principle of faith or dependence upon the Spirit rather than on the basis of any supposed resources of his own. These four truths which are so closely related are probably more misunderstood and neglected than any others within the range of Bible doctrine. Who, indeed, could estimate what would have been the history of believers as respects their character and faithfulness had these truths been given the elucidating emphasis that belongs to them! How important it is in the progress of each believer that he

shall come to a right comprehension and recognition of himself, that is, of the fact and dominating force of the flesh with which he contends! Earlier in this volume, when examining the doctrine of the Spirit's baptism, the truth was presented that by such a baptism Christ is "put on" (cf. Gal. 3:27), and this upon the righteous ground of the sweet savor aspect of Christ's death. Under the present discussion the complementary truth is being contemplated, which reveals that by the death of Christ unto the judgment of the sin nature the "old man" is "put off" for Christ to be "put on." Experimentally, by means of the power of the Holy Spirit the believer may realize the negative aspect of the spiritual life, which means deliverance and preservation from evil; and positionally, by means of the Spirit he may realize the positive aspect of the spiritual life, which is the outliving of the inliving Christ (cf. Gal. 2:20).

Several major passages establish the truth that the believer's flesh with its sin nature was judged by Christ in His death, and show how it was a complete substitution to the extent that the flesh with its sin nature was as perfectly dealt with as it would have been had these features been judged in the believer himself. In truth, since there was nothing of a sin nature in Christ which related Him to a judgment death, the only explanation of His death possible in this aspect of it makes it out a substitution for others; the souls for whom He died this death (cf. Gal. 5:24), upon believing, are reckoned by God to be wholly and eternally in possession of every value of that death. Certain passages may well be considered:

Galatians 5:24. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

Unlike some other references in the New Testament to the death of Christ as a judgment of the sin nature residing in the believer, the tense of the verb as translated in this verse is properly represented. In a past and completed sense the Christian's flesh, with its affections and lusts, was crucified when Christ was crucified. Far, indeed, is this removed from the idea that the believer is to attempt self-crucifixion by any means whatever; rather the great transaction is done and the responsibility resting on the Christian is to *believe* it and to *reckon* it to be true. Complete assurance can thus be gained that the way is also clear for the Holy Spirit to accomplish a full experimental deliverance from the reigning power of sin. The declaration of the passage is direct and conclusive. All that are Christ's *have*

crucified the flesh. This is the divine achievement in and through the death of Christ. It is most evident that this refers to a positional rather than an experimental reality; yet how limitless is the value to the believer of the fact that the judgment is accomplished and the victory is possible! There need be no wonder if this fact is not generally understood and recognized. Even the death of Christ as the righteous basis for forgiveness and justification is slighted and misunderstood by the great mass of people; and it is probable that where a hundred have come to comprehend their dependence upon Christ's death for their salvation, there is no more than one that apprehends his dependence upon Christ's death for his sanctification as well.

Romans 6:1–10. Though not again quoted here, this Scripture portion should be read with care considering the fact that it is a record—the most extended and exhaustive in the New Testament—of the thing Christ did in judgment of the believer's sin nature. The context continues on, with reference to the presence and power of the sin nature and the possible victory over it, into chapter 8. Having in 6:1–10 declared the truth that a judgment has been gained against the sin nature, the Apostle in 6:11–23 urges the appropriation of this limitless benefit. In 7:1–14 he declares the merit system to be removed, so that the life now in immediate relation to Christ may actually be realized. In 7:15–8:2 the inability of the saved man in himself to overcome the sin nature is declared. The oft-repeated reference to what is described once as "sin which is in my members" indicates the presence of the sin nature in the believer: something which, though identified, is incapable of being governed by any power other than that of the indwelling Spirit. However, the way to victory is prepared since Christ has died unto the sin nature (8:3–13). The victory must be "through Jesus Christ our Lord," but will be wrought out in experience, even a freedom from the power of sin and death, by the Spirit of Life-in-Christ-Jesus. In the one verse, 8:3, a most determining declaration is made. The verse reads: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." The merit system in itself is holy, just, and good. Its failure must therefore be due to the fact that it was addressed to weak flesh, which could in no wise respond to its demands. Since the merit system fails, as it always does, God moved in the direction of a new principle of living (8:4), namely, a walk after the Spirit or in dependence upon the Spirit. In such

case, the whole will of God will be fulfilled *in* the believer, but never will it be fulfilled *by* the believer. Back of this achievement by the Spirit is the truth that, to make a new walk possible, God sent His own Son, who came not as One of sinful flesh, but in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, that is, the nature, thus to condemn, in the sense of bringing to judgment, that sin —the nature—which is in the flesh. Thus, as a climax at the end of so extended a Scripture bearing on the sin nature and its control, the direct statement is made that Christ brought the believer's sin nature into judgment, and on this legal and righteous ground the Holy Spirit can cause the believer to triumph to the extent of the realization of the full will of God.

Second only to salvation itself is this great reality of a God-honoring life and the divinely provided way in which it is to be attained. That the passage under consideration presents only the problem of the sin nature is obvious from the identification thereof which is repeatedly found in this portion of the Scriptures, Romans 6:1–10, and in that which follows to the end of the context, or to 8:13. The sins of the unsaved or the sins of the saved as such are not in view; it is a problem wholly related to the root of all—the sin nature and its judgment. The following expressions in this context, including 7:15–25 and 8:3, attest this: "dead to sin" (6:2), "planted [or, conjoined] together [with Him] in the likeness of his death" (6:5), "Our old man is [better, as in R.V., *was*] crucified with him" (6:6), "if we be dead with Christ" (6:8), "he died unto sin [i.e., the sin nature] once" (6:10), "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin" (6:11), "Sin shall not have dominion over you" (6:14), "sin that dwelleth in me" (7:17, 20), "sin which is in my members" (7:23), "sin in the flesh" (8:3). In no sense is this great theme a mere command for the Christian to try to crucify his own flesh, nor is it something he is called upon to enact by use of a mere ordinance. When any of these untrue interpretations are put on this and other passages, it is at the expense of what is vital and valuable beyond all computation.

The Christian is likewise, through the resurrection of Christ in the substitutionary aspect of it, brought judicially upon resurrection ground whereon death as a judgment for the sin nature is wholly past. This is the sublime reality asserted in Romans 6:7–10, which reads: "For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we

shall also live with him: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." He that is dead, as the believer is reckoned to be in Christ's judgment death, is freed from those demands respecting the sin nature which required the penalty of death; but then one cannot have died in Christ's death without being made alive also with Him in His resurrection. As this judgment death of His hath no more claim over Christ, being accomplished to infinite completeness, Christ dieth no more, nor is there ever again need of such a death. Therefore, the grand reality emerges that, as Christ died unto the sin nature once for all, even so the one for whom it was accomplished possesses the undiminished benefit of His death to the same degree of infinity of completeness, thus to become not only one in whom the sin nature is judged and who stands freed from the penalty of such a judgment death, but one who has judicially entered the limitless sphere of Christ's resurrection life. This position in resurrection is as actual as either the death or the burial with Christ. On this new ground the believer is enjoined respecting daily life: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God … For ye are dead [as all are for whom Christ thus died], and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:1–3).

Colossians 2:11–12. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

The right understanding of this Scripture depends very largely on recognizing that the reference to Christ's circumcision is a reference to His death—a putting off of the body or substance of the flesh as a formidable hindrance to spirituality, not Christ's physical body as Paul meant earlier in Colossians 1:22, nor the believer's physical body, but an ethical circumcision in which the sin nature which is found in the flesh is judicially deposed from its rule. As before indicated, this, since Christ Himself had no sin nature, is a case of substitution; it is Christ's judgment death in behalf of the sin nature resident in those for whom He thus died, the same threefold undertaking as Romans 6:2–4 announced, namely, codeath, coburial, and

coresurrection. The death represents the execution of the demands of infinite holiness against the sin nature and is in all instances presented as a thing wholly accomplished for the believer. The burial represents the disposition of the offense of the sin nature before God, as that same burial, according to 1 Corinthians 15:3–4, is also the disposition of the offense of the sins of the world. Similarly, Romans 6:4 declares the burial to be the judicial disposition of the offense of the sin nature, itself being secured by the union of Christ and believers which the Spirit's baptism has wrought. Again no command, example, or precept concerning an ordinance is incorporated into this lofty passage of Colossians 2. The reference to baptism is a recognition of the Spirit's baptism, which alone engenders that vital union to Christ by which the believer becomes so identified with Him that he has secured unto himself all the value of Christ's crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection.

Ephesians 4:20–24; Colossians 3:8–10. "But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. … But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him."

The two expressions *put off* and *put on* are significant when the right form of the verb is introduced into the translation. Again it is allusion to that past, completed achievement of Christ in His death and resurrection. By that death the old man was put off (cf. Rom. 6:6; Gal. 5:24), and by that death and resurrection the provision was made whereby the new man might be put on. All of this, which is so evidently positional in character, leads with all reasonableness to the exhortations which follow immediately, asking for a God-honoring walk.

III. The Devil

Any serious and attentive reading of the Sacred Text will disclose two facts, namely, (1) that Satan is as real a being as any other character depicted in the Bible, and (2) that, though limited in what he can do because of divine restraint, he wages an unceasing and unrelenting warfare against those who are saved. Ignorance of Satan's devices, even if all but universal, is without much excuse since the Word of God presents the facts as they appear both on the human and divine sides. The general subject of Satanology, as already treated at length, incorporates the salient features of the doctrine of Satan, such as his ways, his influence over the *cosmos* world, and his enmity against believers. There it has been observed that Satan as a roaring lion goeth about seeking whom he may devour (1 Pet. 5:8). Since there is no enmity between Satan and the unsaved inasmuch as they are his subjects (cf. Col. 1:13) whom he energizes (cf. Eph. 2:2), his assault is directed only against the children of God, and, evidently, because of the divine nature which is in them. Possessing that nature, they become at once an opportunity for Satan's fiery darts to be aimed at God, with whom Satan is primarily in conflict. This onslaught against the children of God and because of the fact that they bear the nature of God is described in Ephesians 6:10–17, which reads: "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Not only, then, is this warfare real and the foe actual, but his strength surpasses the range of human ability or comprehension. Thus in the passage just cited, the Christian is directed to be cast wholly upon God, and to use the weapons and to follow the instructions God has provided. No human situation or combination of circumstances can be as hopeless as that in which the believer is placed when in conflict with Satan, if depending on human

resources. As earlier declared, the conflict with the world is outward, calling, as it does, for separation there-from, the conflict with the flesh is inward and by so much is circumscribed to take in no more than the individual, while the conflict with Satan is with a mighty person of the spirit realms. In each instance the only hope of success is based on that which the Holy Spirit supplies believers. “Greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world” (1 John 4:4), “Whom resist stedfast in the faith” (1 Pet. 5:9), and “Be strong in the Lord” (Eph. 6:10): these are not only wise instructions, but they present the only way of victory. Neither Satan, nor the world, nor the flesh is ever eradicated, nor is the conflict ever lessened. God’s provision is sufficient for a triumphal conquest even when seemingly the foes are unrestrained.

Conclusion

In concluding this chapter respecting the negative aspect of the spiritual life, it may be restated that each of the three foes—the world, the flesh, and the devil—can outmatch all human ability and the victory over them is gained only by the superior power of the Holy Spirit; and this success, if it is to become a reality in daily life, calls for a peculiar and altogether different plan or principle of living. The change from self-sufficiency to dependence upon the Holy Spirit is a comprehensive one; yet at no time, even when believers are fully enabled, does the Spirit work outside the functions of the human will, nor is a consciousness experienced that another than one's own self is acting or determining. The spiritual life does not consist in the withdrawal of self, of initiative, or of the consciousness of responsibility. "It is God," the Apostle declares, "which worketh in you both to will [with your own will] and to do [with your own doing] of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). Thus it is seen that the actual experience into which the believer is brought as a result of dependence upon the Holy Spirit is not a coercion of his will, but a larger and more effective exercise of it. It is not a matter of the Holy Spirit compelling the one whom He empowers to make choice of right ideals whether that one wills to do so or not; it is the deeper, more effective, and more normal achievement by the Spirit of inclining the one who depends upon Him to *will* in the sense of desire, and to *do* in the sense of complete accomplishment of that which constitutes the will of God —the good and acceptable and perfect will of God (Rom. 12:2)—or what is "according to his good pleasure." The point at issue is vitally important if the by-faith principle is to be exercised in the believer's life. It is natural to conclude that, if another than the believer himself undertakes for him the conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil, the believer must retire from the encounter and become no more than an interested spectator; but there is no retiring from this threefold impact. The trusting Christian remains in the heat of the battle with no immediate consciousness of the presence of the Spirit on whom he depends. However, the presence of the Holy Spirit is made evident by the fact that the will is making choice of that which honors God and by the fact that victory is experienced in place of defeat. The warning should be sounded concerning every conflict related to

the spiritual life, to the effect that, so far as the believer's consciousness is concerned, it is not a matter of lazy withdrawal from reality and responsibility, but rather of the zest of victory through a more effective action of the will, moved, as that will must be, by a more vivid appreciation of and vital determination to attain to every divine ideal. The conflict is not a test of physical strength in a match against an outside foe. It is a battle within and the Christian who is defeated discovers that he has no will power sufficient to determine the issues; still, when strengthened by the Holy Spirit he not only has the will power, but sees clearly and with balance of mind all the features of the problem in which he is involved. The parallel of this divine method of dealing with the human will is to be seen in the salvation of those who are lost, in which instance the choice of Christ by the action of the heart is developed by the Spirit to a point of passionate desire, but all the same the human will acts without compulsion and the unalterable truth is preserved that "Whosoever will may come." Thus the spiritual life is the result of a voluntary choice of God's will and consequently it may be said that "Whosoever will may attain to victory over every foe." As the unsaved do not and cannot make choice of Christ until moved to do so by the action of the Holy Spirit working in the heart, in like manner Christians do not and cannot make choice of the things of God which constitute spirituality until moved to do so by the Spirit working in the mind and heart. Living the spiritual life on a faith basis is not in reality a cessation of works, rather it is the gaining of ability to perform "every good work." Just as James emphasizes the fact that justification before men rests on a works basis, there is a sense in which it is true that spirituality must be demonstrated by the fruit that is borne. There is in the whole field of pistology a form of faith which claims from the Spirit power to work the works of God. This theme must yet reappear for exposition in a later chapter.

It still remains true that this the negative side of spiritual living is secondary to the positive side, which is a vital output, a spiritual reality to the glory of God. The positive aspect is to be considered next in Chapter XIV.

Chapter XIV

Power to Do Good

The reasonableness of the command, addressed, as it is, to every believer, to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18) is sustained both by the fact that Christ instructed His disciples that no service should be undertaken before the Spirit came upon them (cf. Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4, 8) and that in every subsequent major undertaking they are said to have been refilled for that service. The work of the Holy Spirit in and through each believer is, as has been indicated, both negative (a victory over the world, the flesh, and the devil) and positive—an output from within of that which is good; furthermore, the filling of the Spirit, while it does provide for a triumph over what is evil, has as its more important objective a positive, vital life and service which only God the Spirit can achieve. In the larger field of that which is positive, the work of the Spirit during the present age is comprehended in seven ministries of which the filling is but one; admittedly, however, this ministry alone is directly related to Christians as the ground and source of the spiritual life. The other six ministries—restraining, reproving, regenerating, indwelling, sealing, and baptizing—have been considered in the earlier portion of this volume; as for this the seventh ministry of the Spirit, when related to the output of the spiritual life and service it is set forth in the New Testament as the realization of seven of the Spirit's manifestations in this age. That is, the positive expression of the Spirit's power—apart from His mighty work of overcoming evil—is manifested in no less than seven distinct ways. There is cause here for thanksgiving respecting this fact, for by so much the Christian is not left in darkness relative to the precise realities which constitute a positive, worthy spiritual life and service. Only uncertainties and distress would obtain if all that could be discovered regarding the outworking of the spiritual life had to be gained from the experience of those who attempt to live that life. God's norm or pattern is indicated clearly. Whatever untaught minds have supposed the spiritual life to be, it follows a channel which is, apart from the varying exercise of individual gifts and the outworking of personal responsibilities, a standardized expression of the mind of God in behalf of the believer. A spiritual Christian is God's *normal* child, though in the outworking of daily life with its human weakness and failure he may not be

the *usual* type. It would still remain true that the Spirit-filled life with all its wealth of reality is God's standard, normal, and ideal, even though none ever attained to it. The setting forth of these seven manifestations of the Spirit in the New Testament is not to place an ideal before the believer which he is to try in his own strength to realize; rather it is the presentation to him of that blessed life which he may anticipate as the result of the Spirit's operation in and through him. To these God-manifested ideals the Christian should give attention and to them he should yield himself in sympathy and cooperation, but the achievement is definitely the Holy Spirit's own—these are only manifestations of the Spirit. The seven such realities indicated in the New Testament are: (1) the fruit of the Spirit, (2) the gifts which are inwrought by the Spirit, (3) the praise and thanksgiving which are inspired by the Spirit, (4) the teaching of the Spirit, (5) the leading of the Spirit, (6) the life of faith which is actualized by the Spirit, and (7) the intercession of the Spirit.

I. The Fruit of the Spirit

"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith [or, as in R.V., faithfulness], meekness, temperance" (or, as in R.V., self-control—Gal. 5:22–23).

This context—Galatians 5:16–25—follows naturally after a portion of Scripture but recently considered, namely, Romans 6:1–8:4, in which the Apostle has laid the foundation upon which all spiritual living and effective service is based: it is that aspect of Christ's death which is a judgment of the sin nature, and by which the freedom is secured for the Holy Spirit to pursue an unhindered operation within the Christian in spite of the active presence of the sin nature which is in the flesh. Since God in Christ has "condemned sin in the flesh," the whole will of God may "be fulfilled in us," but never *by* us (Rom. 8:3–4). That is, the Spirit is appointed to bring the whole will of God to realization in the believer's life, which experience could never be achieved when depending upon human ability (cf. Rom. 7:15–25). This end result, which is doing the whole will of God, is not accomplished in all Christians or by virtue of the fact that they are saved, but only in those among the saved ones who "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The contrast is between those Christians who depend on

their own human resources — which line of action is compatible with the character of all law-relationship to God—and those Christians who depend upon the power of the indwelling Spirit. One method represents “the works of the flesh,” or that which the law anticipates when it makes its appeal to human resources; the other method, since it contemplates the enablement of the Spirit, results in a realization of all that the Holy Spirit may do. That which follows in the context of Romans 8:4 is an important development of the contrast between the law principle and the faith principle; then too, as stated above, the determining walk by dependence upon the Holy Spirit as announced in Romans 8:4 is taken up again in Galatians 5:16–25, with the continuation of the same contrast between the works of the flesh and the inwrought works of the Holy Spirit. In the Galatians passage the flesh and the Spirit are declared to be wholly irreconcilable. The fact that the two cannot ever be reconciled is true without exception in every child of God (cf. Gal. 5:17), and so long as he remains in this body and in this world. No believer has ever reached the place where he does not need to walk by means of the Holy Spirit. The most mature Christian must, if awake to the truth respecting himself, witness to the fact that the flesh with its affections and desires is present with him and will demonstrate its presence through “the works of the flesh” if not held in check by the superior power of the Spirit. Ideals of respectability may deter one from shocking disregard of society’s demands, but the full inward victory over the flesh is gained only by the working of the Spirit in response to specific dependence upon Him. Extended and appalling are “the works of the flesh”: “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like” (Gal. 5:17–21). But over against the works of the flesh is the fruit of the Spirit.

When walking by faith or in dependence upon the Holy Spirit, two results are secured: (1) the works of the flesh shall not be fulfilled and (2) the fruit of the Spirit shall have its manifestation. Both the negative and the positive aspects of the spiritual life are guaranteed to those who thus depend

upon the Spirit. That which constitutes the fruit of the Spirit is precisely named. It is a product of the Spirit operating in and through the believer. As employed in the passage now being considered (Gal. 5:22–23), the nine words which denote the fruit of the Spirit represent superhuman qualities of character; they could under no natural circumstances be produced by human ability; they are divine characteristics. Similarly, these nine graces taken together are constituted the one fruit of the Spirit. The singular form *fruit* being used is explained by the fact that these nine graces form an indivisible whole. The Holy Spirit will not produce a few of these and not all of them. If any are present, all will actually be present. Thus, also, these nine graces constitute the essential elements of Christian character. With little apparent thought for the implications involved, Christian leaders have urged upon believers the idea that Christian character is a thing to be built by strenuous self-effort, when by so much they enter upon a path which is not only characterized by, but ends with, a dependence upon human works as the basis of any acceptance before God. The supposed sequence in character-building is said to be simply that thoughts determine acts, acts determine character, and character determines destiny. Little need, indeed, is there for a Savior or the power of God in such a program of development. Whatever the world may elect to designate as their plan by which man may reach what is supposed to be right character, a unique, immediate, and effective method is assigned to the child of God. Christian character is a divine product which is not to be realized but partially and that at the end of a painful self-effort, as is the case with the world in using its method, but is a product which becomes wholly and instantly available when right relation to the Holy Spirit is unhindered. As has well been said, Galatians 5:22–23 is the shortest life of Christ ever written, for the fruit of the Spirit is the outliving of the inliving Christ. It may well be accepted, then, as the realization of that experience to which the Apostle referred when he said, “For to me to live is Christ” (Phil. 1:21; cf. Gal. 2:20). Respecting the nine graces which together comprise the fruit of the Spirit, Dr. C. I. Scofield has written: “Christian character is not mere moral or legal correctness, but the possession and manifestation of nine graces: love, joy, peace—character as an inward state; longsuffering, gentleness, goodness—character in expression toward man; faith, meekness, temperance—character in expression toward God. Taken together they present a moral portrait of

Christ, and may be taken as the apostle's explanation of Gal. 2:20, 'Not I, but Christ,' and as a definition of 'fruit' in John 15:1–8. This character is possible because of the believer's vital union to Christ (John 15:5; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13), and is wholly the fruit of the Spirit in those believers who are yielded to Him (Gal. 5:22, 23)" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1247).

With these general introductory words in mind, attention should be given to each of these nine words in their order and note should be made of their divine character as well as the desirability of all that they represent.

1. Love. Since the Holy Spirit declares, as He does in 1 Corinthians, chapter 13, that love is supreme among all gifts, it is reasonable that it should stand first on the list of the manifold fruit of the Spirit. Love is the pre-eminent feature of human experience both in the Mosaic and the kingdom dispensations, as it is in the Christian. As for the Mosaic, it is declared that "Love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10); and the advance in responsibility respecting love which the coming kingdom anticipates is stated in Matthew 5:43–44, 46, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.…For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?" However, that standard of love which Christ enjoins upon believers of this age is supernatural and wholly divine in character. He said: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John 13:34–35). When he is called upon to exercise a divine characteristic and when for the task sufficient power is provided whereby it may be realized, it is not asking too much to expect the believer to manifest that characteristic. Having indicated the divine compassion for lost men which led to the sacrifice on the cross and having indicated also the lack of love in the one who makes no sacrifice for others, the Apostle John inquires of all such, "How dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John 3:17). Similarly, the same Apostle, after having stated that the *cosmos* world system should not be loved, declares: "If any man love the [*cosmos*] world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John 2:15). This, again, is not a reference to the believer's

love for God; it is God's love operating through the believer. It was thus, too, in closing His priestly prayer, as Christ spoke of providing that the love wherewith the Father had loved Him might be in those for whom He prayed (John 17:26). Yet even more directly, the Apostle Paul asserts that "the love of God is shed abroad [or perhaps, gushes forth] in our hearts by [that is, out from] the Holy Ghost which is given unto us" (Rom. 5:5). In the light of these Scriptures, it is not difficult to accept the reality to which the Apostle refers when he says, "The fruit of the Spirit is love." Dr. Norman B. Harrison has spoken of "God's own Love actuating human life!" So, again, he states: "God labelled His Love 'For the World'—John 3:16; 1 John 2:2. God channelled that Love to earth through the person of His Son. He channelled that Love into our hearts through the person of the Holy Spirit. He would channel that Love out to needy men everywhere through the person of His redeemed children. Thus Love is the key to His redemptive program: received, it becomes our Salvation; responded to, it becomes our Sanctification; released to others, it becomes our Service. And—let us remember it well—Love has no substitute" (*His Love*, pp. 6, 32–33).

As certainly as God's own love passes through His child when filled with the Spirit, so certainly that love will continue to be directed toward its own objects and the Christian thus blessed will love what God loves and hate what God hates. It is therefore pertinent to observe what God is said to love and to note its expression in those who are Spirit-filled; but it should be remembered that this is not human love augmented or stimulated, though human love in itself is very real. It is divine love manifested by and arising from the very Person of the Godhead who indwells the believer. These objects of divine love are named in Scripture.

a. Inclusive of the Whole World. The emphasis in Scripture is full and complete on this fact, namely, that God loves the world of mankind (cf. John 3:16; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2). What is called "the missionary spirit" is none other than the compassion which brought the Son of God from heaven to earth and then to death so that men might be saved. Interest in lost men is not accidental with Christians, nor is it a mere human trait; it is the immediate realization of divine love. Soul-winning passion is not secured by exhorration; it is a normal outflow from within believers of a divine reality.

b. Exclusive of the World System. John declares: “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world” (1 John 2:15–16). This seeming contradiction with the point made in the preceding paragraph can be explained easily when it is recognized that, though it is the same *cosmos* world which God both loves and hates, it is the men of that world which He loves and only their institutions and evil which He hates. Thus the Christian must love the world of lost men and strive for their salvation, and at the same time hate the satanic system in which the lost are placed.

c. Inclusive of the True Church. “Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life” (Rom. 5:9–10); “Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it” (Eph. 5:25). He loves His own even though they may wander away, as is revealed in the scene connected with return of the “prodigal son.” “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us” (1 John 4:12). By this divine compassion for one another the Christian attests the reality of his profession and that before the world: “A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another” (John 13:34–35). Such divine love is also the test of brotherhood in Christ: “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world’s good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?” (1 John 3:16–17); “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren” (3:14).

d. Without End. “Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end” (and so, *eternally*, John 13:1). The love of God operating in the believer is said to “suffer long” and then after all that is kind (1 Cor. 13:4).

e. Toward Israel. To them God has said, “I have loved thee with an everlasting love” (Jer. 31:3). With some knowledge of God’s eternal purposes for the elect nation and also on the part of believers with a right relation to God whereby the divine love may flow out unhindered, there will be a very definite love experienced for this people whom God as definitely and eternally loves as He does the Christian himself.

f. Sacrificial. Those who experience divine love will be impelled to sacrifice to the end that others may be saved and built up in Christ. It is written to Christians: “For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich” (2 Cor. 8:9). Such an attitude on the part of the Son of God toward the eternal riches must, if reproduced in the Christian, affect largely his attitude toward earthly riches. Not only is the love of God sacrificial regarding heavenly riches; it is sacrificial with respect to life itself. “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.” It therefore follows: “And we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren” (1 John 3:16). The Apostle Paul testified: “I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:1–3). The Apostle knew full well that there was no occasion for him to be accursed, since his Lord had been made a curse for all; but he could still be *willing* to be made a curse. Such an experience is the direct outworking in a human life of the divine love which gave Jesus to die under the curse and judgments of the sin of the world. When this divine compassion for lost men is reproduced in the believer, it becomes the true and sufficient dynamic for soul-saving work.

g. Unrequited and Pure. God’s love seeks no compensation and is as holy in its character as the One from whom it flows. What imperfect human elements may be fused into it would not be easy to define; but in itself it comes forth from the heart of God uncomplicated and infinitely worthy. God is Himself love. This does not mean that He has attained to love or that He maintains it by an effort. He is love by reason of His essential nature and the source of all the true love which is found in the universe. However, love means, among other things, capacity to be indignant and to react in judgment upon

that which is opposed to it unlawfully. This, it may be believed, is also one of the divine features of infinite love.

Useless, indeed, is any attempt to imitate the imparted divine love as that may be normally manifested in the spiritual believer. Even human love is not subject to control by the human will. An individual cannot make himself love what he does not love, nor can he by any ability lodged within himself cause whatever love he experiences to cease. Certainly the possibility of a counterfeit of the divine compassion is inconceivable. If affection for the normal objects of human love cannot be governed by human will, how could affection for the divine objectives be engendered or dismissed at will? Thus it is demonstrated that the presence of divine compassion in the believer's heart is none other than the direct exercise by God Himself of His own love through the believer as a channel. When there is some failure to be adjusted or in right relation to God, the divine love will not flow freely; but when right relation is sustained the flow of divine love is unhindered. Such control of the expression of divine love is far removed from mere human willingness to love or not love that which God loves. Divine love is the dynamic, the motivating force in the spiritual life. With it the life is by so much a realization of the divine ideal; without it there is only tragic disappointment and failure.

Likewise, the superhuman character of divine love is readily apparent. Not only is such love beyond human capacity, but it is as far removed from the quality of human affection as heaven is higher than the earth. Consider again the measure of love being required when Christ said: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another" (John 13:34). No wonder He went on to say that this wholly supernatural love would be the sign or indisputable evidence to the world of what is Christian reality. Thus He spoke: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love [like this] one to another" (vs. 35). In His priestly prayer Christ four times requested that believers might be one, even as the Father and the Son are one. This prayer is answered in the unity being achieved by the one Body which the Holy Spirit has formed. The fact of this unity creates an obligation for every believer to love every other believer with no less than the compassion of Christ who died for them. Should such a love actually be manifested among Christians, Christ declared that, as a sure result, the world would come to

know and to *believe* Him (cf. John 17:21–23). To possess and to manifest the compassion of God is not anything optional; it is commanded of Christ. It is likewise essential for Christians in their lives, else the world will neither know nor believe Christ. In the light of such deplorable disunity among Christians, it may be questioned whether the world has ever had even a passing opportunity either to know or to believe. Immeasurable is the effectiveness and attractiveness to others of a pure Christian love; and to the one who thus loves the joyous satisfaction is beyond expression. Little wonder that the Apostle contends that love is supreme and the gift to be desired above all others; nor is it other than proper that love should be named as the first among the elements which comprise the fruit of the Spirit. He who loves with divine compassion drinks the wine of heaven and enters actually by experience into the ecstasy which constitutes the felicity of God.

2. Joy. In like manner, joy, which is the second-named element in the fruit of the Spirit, is none other than the celestial joy of God passing through, or reproduced in, the child of God. It is not human joy stimulated or augmented by divine influence. It is the Holy Spirit's own joy and that of Christ and the Father, wrought as an experience in the believer. Nehemiah declared: "The joy of the LORD is your strength" (8:10), and his truth abides forever. Of the imparted divine joy, Christ said: "… that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full" (John 15:11). The Apostle John, having declared the fact of fellowship between God, Father and Son, and the believer, states: "And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full" (1 John 1:4). When prayer is realized in all its blessing, joy will be full (John 16:24). So, also, Peter writes: "Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory" (1 Pet. 1:8). Only the divine joy is a πλήρωμα or infinitely full. Great misconceptions have been engendered by artists who essay to paint their imaginary portraits of Christ—a daring enterprise in the light of 2 Corinthians 5:16, by which effort they have seemed to vie with each other in depicting sorrow and grief. To them He was only "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief" (Isa. 53:3); but the disciples to whom He spoke and who had accompanied Him throughout His

three and a half years of ministry knew full well to what He referred when He spoke of His own joy, as their writings bear witness.

Exhibiting the same general characteristics as love, likewise divine joy can neither be increased nor decreased by the command of the human will, and equally certain is the evidence that such joy cannot be imitated. Celestial joy in the heart constitutes an attractiveness more effective than can be told. It is an element in the Christian greatly desired by God, else it would not be provided by Him as it is. It is a spiritual God-given capacity to be able to suffer with Christ as one who shares with Him the burden of a lost world, and yet both celestial joy and divine sorrow—a feature of His love—are to be experienced by the Christian at one and the same time. If this suggests a contradiction in terms, it is only at the dictation of human limitations in understanding. It is of the nature of God to be both glad and sad at the same time, and such must the spiritual believer be as a result of the outworking of the divine characteristics: not to be neutral, because the one feature neutralizes the other, but to be both sad and glad with undiminished divine fullness as these characteristics are engendered by the Holy Spirit. “Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice” (Phil. 4:4); “Rejoice evermore” (1 Thess. 5:16).

3. Peace. As Christ bequeathed His joy, in like manner He bequeathed His peace when He said: “Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid” (John 14:27). Reference is made here to the peace which is divine but which can be nonetheless wrought in the human heart. The Apostle Paul defined it when he said: “And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus” (Phil. 4:7). A distinction should be observed between “the peace of God,” which is an inwrought subjective experience, and “peace with God” (Rom. 5:1), which latter phrase refers to the truth that, through the completeness of Christ’s work, the believer is on a peace footing with God forever. In the latter case Paul describes the perfection of reconciliation. The peace which Christ bequeathed and which is an element in the fruit of the Spirit, however, is an experience of peace felt in the heart. It, like all else included in the fruit of the Spirit, is the direct and constant impartation of that which constitutes the very nature and character of God. It cannot, any

more than love or joy, be secured by the force of the human will, nor can it be dismissed. Only the experience of it can ever demonstrate to oneself what the peace of God really is—a sublime tranquility of heart and mind in spite of every disturbing memory, foreboding, circumstance, or condition. Such peace, priceless as it is, honors God before men and thus satisfies God; indeed, only "great peace" becomes those whose lives are "hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3).

These three—love, joy, peace—form a group which represent character as an inward state, that which the heart experiences directly from God and especially as looked at as an entity in itself.

4. Long-Suffering. Each element in the fruit of the Spirit is contrary to a corresponding unspiritual feature in the human heart. The cure for the unspiritual feature is not an attempted cessation from the evil thing, but a substitution of the Spirit's fruit or all the virtue which God imparts. Long-suffering, for example, is the divine antidote to impatience. There is no mere enlarging of human patience being contemplated; rather it is the patience of God inwrought. The long-suffering patience of God knows no bounds. This is seen in His agelong dealing with mankind, in His patience with individual Christ-rejectors, and in His patience with those whom He brings to Himself (cf. Luke 18:7). When Jehovah proclaimed His name to Moses in the fiery mount it is said: "The LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, The LORD, The LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth" (Ex. 34:6). Thus Moses in an intercessory prayer reminds Jehovah of His own revelation respecting Himself: "The LORD is longsuffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation" (Num. 14:18). And the Psalmist declared: "But thou, O Lord, art a God full of compassion, and gracious, longsuffering, and plenteous in mercy and truth" (Ps. 86:15). The Apostle Paul warns those who oppose themselves against God when he asks, "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" (Rom. 2:4). Even "the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction" are objects of God's long-suffering. It is written: "What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with

much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction?" (Rom. 9:22). Peter declares: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. 3:9). And Peter also states that "the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation" (2 Pet. 3:15).

That the divine characteristic of long-suffering is to be communicated directly to the believer and through him manifested to the glory of God is not only declared since it is said to be an element in the fruit of the Spirit, but also it is written concerning him and the Lord he serves: "Strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and longsuffering with joyfulness" (Col. 1:11). So, again, the believer is enjoined to put on, and by the divinely provided means, "bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering" (3:12). But how definite and personal the great Apostle becomes respecting the inwrought long-suffering of Christ when he says: "Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting" (1 Tim. 1:16) !

Long-suffering is one virtue which must be expected to appear in the believer's life. In the midst of the most vital directions about responsibility to "walk worthy," it is written: "With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:2–3). Likewise says Paul, "Be patient toward all men" (1 Thess. 5:14). It was a practice of Paul's own experience. He therefore testifies to Timothy: "But thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, longsuffering, charity, patience" (2 Tim. 3:10); indeed, this virtue belongs especially to those who are called to preach. Addressing Timothy again, the same Apostle commands: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:2). It was after Abraham "had patiently endured, he obtained the promise" (Heb. 6:15). The delay in the return of Christ calls for patience. So James exhorts: "Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh" (5:7–8). The fruit of the indwelling Spirit

includes this long-suffering. It will be realized definitely, sufficiently, and as a manifestation of God's own infinite patience when the Spirit's fruit is borne in the life of the believer.

5. Gentleness. The gentleness of God does not imply weakness. The Lamb *dumb* before its shearers is a demonstration of that in God which is, as occasion demands, nonresisting; but it should not be concluded that other attributes are not in God also which defend His holy Person and His righteous government: nor will the Spirit-filled believer manifest only gentleness. He, too, may know the power of indignation; but likewise he will be gentle. In his song of deliverance David said, "Thou hast also given me the shield of thy salvation: and thy gentleness hath made me great" (2 Sam. 22:36). This revealing testimony David repeats in Psalm 18:35. The Apostle beseeches the Corinthians "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:1). In addition to the disclosure in Galatians 5:22 that gentleness is derived from the Spirit to be reproduced by Him in the yielded believer's life, James also asserts: "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy" (3:17). This wisdom is the wisdom of God. It is from above. It is manifested in and through the child of God. How fully the great Apostle experiences the direct power of the Spirit productive of gentleness when he could say: "But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children" (1 Thess. 2:7) ! This same virtue, too, is required of all who would manifest the true grace of God in service. It is written: "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will" (2 Tim. 2:24–26). Likewise the Apostle urges "to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men" (Titus 3:2). Again, the longing heart is encouraged to believe that the endearing and Christlike property of gentleness may be gained, not by human effort or by useless imitation, but as a direct fruitage of the Spirit.

6. Goodness. A hidden but nonetheless vital element in goodness distinguishes that special virtue from the related one of righteousness. The Apostle, for instance, writes, “For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die” (Rom. 5:7). This distinction may be indicated by the fact that a righteous man could evict a widow with insufficient funds from her home the day her rent is due, when a good man would find a way to avoid doing so. In the Person of God, goodness reaches to infinity, and the Scriptures bear abundant testimony to His unbounded goodness. In truth, though little consciously acknowledged by them, the world clings to the fundamental conviction that God is good. No mind can picture the distress and confusion that would eventuate were the world to be convinced that God is essentially evil in Himself. Even the sovereignty of God, though in itself so little understood, is an expression of His essential goodness. Accordingly, God said to Moses after he had interceded for Israel: “I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy” (Ex. 33:19). In defense of God’s perfection and sovereign will, the Psalmist wrote: “For the word of the Lord is right; and all his works are done in truth. He loveth righteousness and judgment: the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord” (Ps. 33:4–5). Nehemiah speaks to God of His “great goodness” (Neh. 9:25, 35), and David anticipated that “goodness and mercy” would follow him all the days of his life (Ps. 23:6). So, again, he declared: “I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living” (27:13). Likewise, he said, “Oh how great is thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee; which thou hast wrought for them that trust in thee before the sons of men! Thou shalt hide them in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man: thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues” (31:19–20). As noted above, it is the goodness of God that achieves repentance in the wayward heart. This principle of divine action should not be overlooked (Rom. 2:4). A warning to Gentiles in the light of God’s judgments upon Israel refers to His goodness, “Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off” (Rom. 11:22). Thus it may be seen that God is essential goodness, which

characteristic is held in perfect balance with all His other attributes, and that the Spirit is appointed to reproduce divine goodness in the one He Himself empowers.

7. Faithfulness. The virtue word used here by Galatians 5:22 as the seventh element of fruit is not *faith* in the subjective sense, of course. It is true, also, that saving faith is a divine work in the heart, but obviously it is not true that God exercises any such faith; rather He is faithful, trustworthy, and stedfast, and Galatians 5:22 is a record of this divine characteristic being reproduced in the believer by the Holy Spirit. The human trail of unfaithfulness is corrected only by the larger manifestation of the faithfulness of God. God is ever faithful. It is declared in Lamentations 3:22–23: "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness." No stronger word on the subject can be given than that of Psalm 36:5: "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds." God had promised in His faithfulness to remember David. He said, "But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his horn be exalted. … Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail" (Ps. 89:24, 33). The same eighty-ninth Psalm may well be called the Psalm of Jehovah's faithfulness, since this virtue is mentioned at least six times. The Psalm opens with the words, "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord for ever: with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said, Mercy shall be built up for ever: thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. … And the heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Lord: thy faithfulness also in the congregation of the saints" (vss. 1–2, 5). The faithfulness of Jehovah is a right subject for praise. Hence Psalm 92:1–2 reads, "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O most High: to shew forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night." As certainly, then, as this imperative attribute appertains unto God, so certainly it may be and will be reproduced in the yielded believer by the Spirit. Such faithfulness will be exhibited in the believer's relations with God, with his fellow men, and with himself. Honesty, sincerity, and sacrificial devotion

are factors in this outlived divine faithfulness. This imparted grace will be directed toward that to which God Himself is faithful.

8. Meekness. Of all the elements which together form the fruit of the Spirit, none is more elusive or difficult to define than meekness, and none more needed inasmuch as vanity and pride are the most common of human traits. Were one by self-effort to attain to meekness even to a slight degree, of that achievement one would soon be proud. As strange as it may seem and as contradictory as it may appear when the almightiness, the sovereignty, and the essential glory of God are considered, it is nevertheless true that one of the divine characteristics is meekness. Let it be remembered that meekness does not consist in pretending to be less than one really is; it rather is demonstrated when one does not pretend to be more than one really is. Certainly, the truth which God is must demand that He publish all that is true of Himself. Less than this would be untruth and more than this would be vanity and pride added to untruth. In 2 Corinthians 10:1 reference is made to the meekness of Christ, and similarly meekness is enjoined upon the believer at least twelve times in the Word of God. Zephaniah commands: "Seek ye the Lord, all ye meek of the earth, which have wrought his judgment; seek righteousness, seek meekness: it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger" (2:3). In addition to his statement of the striking fact that divine meekness is to be reproduced in the believer as an element in the fruit of the Spirit, the same Apostle writes: "We then as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain" (2 Cor. 6:1; cf. 2 Tim. 2:25), and one of the most vital features of a worthy walk like this, as presented in Ephesians 4:2, is meekness. So, likewise, meekness, among other needed virtues, is to be put on—all by the divinely provided means. It is so recorded in Colossians 3:12: "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering." The same virtue is commanded in 1 Timothy 6:11: "But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." Meekness is the right condition of mind to have that the Word of God may be received. James therefore declares: "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls" (1:21).

James also speaks of the “meekness of wisdom” (3:13). In addition to all this the Apostle Peter gives a final word, “But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear” (1 Pet. 3:15). That which is so much needed in every human heart and so essential to a right manner of spiritual life is provided for every believer through the ministration of the Holy Spirit.

9. Self-Control. Again in the ninth element of the fruit to be named the word *temperance* as found in the AV., because of its present restricted meaning, fails to convey the Apostle’s message. This the lastnamed of the elements which comprise the fruit of the Spirit is really *self-control* (R.V.). That such a reality is true of God need not be declared or defended; but it is anticipated likewise as a virtue in the believer. Furthermore, when it is named among the nine graces under consideration, there may be assurance that it is not only anticipated, but provided for by the power of the Spirit. Peter includes this characteristic among important graces which he names. He writes: “And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity” (2 Pet. 1:5–7). The Apostle Paul asserts that temperance must characterize the one who would contend for a crown: “And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible” (1 Cor. 9:25). Temperance or self-control is required of a bishop or elder in the church (cf. Titus 1:7–9), so, also, of the aged believer (Titus 2:2).

In concluding these word-studies and the consideration of that to which they give assurance, it may be well to emphasize afresh the truth that God not only anticipates a high and holy manner of life on the part of the one He has saved, but has provided every needed resource whereby the life that will satisfy and glorify Him may be experienced as a manifestation of the Spirit. The life which is approved of God has been stated most fully and clearly by the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 6:3–10: “Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed: but in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings,

in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." The newly provided principle whereby the believer may, by adjustment to the mind and will of God, experience the results of the Spirit's filling is well seen in the revelation concerning the fruit of the Spirit, which revelation is the first in the series of seven manifestations of the Spirit that together set forth what constitutes the Spirit-filled, or spiritual, life. What God is naturally is, of course, what God requires, and indeed His attributes, so far as they may be adapted to human life, are to be wrought directly in the believer by the Spirit. The life to be lived could not be more divine had the believer moved out of his body and the Spirit alone remained as the occupant, but for the fact that the Spirit makes use of all the faculties as He does of the body of the believer. Then, too, direct manifestation of the divine characteristics is not hindered because of the presence of living human faculties. Contemplation of these nine divinely wrought graces will stimulate an appreciation of their desirability and necessity if the Christian's life is to glorify God or to yield the consolation to himself which only inwrought love, joy, and peace can impart. The unregenerate man who in desperation seeks relief from such unceasing distress as only an empty heart and life create would surely, could he realize their experimental value and could such blessings be purchased with gold, give all in his power to enjoy even a brief period of such satisfaction and comfort; yet such is the blindness of carnality that those to whom all the riches are available drift on unwilling to enter the realms of immeasurable reality. Considering what these limitless blessings are, there need be little wonder that God commands through His Apostle that all who are saved by His grace be filled with the Spirit.

II. The Gifts of the Holy Spirit

Regardless of the all but universal disregard of it, the doctrine respecting service gifts which are wrought by the Spirit in the believer occupies a large place in the New Testament and demands its full recognition in any work on Pneumatology. The Apostle's thanksgiving for the Corinthian church when he asserted of them, "Ye come behind in no [spiritual] gift," is hardly understood today; yet this great ministry of the Spirit is a present reality, and becomes a challenge to every individual Christian and to every church which proposes to maintain New Testament ideals.

By way of attempting an accurate definition, it may be said that a gift in the spiritual sense means the Holy Spirit doing a particular service through the believer and using the believer to do it. It is not something the believer is doing by the aid of the Holy Spirit, nor is it a mere augmentation of what is termed a native or natural gift. According to 1 Corinthians 12:7, a gift is a "manifestation of the Spirit." It is conceivable that the Spirit might use native gifts, but the gift which is wrought by the Spirit is an expression of His own ability rather than the mere use of human qualities in the one through whom He works. As it was seen earlier regarding the fruit of the Spirit that it is a direct product wrought by the Spirit within the believer, in like manner the exercise of a spiritual gift is a direct achievement of the Holy Spirit. The fruit of the Spirit is inward, it is standardized, and it is uniform in its outworking; but the gifts which are wrought by the Spirit are outward in the realms of service, and are varied to the point that it may be assumed that no two Christians are appointed to exactly the same responsibility since no two are situated in precisely the same way nor have the same obligations. That this important truth may be understood, certain gifts are named in the Sacred Text. These may serve as a general classification of the Spirit's activities in the field of the believer's service. The specific gifts as named are set forth in the following Scriptures:

> "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness" (Rom. 12:4–8); "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to

every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will" (1 Cor. 12:4–11); "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers" (Eph. 4:7–11); "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen" (1 Pet. 4:10–11).

For the further elucidation of the doctrine of gifts, 1 Corinthians, chapters 12 to 14 inclusive, should be noted with care, and two important truths should be observed: (1) that every Christian is the recipient of some gift, for of this fact it is written: "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. … But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will" (1 Cor. 12:7, 11); "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. 4:7) and (2) that these gifts are always wrought by one and the same Spirit. Five times in 1 Corinthians 12:4–11 it is declared that, regardless of the variety of gifts or the number of believers through whom He works, without exception the gifts are wrought by the same Person, the Holy Spirit.

As an illustration of the functioning of the spiritual gifts in the Body of Christ, the Apostle compares that spiritual Body to the human body with its many members, and as the members of the human body do not serve the same purpose, in like manner those who comprise the Body of Christ serve in various ways and to various ends. The instructions governing the use of gifts in the Church, the comparative value of gifts, and the required recognition, regulation, and co-ordination of gifts, as all this is set forth in the New Testament, should have every student's attentive consideration.

Of the several gifts named in Ephesians 4:11—"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers"—it may be said that these are leadership ministries of divine

appointment in the Church. The service of those designated here as *apostle* evidently ceased with the first generation of the Church, for no such qualified ministry is to be recognized in the Church today. The New Testament prophet's service is defined as follows: "But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort" (1 Cor. 14:3). The one here named *evangelist* is not the revivalist of modern times, but is rather the missionary to the unevangelized. The *pastor and teacher*—probably reference to two gifts being exercised by one person—both shepherds the flock and instructs the people of God. Under his ministry the saints are perfected unto the work divinely committed to them and are edified. Every pastor is the dean of a Bible training school, which school is composed of those members in the Church of Christ committed unto him. If the pastor has had no preparation to serve as an accurate teacher of the Word of God, this entire responsibility must go unfulfilled (cf. Eph. 4:11–12).

Christian service as designed and represented in the New Testament is far more orderly and effective than the more or less accidental and disarranged efforts which now receive that name. In the early church, none were released to service who were not thought to be Spirit-filled, and the possession of spiritual gifts was recognized and these gifts were intelligently employed. That all this has now become almost lost to view and foreign to present conditions is evident.

This limited treatment of the whole doctrine of gifts will be strengthened by the following quotation from Dr. John F. Walvoord:

> Before turning to the discussion of the gifts themselves, certain general factors relating to gifts may be mentioned. First, spiritual gifts are revealed to be given sovereignly by God, and as such, they are not properly the objects of men's seeking. To the Corinthians, who were exalting minor gifts to the neglect of more important gifts, Paul wrote, "But covet earnestly the best gifts" (1 Cor. 12:31), yet in his other epistles it is clear from his silence on the subject that seeking spiritual gifts is not a proper subject for exhortation. Because their bestowal is sovereign, it follows that it is not a question of spirituality. A Christian unyielded to the Lord may possess great spiritual gifts, while one yielded may have relatively minor spiritual abilities. According to the Scriptures, "All these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will" (1 Cor. 12:11). It remains true, of course, that proper adjustment in the spiritual life of the believer is essential to proper exercise of his gifts, but spirituality in itself does not bring spiritual gifts. The question has been raised whether spiritual gifts are a part of the original bestowal of grace accompanying salvation, or whether they are a subsequent work. The Scriptures give no clear answer, but from the nature of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which occurs at the moment of new birth, and the resultant

placing into the body of Christ, it would be reasonable to infer that spiritual gifts are bestowed at that time in keeping with the place of the believer in the body of Christ, even if these gifts are not immediately observed or exercised. Accordingly, spiritual gifts probably attend the baptism of the Holy Spirit, even though their bestowal is not included in the act of baptism. In the analogy of natural gifts as seen in the natural man, it is clear that all the factors of ability and natural gift are latent in the new-born babe. So, also, it may be true for spiritual gifts in the one born again. In both the natural and spiritual spheres, it is a matter of proper use and development of gifts rather than any additional gifts being bestowed. Second, it may be observed that every Christian has some spiritual gifts. According to the Scriptures, "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal" (1 Cor. 12:7), and "All these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will" (1 Cor. 12:11). Christians are "members in particular" (1 Cor. 12:27), and "are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another" (Rom. 12:5). However small the gift, or insignificant the place, every Christian is essential to the body of Christ. As the Scripture puts it, "Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary" (1 Cor. 12:22). There is divine purpose in the life of every Christian, and spiritual gifts are in keeping with that purpose. It is the challenge of the Scriptures on this subject (cf. 1 Pet. 4:10) that every Christian fulfill the ministry for which he has been equipped by God. Third, it is clear that gifts differ in value. While there is equality of privilege in Christian faith, there is not equality of gift. According to 1 Corinthians 12:28, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." In the nature of the various gifts, some are more effective and essential than others. Paul contrasts the gift of prophecy and the gift of tongues with the words, "I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied" (1 Cor. 14:5); and again, "Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. 14:19). Fourth, as 1 Corinthians 13 bears witness, spiritual gifts to be profitable must be used in love. Spiritual gifts in themselves do not make great Christians. Their use in the proper way motivated by divine love, which is the fruit of the Spirit, is effective and bears fruit to the glory of God. A fifth general feature of spiritual gifts is that certain gifts were temporary in their bestowal and use. It is clear that the great body of Bible-loving Christians does not have all the spiritual gifts manifested in its midst as did the early apostolic church. On the other hand, certain gifts clearly characterize the entire present dispensation. The considerations leading to the classification of each gift will be noted in its individual treatment. A sixth and concluding feature of spiritual gifts which is of great importance is the evident contrast between spiritual gifts and natural gifts. While God may choose men of natural ability, it is clear that spiritual gifts pertain to the spiritual birth of Christians rather than their natural birth. The qualities of the spiritual gifts are not evident in the individual before his salvation. The spiritual gifts pertain to his new nature rather than his old. Spiritual gifts must not be regarded, then, as an enlargement of natural powers, but a supernatural gift bestowed in keeping with the purpose of God in placing that individual in the body of Christ. It may be frequently observed that individuals with little natural talent are often used mightily of God when those with great natural talent, though saved, are never similarly used. The spiritual gift is not, then, a demonstration of what man can do even under favorable circumstances, but rather it reveals what God can bestow in grace.

An examination of the fifteen spiritual gifts revealed in the New Testament will disclose considerable differences in the character of the gifts. Certain gifts are clearly the possession of the Church today as exhibited in their exercise in gifted men throughout the present

dispensation. There is little doubt that some men today have (1) the gift of teaching, (2) the gift of helping or ministering, (3) the gift of administration or ruling, (4) the gift of evangelism, (5) the gift of being a pastor, (6) the gift of exhortation, (7) the gift of giving, and (8) the gift of showing mercy. In contrast to these, as their individual exposition will demonstrate, stand other spiritual gifts known by the early Christians, which seem to have passed from the scene with the apostolic period. Some of these are claimed for today by certain sects, whose neglect of the Scriptural instructions for use of these gifts is in itself a testimony to the spurious quality of their affected gifts. Among these temporary gifts the following can be named: (1) the gift of apostleship, (2) the gift of prophecy, (3) the gift of miracles, (4) the gift of healing, (5) the gift of tongues, (6) the gift of interpreting tongues, (7) the gift of discerning spirits.—*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 182–85

III. The Offering of Praise and Thanksgiving

Closely related to the experience of joy, which comes second in the list of nine graces comprising the fruit of the Spirit, is that of praise and thanksgiving. This additional feature of the spiritual life obtains the distinction of being directly related to, and the normal result of, the command to be filled with the Spirit, the implication being that, in its primary outworking, the Spirit's filling will result in praise and thanksgiving. The whole context under consideration at this point reads: "See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is. And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God" (Eph. 5:15–21).

The stupendous obligation to offer worshipful praise to God and to render thanks for never-ceasing benefits is such that it cannot be discharged by any human being if no more than natural resources are drawn upon. Unfallen angels who have ever been in the glorious presence of God since their creation cease not to cry "Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts" (Isa. 6:3, R.V.); yet the infinite value of redemption has never reached them nor has it been required for them. They worship God for His intrinsic worthiness; but how much more obligation rests upon those of humankind who not only have the same obligation to acknowledge the infinite worthiness of God but are the recipients of God's saving grace! In truth, an

immeasurable obligation rests upon all men to worship God for what He is, and to acknowledge His love expressed in the death of Christ whether it be received as the ground of salvation or not. It is the normal work of the Spirit to inspire God-honoring praise in the believer's heart. This adoration results directly and automatically in the heart when the Spirit is free to work at all. There is great satisfaction to be found in offering up worthy praise to God. Such an exercise stimulates other graces in the heart and not the least of these is humility.

Similarly, as a result of His filling Christians, the Spirit moves the heart to thanksgiving, and to a degree to which no human being could ever attain. It is perhaps within human bounds to give thanks sometimes for some things, but how different is the requirement which the Bible text presents in bidding one to be thankful "always for all things"! Such superhuman gratitude is included, then, in the command to be filled with the Spirit. If all things are "working together for good to them that love God," there is ample reason for giving thanks by faith for the all things. No argument is needed either to demonstrate the reasonableness of praise and thanksgiving on the lips and from the heart of those who are saved, or to convince an unprejudiced mind of the impossibility of a discharge of this obligation when there is drawing only on that which belongs to human ability. A Spirit-filled life alone will be radiant with praise and thanksgiving.

IV. The Teaching of the Spirit

The Holy Spirit is the Master Teacher, but spiritually this ministry is restricted, in the main, to the Word of God. That Word has been given to men by God in good faith and with the expectation that it would be understood and received by those for whom it is intended. That they need to study to show themselves approved unto God in making the right divisions of doctrine and in arriving at its true meaning does not lessen the obligation; indeed, few apprehend the fact that the Word of God, quite different from other themes of knowledge, cannot be received with understanding other than by personal illumination such as the Holy Spirit alone can achieve. Even the unsaved receive not the Gospel unless it is by the Spirit disclosed to them (cf. John 16:7–11), and similarly truth can come to the believer only as it is revealed to him by the Spirit. Multitudes are "ever learning, and

never able to come to the knowledge of the truth" (2 Tim. 3:7)—learning in that restricted sense that they dimly apprehend certain features of truth, but are never fully informed or transformed by it. An evidence of the Spirit's filling—that which He does when free to work effectively at all—is the bringing of one in whom He dwells to an ever increasing understanding of the Scriptures with all their sanctifying power (John 17:17). Thus the only key to attainment in the knowledge of the Word of God, itself a pedagogical law not appearing in general academic training, is suggested by the imperative necessity that right relation be sustained to the Holy Spirit by which alone His teaching ministry may go on unhindered. The student who is not in right relation to God cannot hope to make progress in the study of spiritual truth. It is regrettable, indeed, that in so many instances whole courses are offered in Bible doctrine without so much as one word of warning or instruction regarding this most vital and fundamental feature of all Christian pedagogy. Little seems to be said or implied in the Scriptures on this theme before the Upper Room Discourse. It is then that Christ first presented this great truth in no uncertain terms. In this discourse He said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you" (John 16:12–15).

Even after three and a half incomparable years in the constant company and instruction of Christ, it was still true for the disciples that He had many things to say unto them. It must ever be so with believers to the end of this life. He will always have more to reveal to the one who can hear and will heed. That there were truths which they could not then bear is recognition of the fact that these men were precluded from receiving any and all truth related to the death and the resurrection of Christ, since up to that time they did not know or rather believe. He would die and be raised again. When all the truth belonging to the present dispensation which depends either on the death or the resurrection of Christ is left out of consideration, there will be little remaining, and of course this demonstrates the fact that the twelve disciples had not at any time preached the gospel of divine grace, which

gospel is based wholly upon Christ's death, burial, and resurrection (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3–4). As the Scriptures themselves show, these men preached the gospel of the kingdom. However, a new dispensation with all its reality is dawning for them and all these men are to be taught new and wonderful revelations by the direct ministry of the Spirit. Earlier He has told them that the Holy Spirit "shall be in you" (John 14:17), and to this He adds now (16:12–15) the new and momentous truth that the indwelling Spirit is appointed to undertake a measureless ministry of teaching and that from the incomparable vantage ground of the position He occupies within the heart. Direct and effective beyond all that human experience records is this inner approach of the Spirit to the understanding and heart of man. Witness in support of this the fact that impetuous Peter boldly rebuked Christ only a year or less before His death for asserting that He was about to die and rise again; yet that very same Peter some fifty days after Christ's death arose in the midst of a public throng in Jerusalem and preached the greatest sermon ever heard on human lips if results are to be considered, and his whole appeal was based on the death and resurrection of Christ. Very much truth had reached Peter's mind in the meantime and evidently from no other source than the teaching of the Holy Spirit within Peter's own heart. The arrangement thus divinely provided claims attention from every sincere believer. The Holy Spirit from within the heart is to "guide" into "all truth." The scope of this promise should be observed and the lack of all qualifying conditions. No human limitations may hinder. A dull mind is not considered a special problem for the Spirit. It is still true that He will guide into all truth. Yet He, the Spirit, does not speak the message that He imparts as the Author or Originator of it. Whatsoever He hears, that He speaks. If it be asked who originates and passes on the message to the Holy Spirit living within the heart, the answer is given twice in this limited context, namely, He who said "I have yet many things to say unto you" and who said, speaking of the Spirit, "He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." The first-mentioned theme in the Spirit's teaching ministry is that of unveiling the prophetic Scriptures. "He will shew you things to come." It is also to be observed that the Spirit in the human heart will glorify Christ rather than Himself and that the richest of all treasures of knowledge to be imparted, the things of Christ, are augmented to the point of including the "all things" of the Father.

As the Upper Room Discourse is the seed plot for the doctrine of the epistles, especially those from the Apostle Paul, it is to be expected that so new and vital a theme as the teaching ministry of the Spirit and the manner of it as set forth in the passage just examined will be given a larger and more amplified presentation in the doctrinal epistles. Such a treatment, indeed, is found in 1 Corinthians 2:9–12, which reads: “But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.”

As in John 16:12–15, the subject of the passage again is “things”—the “things to come,” the things of Christ, and the “all things” of the Father. Thus the Apostle refers to “things” which reach the heart of man by direct revelation without reference to the natural channels of information proceeding through the eye gate, the ear gate, and the heart or reasoning power of man. Long before modern psychology attempted to stress the three natural channels of approach to human understanding, this portion of the Word of God had identified them, but had added that to which no psychologist or human pedagogue can of himself attain, much less impart, namely, things which are directly revealed by the Holy Spirit to the one in whom He dwells. In this connection, the Apostle asserts: “Now we have received … the spirit which is of God” and to the grand consummation “that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.” The infinite qualification of the Spirit in this role as Teacher is stated in the words: “for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.” Man may know the things belonging to human spheres, but the Spirit alone knows the things which belong to the sphere of God. Such an illuminating work as this was wrought by God’s Son, Christ, for example, in the hearts of two disciples on the Emmaus road. Of this it is written: “And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures? … Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures” (Luke 24:32, 45).

Thus the believer is placed through the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit in that unique position of one who may be directly and inwardly taught by the Master Teacher of all teachers, the Holy Spirit of God. Of a certainty will the divine Spirit function in the heart which He fills.

V. The Leading of the Spirit

Being led of God is one of the grand realities even of the Old Testament. Upwards of forty times the directing hand of God is seen hovering over His people of old; and in the sphere of His humanity, Christ was led by the Spirit (cf. Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:1). In this as much as in any feature of Christ's humanity He became and is the example or pattern for the child of God. The extent of the advantage which this ministry of the Holy Spirit provides is beyond all computation. As a patient may be guided back to health by giving heed to the directions of a wise physician, so the Christian may be led by the Holy Spirit into paths chosen by infinite love, infinite power, and infinite wisdom. A human being is so designed by God that he cannot guide himself. Jeremiah therefore states: "O LORD, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (10:23). One cannot contemplate the expressed helplessness of David without a consciousness of a like need of divine guidance. He said: "Lead me, O LORD, in thy righteousness because of mine enemies; make thy way straight before my face" (Ps. 5:8); "Lead me in thy truth, and teach me: for thou art the God of my salvation; on thee do I wait all the day" (25:5); "Teach me thy way, O LORD, and lead me in a plain path, because of mine enemies" (27:11); "For thou art my rock and my fortress; therefore for thy name's sake lead me, and guide me" (31:3); "Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know my thoughts: and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting" (139:23–24). No command is recorded in the New Testament which directs the believer to be led of the Spirit; however, it is assumed as a foregone conclusion that apart from this ministry none can follow the path of God's own choosing. It is said, for instance, that "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. 8:14). That is, by the leading of the Spirit they are proved to be mature sons of God. Here seemingly a distinction is drawn between the *child* of God (τέκνον) and the mature *son* (υἱός), the implication being that

not all Christians, though uniformly children of God, are manifesting the characteristics of those who have grown to maturity. In other words, not all Christians are spiritual or Spirit-filled; but those led by the Spirit are. Likewise, it is also written: “If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law” (Gal. 5:18). Thus, again, it may be suggested that not every saved person is led of the Spirit; for those who are led are so supplied with true counsel and guidance that manifestly they need no outward commandments. This wonderful relationship which provides such blessed realities may easily be perverted by sincere persons if they do not know the right relation to God through which true guidance may be secured. Not only is it demanded that a right understanding should obtain relative to the leading of the Spirit, but that there be freedom from fanaticism, undue emotionalism, and superstition. Since the whole course of a life may be misdirected and that in spite of sincerity, it is needful to an imperative degree for the believer to learn for himself—for no other’s experience is a pattern—how to be led of the Spirit. No step can be safely taken in this world apart from divine guidance. But little help can be gained by imitating the experience of others or by following rules which men have made. The leading of the Spirit, as the very term used for this ministry implies, is a most intimate and personal experience. To those who by constant attention and prayer are made familiar with the Spirit’s ways of guiding them, the leading becomes one of the richest experiences known to the believer’s heart. The importance of substituting infinite wisdom for finite guessing can never be overestimated. It is the purpose of God that a child inside a home shall through obedience avail himself of the wisdom of his parents. It is likewise the purpose of God that His own child through being guided by the Spirit shall avail himself of the infinite wisdom of God. It is worse than useless for the believer to depend on his own wisdom and even more useless and dangerous for him to seek the wisdom and counsel of others, even if believers. In matters of which men can know nothing they are rightfully termed *blind*. On this point Christ asked: “Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?” (Luke 6:39).

Considering the manner in which the will of God may now be known, it should be observed that direct leading by the indwelling Spirit has superseded, as something far more advantageous, the Old Testament method of guidance by natural light, by dreams, by voices, and by tests. All

of these early methods should be considered ineffective now. The child of God cannot magnify too much the truth that for him under present grace relationships he lives and serves in closest companionship with the Holy Spirit. He in conjunction with the Spirit occupies the same body and as partners they enter into the same enterprises that God the Father may appoint. Of course, this sort of life is in large degree supernatural; still, no child of God should be afraid of things supernatural. It is also true that every instance of the Spirit's leading has to be contemplated under three tenses or time relationships. There is a time before the experience, the time of the experience itself, and a time after it which is characterized by retrospect. Thus one if Spirit-filled is ever preparing for the experience, ever being led, and ever looking back upon God's faithful dealing. In the matter of preparation, two passages may serve to give all the needed instruction: "Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding" (Prov. 3:5); "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God" (Rom. 12:1–2). It is needful for the one who would be led not only to be depending definitely on the Spirit for leading but ever to be willing to be led. Relative to the time when one is actually being led the question may be asked, How may one be aware or conscious of the thing God wills? To answer this query involves the most personal realities, those degrees of development and experience concerning which no two would ever be alike. No Scripture is more revealing about the matter than Philippians 2:13, which states: "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." This revelation brings assurance which is both definite and final. It may be that a delay will be imposed upon the action being considered or God will speak His will through some other providence or circumstance; but one thing can always be counted upon: He will work within, and the leading in the end creates a convinced mind that all influences may have but engendered anyway. God is certainly able to speak loud enough for a willing soul to hear. George Müller taught and testified out of a very rich experience in fellowship with the Holy Spirit that God leads, not by signs or outward things, but by means of the willing, expectant

mind. He sways the judgment itself, and then one becomes clear and convinced about the course God would indicate. The voice of men may be heeded only if God has sent them to His child for that purpose. As for the time after one has been led, there is then the need of resting in that which has been determined for him. The guidance must be so convincing it will not be doubted in days that follow when, perchance, times of testing may come. That leading which takes one to his particular field of service must be of such a definite nature that suffering and hardship can be endured without any questioning of the step by which one reached the place of testing.

Finally, one who is yielded to God must account himself in the will of God when he is unreservedly willing to do God's will. If the position one occupies in life or service is not what God desires, surely He can, providing that one is yielded, move him out into the place which He does choose. The will of God indeed is not primarily a matter of a Christian's being in one place or another; it is rather of his being willing to do God's will. All else is then easily adjusted.

A very vital factor, then, in the spiritual life is that of being led by the Holy Spirit, and this necessary experience will be the portion of all who are Spirit-filled.

VI. The Life of Faith

Most vital indeed is the achievement of the Holy Spirit by which He makes supernatural things real to the one in whom He dwells. This undertaking is quite similar in character to that of His teaching work, save that the latter is largely restricted to impartation of knowledge of the Scriptures while the former comprehends a wide field in the believer's experience. What is most to be emphasized in the former is the truth that the Holy Spirit bears witness in the believer's heart, which witness becomes an assurance that the believer is a child of God. The Apostle Paul declares: "The Spirit itself [R.V., himself] beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16), and the Apostle John likewise writes: "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his

Son" (1 John 5:9–10). Thus, also, the ability to speak to God the Father with the sense of filial relationship is a work of the Holy Spirit performed in the heart, and then, too, it is because of sonship's genuineness that the Holy Spirit is given to the believer where He may with success engender the consciousness of sonship. It is written accordingly: "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6). Not only does the Spirit actualize the sonship relation, but He is appointed as well to make real every great fact of relationship the truth of which may have been theoretically acknowledged by faith. The Apostle's prayers bear directly on this specific work of the Holy Spirit. He prayed "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph. 1:17–21); and "that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God" (Eph. 3:16–19).

Like the leading of the Spirit, the Spirit's work of actualizing, being so definitely in the realm of experience, can be distorted by those who lack a right instruction and knowledge of God's ways with them; nevertheless, the leading and the true witness of the Spirit must be recognized and maintained regardless of perversions. It is a matter of Scriptural record that a believer will be made aware of his sonship relation to God by the witness to, and with, his human spirit by the indwelling Third Person. It is indeed the usual attitude of those who comprise the great company of spiritual believers to have peace in their hearts about personal salvation. They may

have various problems in the sphere of their daily life, but, unless most abnormal, they do not entertain uncertainty about their own acceptance with God. Such peace is foundational, for none will grow in the knowledge of Christ within the sphere of grace who are not at rest respecting their own relation to God (cf. 2 Pet. 3:18).

It may be concluded, then, that the great realities which enter into a believer's relation to God will be made actual to him by the Holy Spirit.

VII. The Intercession of the Spirit

No believer should be uninformed about the divine arrangement in this dispensation respecting prayer. As a new privilege for the child of God (John 16:24), Christ Himself directed that prayer be offered to the Father in the name of the Son (cf. John 16:23). To this the Apostle adds by the same divine authority that prayer be offered in the enabling power of the Holy Spirit. He writes, "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself [R.V., himself] maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. 8:26–27); "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Eph. 6:18). And to this testimony Jude, also, adds: "But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost" (Jude 1:20). According to the first of these passages—Romans 8:26–27—it is indicated that in the sphere of that particular form of prayer designated *intercession*, which is the act of standing between God and man on behalf of another, the human instrument does not know that for which he should pray. How could he know what God's purpose in another person's life might be? Or how could he know what relationship exists between God and his fellow man? Because of this obvious limitation, the Spirit indites the prayer of intercession, and furthermore He, as one of the Godhead who Himself knows the need of human hearts and indeed who searches all hearts, is understood by the Father since He knows perfectly the mind or petitions presented by the Holy Spirit when the Spirit makes intercession for the saints according to the Father's will. Of this divine plan for prayer Dean

Alford writes, “The Holy Spirit of God dwelling in us, knowing our wants better than we, Himself pleads in our prayers, raising us to higher and holier desires than we can express in words, which can only find utterance in sighings and aspirations” (*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., at Rom. 8:27). Thus the Spirit-filled man may and does enter a sphere of effective ministry in prayer because of the Spirit’s intercession operating within.

Conclusion

It has been the purpose in this chapter of Pneumatology to present and amplify the revealed truth regarding that which is wrought by the Holy Spirit in the heart and life of the believer whom He fills. The filling with the Spirit results in seven manifestations of Himself in and through the child of God. There need be no doubt about what the Spirit's objectives are. Because of the clear presentation in the Sacred Text, all discordant human experience is to be rejected as irrelevant, and the Christian may judge himself in a most practical way with respect to the measure with which he is Spirit-filled. Attention has been called repeatedly to the determining fact that all of these seven effects are wrought in and through the believer so as to be termed properly *manifestations of the Spirit*. These operations are not to be sought as special concessions from God, but are the normal activities of the Spirit within the one whom He fills. This truth leads on to consideration of the problem of what the precise terms or conditions are, as revealed in the New Testament, upon which a Christian may come into the realization of this priceless, God-honoring experience in daily life.

Chapter XV

Conditions Prerequisite to Filling

Again the believer is to be confronted with the simplest of conditions, and just those which are naturally required on the human side to the end that he may be Spirit-filled. As is too often the case with interpreters, however, the prerequisite adjustments outlined by the Scripture have been increased, demands being added which are foreign to the revelation God has given. Exhibiting the same disposition to add unappointed burdens, which disposition is displayed when anything is added to the one condition of salvation by faith alone, men have stressed beyond measure the supposed human obligations relative to the Spirit's filling. It is commonly urged that the Spirit's filling depends upon asking or praying for it. This error is prompted by the notion that to pray for the filling of the Spirit is reasonable. By some also who confuse the receiving of the Spirit with the filling of the Spirit, it is believed that prayer for the Spirit is commanded in Luke 11:13, where the Savior's words are recorded thus: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Previously it has been demonstrated that the direction Christ gave as stated in this passage does not and could not apply to believers of the present age, and it is equally true that receiving the Spirit is not the same as being filled with the Spirit. Prayer for the Spirit's filling is an error of great proportions and indicates a misunderstanding of the conditions which now obtain. The Spirit's filling does not await the influence of prayer. God is not withholding this blessing until He is prevailed upon or some reluctance on His part is broken down. He awaits the requisite human adjustments. In other words, He is waiting for the believer to yield all to Him. When the revealed conditions, which are most reasonable, are met, the Spirit goes forward in the believer's heart with all the activities which together constitute the Spirit's filling. The Spirit does not need to be implored to do that which He came into the Christian's heart to do; He is rather imploring the Christian to make the way clear for Him to do His gracious work. The results are immediate and the blessing is secured when the conditions are met, but prayer for the filling of the Spirit is not one of those conditions.

Next to the error of supposing that prayer is a condition upon which the believer may be filled is that of assuming, because the disciples waited ten days for the Spirit before the Day of Pentecost was fully come, that all believers must wait for the Spirit. This notion is possible only because the truth is unobserved that the disciples were not waiting for their own filling, but were waiting for the advent of the Spirit into the world. Since the Spirit came as He did on Pentecost, none have ever had the slightest occasion to wait for Him; but how long and with what patience the Spirit has waited for unyielded lives to be surrendered to Him!

Similarly, there are those who, continuing a misunderstanding of two or three generations ago, contend that the Spirit's filling depends upon some crisis experience, at which time the filling is claimed by a supreme effort of faith resulting in what is thought to be a permanent state of spirituality. Men have taught that Christians should receive the Spirit's filling by a specific effort much as they would draw a deep breath into their lungs. All this, however sincere, ignores the simple truth that the Spirit indwells every believer and so the problem before the believer is only one of adjustment to the end that the Spirit's work in the heart and life may be unhindered.

In approaching the theme respecting the terms upon which the child of God may be filled with the Spirit, it should be clear to all that only those instructions which are set forth in the Scriptures are to be considered. One great preacher of the past tabulated eighteen requirements which he declared must be met by those who would be Spirit-filled; however, in his autobiography, when describing his own experience in becoming thus filled, he failed to indicate that he complied with even one of these unfounded requirements. Such unreality must be avoided and only those conditions which God has revealed are to be considered. Three conditions are directly stated in the New Testament. There are no more and there are no less. Since this is true, it is evident that these three represent all that is required. Of these three conditions, two are negative—what the believer should not do, and one is positive—that which the believer should do. The negative directions are: "And grieve not the holy Spirit of God" (Eph. 4:30) and "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5:19), while the one positive condition is: "Walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:16). These are now to be considered separately and in the same order.

I. “Grieve Not the Holy Spirit of God”

The Christian is indwelt by the Holy Spirit with the purpose in view that the divine life should dominate all his thoughts, actions, and feelings rather than sin, which is so foreign to the Holy Spirit, indeed the very opposite and that which is furthest removed from the absolute purity and sanctity of the indwelling One. The presence of sin in the believer’s life grieves the Holy Spirit. This is the testimony of the Bible and it is also the abundant witness of reason. When sin is tolerated in the Christian’s daily life, of necessity the Spirit must turn from His ministry *through* the Christian unto a pleading ministry *to* him. The Bible lends no sanction to the idea, so often suggested, that the Spirit is ever grieved away. On the contrary, it is assured that, having taken up His residence in the child of God, He abides forever (John 14:16–17; 1 John 2:27). He remains, but is grieved when sin is present. The grieving of the Spirit becomes a very definite experience in the one within whom the Spirit dwells, an experience which bears a close resemblance to that of his own soul or spirit when depressed. David expressed the feeling which came upon him after his great sin accordingly, saying: “When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer” (Ps. 32:3–4). All of this, being a matter of human experience, is liable to misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Physical conditions often engender a depressed mental state, which state has no relation whatever to the grieving of the Spirit. Allowance should always be made when nerves are depleted or when physical vitality is low. Many are the instances when the mind, because of weakness of nerve or body, is prone to imagine separation from God, even suspecting that an unpardonable sin has been committed. However, the test of all this is very simple. That sin which grieves the Spirit becomes at once a known issue. The sin will stand forth as the known and recognized cause of heart burden. The cure is confession to God and the one who has aught to confess will not be left in doubt or uncertainty about what should be confessed. No one can be definite in confessing unknown sins. Known sin may be confessed in harmony with that knowledge of it which the Spirit creates in the mind and heart. Should a believer be depressed with no recognized wrong coming in view, it is certain that the cause is physical rather than spiritual. In the light

of the truth that the Holy Spirit is grieved by sin and that this reaction to sin on the part of the Spirit is experienced by the one in whom He dwells, it may well be questioned whether the believer ever lives by the dictates of his conscience after he is saved. The presence of the Holy Spirit creates new standards as high as divine holiness itself, and the Christian's manner of life either does not or does grieve the Spirit on that high and holy plane. The Apostle testified that his conscience bore him witness in the Holy Spirit (Rom. 9:1–3). It is probable that the Holy Spirit employs the human conscience, but He as certainly imparts to it a new standard concerning what is right and what is wrong. The clear command addressed to the believer is that he "grieve not the holy Spirit of God." There will be little argument from any source against the truth that sin in the Christian is the cause of grief to the Holy Spirit; nor is there aught to be said against the fact that the child of God, being possessed of a fallen nature, and being subject to unceasing conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil, does sin and thus grieve the Holy Spirit. The practical problem is twofold: (a) how to be kept from sinning and (b) how to apply God's provided cure once sin has entered the life.

1. Prevention of the Christian's Sin. Three major factors enter into the prevention of sin in the life of the Christian.

First, *the Word of God* is itself a protection when cherished in the heart. The Psalmist declared: "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee" (Ps. 119:11). Not only is the Word of God inevitably a power in preserving from sin, but it is a power in detecting sin within the life. Those Christians who are carelessly sinning do not feel comfortable when reading the Scriptures and they naturally avoid such reading. It is written: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12).

Second, *the indwelling Spirit* is the resource from whom abundant ability to resist sin may be drawn. The fact of the Holy Spirit's presence and power is the immediate basis of all holy living. Related to this feature of divine enablement is the action of the human will, the empowered determination to do that which alone will honor God. The will is motivated by the

knowledge of the exalted positions to which one has been brought through grace and is energized by the Holy Spirit to will and to do that which is well-pleasing unto God.

Third, *the Intercession of Christ* is that aspect of His priestly ministry in heaven by which He sustains His own who are in the world. It contemplates their weakness, helplessness, and limitations. It pertains to the shepherdhood of Christ.

2. Remedy of the Christian's Sin. As an approach to the subject named, one point should be made, and indeed it is easily recognized as fundamental that, in addition to the truth of the sinfulness of sin, the believer should not sin inasmuch as sin grieves the Holy Spirit. Much emphasis is given in the New Testament to this latter truth and, as seen above, God has provided vital hindrances to sin; but it yet remains true that, because of failure to claim the protection God has provided, because of the strength of the foes encountered—the world, the flesh, and the devil—though even these are not too great for God to control, and because of human weakness, the Christian does sin to a greater or less degree and is therefore faced with a different problem than the prevention of sin alone: he must be informed in respect to and act in compliance with the divine plan of remedy. In the light of the probability of some sin in his life, the Christian who does not claim the cure of the effect of his sin will of necessity reach the place where all manifestations of the Spirit's presence and power are annulled and the life is lived under the cloud of depression which the unceasing grief of the Spirit creates. It is therefore an important feature in the realization of the spiritual life for the believer to understand the provisions for restoration to right relations with God and to act upon these provisions with unremitting faithfulness. These divinely furnished provisions for the restoration of the sin-injured believer to right relation to the Holy Spirit are set forth in the Bible in certain major passages, and of these provisions it should be said that they lead the Christian who has been injured by sin back to complete fellowship with God. The results secured by pursuing the divinely arranged plan for restoration are *absolute*. Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon this fact, and there is need always for the truth to be restated in the light of the tendency to suppose that the divine forgiveness and restoration are subject to the same limitations which

characterize such human forgiveness and restoration as men exercise toward each other on the basis of leniency and generosity. The major passages respecting divine forgiveness and restoration are now to be considered.

John 13:3–11. "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter, Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean."

Among other important features to be presented in this Scripture passage and which enter into the believer's right relation to God, is one that is most important, namely, that Christ alone can cleanse the believer from the defilement of sin. In the earlier chapters of this Gospel the way of salvation has been presented, but beginning with chapter 13 and continuing through chapter 17 the believer's privilege and responsibility in relation to God are declared. Of the various major issues which are included in this particular passage or discourse, it is important to notice that cleansing from defilement is the first to be mentioned and that apart from cleansing there can be no normal experience of the great realities which this discourse presents. That Christ could say—as He actually did later on (15:3)—"Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you" is most impressive. Cleansing, however, is contemplated by Christ in two widely different aspects, namely, that which is wrought as a part of salvation and that which avails to cleanse the defiled believer. Thus in verse 10 of the present passage Christ declares to Peter: "He that is washed [λούω—wholly bathed] needeth not [to be bathed again] save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." This truth is drawn as respects its reality from the custom of the times, when people bathed in public bathhouses and returning home with bare feet or sandals through the filth of sewerless streets needed on arrival,

not a whole bath, but a partial bathing—that of the feet. Coming to Peter, a normal resistance is set up on the part of this one who did not understand the symbolism of the bathing of the feet and who had but a few months before said to Christ: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:16). That resistance was introduced by Peter’s remark, “Dost thou wash my feet?” To this Christ said, “What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter,” thus indicating that there was a hidden meaning in the act of washing the disciples’ feet—a meaning which depends for its understanding upon the blood of Christ being shed for cleansing, but which no disciple could then understand since they did not believe that Christ was to die (cf. Luke 18:31–34). Peter is little impressed with any hidden meaning. He sees only the unreasonableness of the Son of God washing a sinful man’s feet. His blunt reply to Christ is, “Thou shalt never wash my feet.” This protest draws out from the Savior a statement which explains very much of what is involved. Christ said, “If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.” Here two words are met which need to be understood in their real meaning. The word *wash* (νίπτω) speaks only of a partial bathing such as Christ was undertaking, and is quite in contrast with the word λούω of verse 10 which refers to a whole bath. The second word to be rightly understood is μέρος, translated *part*—“Thou hast no part with me.” There is no implication that Peter would sustain no relation whatsoever to Christ; it is rather a matter of communion. Peter would not be in fellowship unless defilement is removed by the cleansing blood of Christ. The priest of Old Testament times is the type of the New Testament priest and every Christian is a New Testament priest. Fulfilling the type, the Old Testament priest was wholly bathed in a ritual once for all when entering upon his priestly office (Ex. 29:4). In like manner, the New Testament priest is, as a part of his salvation, bathed with the washing of regeneration (Titus 3:5). Similarly, the Old Testament priest was required to be bathed partially—hands and feet—at the laver before every service (Ex. 30:17–21). Thus, also, the New Testament priest must be cleansed repeatedly whenever defilement is contracted; but Christ alone can cleanse, and though the disciples were enjoined to wash one another’s feet as an evidence of service one for the other, no human being can cleanse spiritual defilement from his fellow man, nor is he in any position even by symbol to enact so great an undertaking. The truth is thus established that Christ alone can cleanse the defilement of

the believer, and that because of His death and His blood shed sacrificially for the believer (1 John 2:2).

1 John 1:5–2:2. "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us. My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our's only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

John is the experienced witness in regard to an unbroken fellowship with the Father and with the Son, as indicated by the first verses of 1 John. In the first chapter of this epistle a message is brought forward directly from Christ's earthly ministry which does not appear in any Gospel record. The message has to do with maintaining communion with the Father and with the Son. In contemplating such a relationship it should be remembered that "God is light," which phrase refers to moral or holy perfection, and it is with such a One that the believer is to have fellowship. The bringing of the Christian into communion with God is not achieved by lowering that which pertains to God; it is rather gained by lifting the believer up to the level upon which communion with God is possible. For one to say that he has fellowship with God while at the same time he is walking in darkness is to lie and to do not the truth; but if the Christian walks in the light as God is in the light, it is to experience fellowship with God, the fellowship which is the normal experience of all who are saved. Such fellowship is not a special concession from God, but is rather that which is provided for all who are rightly related to God. All this immeasurable blessing is conditioned on "walking in the light." To walk in the light is not to become the light, which would be sinless perfection; it is to be adjusted to the light. When the searchlight, which God is, reveals needed changes in one's life before God, then in order to walk in the light one must adapt one's self to the will of

God thus revealed. When thus adapted, the blood of Jesus Christ goes on continuously cleansing from all sin. Fellowship does not depend upon an impossible sinless perfection, but on the willing compliance with all that God desires and makes known. Thus confession, which is the outward expression of inward repentance, becomes the one condition upon which a child of God who has been injured by sin may be restored to unbroken fellowship again. Not only will that restoration be absolute to the extent of infinity, but the divine grace that forgives and cleanses is accomplished on a basis which is righteous to the degree of infinity. Since it is God's own child that has sinned to whom He is bound with eternal ties, He is "faithful" to those relationships; and since Christ has met all the rightful judgments against the sin which is in question, He is "just" to cleanse and to forgive. It was thus in the Old Testament order and it must ever be thus wherever God the Holy One deals with human sin. The Israelite brought his sacrifice and it was after the priest offered the sacrifice that the comer therewith was forgiven. Leviticus 4:35 declares: "And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacrifice of the peace-offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: and the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him." Great emphasis is placed on the fact that the one condition to be met for restoration of a believer to fellowship with God is confession of sin. Too often prayer for forgiveness is substituted; but prayer for forgiveness is not an adjustment to the Light which God is. Prayer for forgiveness really assumes that God Himself needs to be changed in His attitude toward the one who has sinned.

1 Corinthians 11:31–32. "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemed with the world."

Coming as it does at the close of the extended portion of this epistle, which portion is devoted to the correction of carnalities in the Corinthian church (1:10–11:34), this clear direction relative to the human responsibility in the cure of the effects upon himself of the Christian's sin is most appropriate. The particular contribution which this passage makes to the whole doctrine of the believer's walk with God is seen in the order of events which it discloses. The Father is here seen to be waiting for the self-

judgment or confession of His child who has sinned. This period of seeming silence or inattention on God's part that follows the sin which the believer has committed is easily misunderstood, and may be wrongly interpreted by the believer as indicating that God has not observed the sin which has been committed. It is the grace of God which waits thus for the believer to act first in his own behalf respecting his sin. However, if the sinning child of God will not thus judge himself by a full confession, it becomes necessary for the Father, being the perfect disciplinarian that He is, to bring His child into judgment. This is the force of the Apostle's words: "If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." The voluntary act of self-judgment satisfies every divine demand and no judgment from the Father will be imposed. It is only when the Christian withholds his confession and by so much assumes the attitude of self-justification concerning his sin, or through love of it refuses to be adjusted to the holy will of God, that the Father must bring him into the place of correction. It will be recognized again that the issue is not one of sustaining a union with the Father, which union, like sonship, when once established can never be broken; it is rather the issue respecting communion or fellowship. Accordingly it is asked: "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" (Amos 3:3). God cannot walk in the dark with the believer, nor can fellowship be experienced when the believer is calling black white and white black. The Christian must agree with God that white is white and black is black. Having come into agreement with God, there remains no obstacle to hinder and fellowship is restored by the gracious forgiving and cleansing from God. The passage from Paul goes on to say: "But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord." A distinction is obvious at this point between chastisement and penalty or satisfaction. Even though the believer is chastened the penalty for his sin is not required of him, since Christ has taken all penalty upon Himself and it is never required again. Too often, Christians do not comprehend the truth that there is not and could not be any penalty. Chastisement has as its purpose to bring the believer to penitence and through the accompanying confession to restoration. That chastisement is not penal is demonstrated by the fact that restoration and forgiveness are secured at once apart even from chastisement, when confession is made without delay. Penalty could not be delayed or remitted if it were designed to fall upon the believer. Having undertaken to save the Christian from all

penal judgments (cf. John 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 8:1, R.V.), and having covenanted to forgive and cleanse instantly and perfectly on the one condition of confession, the believer is chastened only when resisting God. Standing in the merit of the Son of God and being sheltered under the efficacy of Christ's blood, the child of God can never be "condemned with the world."

Hebrews 12:5–11. "And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

The importance of the doctrine respecting chastisement warrants the space given to it in the Sacred Text. The passage quoted is central and from this context as from other Scriptures it may be seen that chastisement comprehends more than correction for evil; it may include discipline, development, or instruction as its objective as well. Were it restricted to correction for evil in the children of God, it could hardly be said to be universal in scope. As for its universal character, it is written: "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," and in chastisement "God dealeth with you as with sons," and unless ye are chastened—as all sons are—ye are "not sons" at all. The believer should not "despise" chastisement nor faint under its discipline. As in the case of an earthly son, every advantage accrues to the one who is "exercised thereby." Verse 6 implies a distinction between chastisement and scourging. Chastisement, as broad as it may be in its outreach, may be experienced many times; but scourging, which seems to mean the final conquering of the will of the believer, would need to be experienced but once. Many sad episodes in the life of the unyielded

Christian might be avoided were he to surrender his will to the mind of God.

Though some specific forms of chastisement are named in the Scriptures and this divine undertaking is seen at work in many of the lives recorded in the Word of God, it is probable that, since God deals thus with individual sons, His ways and means in chastisement are manifold. They may vary with every individual situation. The length to which chastisement may go is asserted in 1 Corinthians 11:30. Speaking of irregularities in connection with the table of the Lord and of discipline which may attend such wrongdoing, the Apostle says: “For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.” It is thus disclosed that the Father may employ physical weakness, physical sickness, or physical death as His means in chastisement. Reference to physical death is made in the same connection in other New Testament texts. The branch in Christ which bears not fruit may be lifted up out of its place (John 15:2), and there is a sin unto death which a brother may commit (1 John 5:16)—in such a case prayer for healing will be unavailing. Even Satan may be used as an instrument in chastisement. The Apostle declares: “Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme” (1 Tim. 1:20).

Because of the comfort which it secures and because of the fact respecting the character of God which is revealed therein, the truth that love is the divine motive in every instance where chastisement is employed should not be overlooked. No attempt to expound this important doctrine should be made which fails to indicate that divine chastisement arises in the infinite compassion of God and is administered under the influence of infinite, divine affection.

2 Corinthians 7:8–11. “For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death. For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea,

what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter."

This passage is cited as an example of a true repentance on the part of believers. The Apostle had written the Corinthian church—the correspondence of his first epistle to Corinth is in view—and in that message, as before observed, he brought up their sins and irregularities with the result that they were convinced of their evil ways, and in repentance—meaning a thoroughgoing change of mind—they cleared themselves wholly before God. A true repentance will not result in a shallow, temporary experience which goes on tolerating and repeating the evil; however, the power to avoid recurrences is not in the degree of repentance, but in a more effective reliance upon the enabling Holy Spirit. Consideration should be given to this passage in the light of the truth that it is a pattern of what God has a right to expect from all whom He chastens.

Psalm 51:1–19. This familiar Psalm, which is too extensive for quotation, presents David as an outstanding example of repentance and confession among Old Testament saints. In the Word of God, David's sin is laid bare and with it his broken and contrite heart. He had partaken of that form of salvation which was accorded Old Testament saints, which salvation, being wrought of God as all salvation must be, was not itself injured. David therefore prayed that the joy of his salvation, rather than the salvation itself, might be restored unto him. It is thus indicated that David understood precisely what he had lost through his sin. His testimony also had been hindered. After making request that he might be restored and anticipating its blessedness, he said: "Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee." To this extent the Old Testament saints were similar in their relation to God to the New Testament saints; however, striking differences must be observed and such as are disclosed in this Psalm. The New Testament believer need never pray, "And take not thy holy Spirit from me," since the Spirit once given is never removed from the heart of the Christian; nor must the New Testament saint ask for forgiveness and restoration. After Christ has died bearing all sin—that of the Christian as well as that of the unsaved—and after that sin-bearing death has rendered God propitious, there are no grounds remaining for the Christian to be asking God to forgive. He forgives, just as He has promised, when sin is confessed (cf. 1 John 1:9). David recognized, as all

saints should, that his sin was primarily against God. “Against thee, thee only, have I sinned” was his heart-broken cry. His restoration based on his confession was complete; for it was in spite of David’s sin and after his restoration that Jehovah said, “I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart” (Acts 13:22; cf. 1 Sam. 13:14). David’s sin was not pleasing to God; but, having repented and having confessed his sin, he was restored to God’s favor.

Luke 15:1–32. The last of the seven major passages bearing on the cure of the effects of sin upon the spiritual life of a saint—whether he is of the Old Testament or the New—is found in Luke 15:1–32. This portion of the Scriptures contains one parable in three parts (cf. vs. 3). It is the threefold story of a lost sheep, a lost piece of silver, and a lost son. Though three incidents are told, there is but one underlying purpose. The particular value of this passage, in the present connection, lies in its revelation of the divine compassion as seen in the restoration of a sinning saint. It is the unveiling of the Father’s heart. The emphasis falls upon the shepherd, rather than upon the sheep; upon the woman, rather than upon the lost piece of silver; and upon the father, rather than upon either son of his. In considering this passage, it must be borne in mind that what is here recorded reflects the conditions which obtained before the cross. It, therefore, has to do primarily with Israel. They were the covenant people of the Old Testament, “the sheep of his pasture,” and their position as such was unchanged until the new covenant was made in His blood. Being covenant people, they could return to the blessings of their covenant, if those blessings had been lost through sin, on the grounds of repentance and confession. This, according to the Scriptures and as has been seen, is true of all covenant people. Israel’s covenants are not the same in character as “the new covenant [made] in his blood”; but the terms of restoration into the blessings of the covenant are the same in the one case as in the other. The *factuality* of the covenant abides through the faithfulness of God, but the *blessing* of the covenant may be lost through the unfaithfulness of the saint. The blessing is regained, too, not by forming another covenant, but by restoration into the unchanging privileges of the original covenant. The threefold parable here is about Israelites and was addressed to them. Whatever application there may be in the parable to Christians under the new covenant is possible only on the ground of the fact that the way of restoration by repentance and confession

is common to both old and new covenants. In the parable, therefore, is supplied a picture of the heart of God toward any and all of His covenant people when they sin.

The parable opens thus: “Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.” Here is the key to all that follows. “Publicans and sinners” were not Gentiles. “Publicans” were Israelites under the covenant “made with the fathers” who had turned traitor to their nation to the extent of becoming taxgatherers for Rome. “Sinners” were Israelites under the same covenant who had failed to present the sacrifices for sin as prescribed by the Law of Moses. An Israelite was accounted “blameless” before the law when he had provided the required offerings. Thus Paul could say of himself concerning his former position as no more than a Jew under the law: “touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless.” The Apostle is not claiming sinless perfection; he is testifying to the fact that he had always been faithful in providing the sacrifices prescribed by the Law of Moses. The Pharisees and scribes were Israelites who gave all their energies to the exact fulfillment of the Law of Moses. Paul was once no more than a Pharisee, “an Hebrew of the Hebrews.” These men were not Christians and should not be judged as such. There is little in common here with Christians. These Israelites were blameless through the animal sacrifices which anticipated the death of Christ. Christians are blameless through faith in the effectual blood of Christ which has already been shed. One is a justification by works, inadequate because contingent on the human side; the other is a justification by faith concerning a finished work of God. The Pharisees and scribes murmured when they saw that Jesus received publicans and sinners and ate with them. He, therefore, spoke this parable unto *them*, His critics. The parable is explicitly addressed to murmuring Pharisees and scribes rather than to everybody, anywhere. And there can be little understanding of the truth contained in it unless the plain purpose for which it is told is kept in mind. In turning to an interpretation of the parable, some consideration must be given to the well-nigh universal impression that this parable is a picture of salvation. While it is a blessed picture of the heart of God, it most evidently has to do with His work of *restoration* rather than of *regeneration*.

The first division of the parable concerns a man who had a hundred sheep. “What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it?” This is not a picture of ninety-nine sheep and one goat: it is of one hundred sheep and “sheep,” according to the Scriptures, are always symbolic of covenant people. Israelites were sheep, so also are the Christians in this dispensation. Jesus, when speaking of those to be saved through His death, said to the Jews: “Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold” (John 10:16). Another important distinction should be noted in this parable: The sheep, the piece of silver, and the son were *lost*, but they were lost only to the point that they needed to be *found*. This is hardly the same as being lost in such an utter way as to need to be *saved*. The Biblical use of the word *lost* has at least these two widely different meanings. “The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost”; but, in all three parts of this parable, it is seeking and finding rather than seeking and saving. The word *save*, it should be observed, does not once appear in this parable. Should this parable be accepted as a teaching in regard to salvation, there is no escaping the error of Universalism; for this Shepherd seeks *until* He finds that which is lost. The passage, on the other hand, presents a blessed revelation of the heart of God toward His wandering child who needs to be found rather than to be saved. “Ninety and nine” who are safe in the fold compared to one that is lost is a poor picture of the proportions which have always existed in this age between the saved and unsaved. Were the parable to teach the salvation of a sinner, far better would it have been had it made the figures ninety and nine who were lost in contrast to one that was safe in the fold. The parable continues: “And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance.”

The sinner here referred to can be none other than one of the covenant “sinners” mentioned in the first verse of the passage and concerning whom the parable was told. He, being a covenant person, is here pictured by the Spirit as returning on the grounds of repentance, rather than as being saved on the grounds of saving faith. So, again, one could hardly find any class of

persons within the church corresponding to the “ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance.” Such a case was possible, nevertheless, under the Law of Moses, the Apostle Paul when under Judaism being a good example. The very Pharisees and scribes to whom the parable was addressed were also of that class. Within the outward demands of the Law of Moses, they needed no repentance. Repentance, which means a change of mind, is a vital element in present salvation; but it is now *included* in the one act of believing, for fully one hundred and fifty passages in the New Testament condition our present salvation on believing, or its synonym, faith. The Gospel by John, written especially that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through His name, does not once use the word *repentance*. The unsaved today are saved through believing, which evidently includes such repentance as can be produced by those who are “dead in trespasses and sins.” Repentance means a change of mind and no one can believe on Christ as his Savior and not have changed his mind with respect to his sin, his lost condition, and the placing of his saving trust in the One who is “mighty to save.”

The second division of the parable concerns the woman and the lost piece of silver. It is the same story of seeking and finding that which was lost. The special emphasis in this division of the parable falls on the *joy* of the one who finds. It is the joy of the One in whose presence the angels are. The story, again, is of a repenting sinner, rather than of a believing sinner.

The third division of the parable tells of “a certain man.” This story is evidently told to reveal the heart of the father. Incidentally, he had two sons, and one of them was typical of a “publican and sinner,” and the other of a “Pharisee and scribe.” One left the blessings of his father’s house (but did not cease to be a son); the other murmured, as did the scribes and Pharisees, when the “sinner” was restored. No greater depths of degradation could be pictured to a Jewish mind than to be found in a field feeding swine. Here we have the Lord declaring, in the terms of His own time and people, that a wandering *son* may return by confession, even from the lowest depths of sin. It was there, in that field with the swine, that the son “came to himself” and purposed to return to his father with a confession, which is only the normal expression of a true heart-repentance. There is no mention of regeneration. Nothing is said of faith, apart from which no soul could hope

to be saved into sonship. He was a son and returned to his father as a son. The sentiment that an unsaved person, when turning to Christ, is "returning home," as is sometimes expressed in sermons and gospel songs, is foreign to the teaching of the Word of God. Sons, who have wandered away may return home, and, as being lost in the state of wandering, may be found. This could not apply to one who has never been a child of God. Such are certainly lost, but need rather to be saved. In this dispensation, unsaved people may *turn* to God, but they do not *return* to God. When the returning son was a great way off the father saw him and had compassion on him and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him. The father saw him because he was looking that way. He had not ceased to look since the hour the son departed. Such is the picture of God the Father's heart, expressed, as well, in the searching carried on both by the shepherd and the woman. All righteousness would require that this returning boy be punished most severely. Had he not dishonored the father's name? Had he not squandered his father's substance? Had he not brought himself to ruin? But he was not punished. The fact that he was not punished unfolds to believers of this dispensation the blessed truth that, because of the work of Christ on the cross, the Father can and will receive His child without punishment. The terms of restoration to be met are only a brokenhearted confession. The guilt of the sin has fallen on Another in our stead.

It is important to observe that the father kissed the son even before his confession was made. Reason would dictate that the son be kissed after his confession. So far as this incident may be made to apply rightfully to the present relationships between God the Father and Christians who have sinned, it emphasizes the truth that *God is propitious*, having been rendered propitious by the all-satisfying death of Christ as substitute in judgment due the Christian's sins. In this connection, it is written: "And he [Christ in His death] is the propitiation for our [Christians'] sins" (1 John 2:2). It is the fact that Christ died as substitute which makes it possible for God to receive those for whom He died as though every obligation to divine justice which their sins created is met, as indeed these obligations were met by Christ acting for them. It is not tears, repentance, or pleading on the part of those who have sinned. Both the unsaved and the sinning believer are invited to come to a propitious God. Of great import also is the fact that, without reprimand or punishment, the son was reinstated in the position and

blessing of the father's house. The confession which he prepared was not fully repeated to the father. The last words "and make me as one of thy hired servants" were cut off by the vigorous command of the father, "Bring forth …" Thus, instantly, when a complete confession is made, regardless of additional words the penitent one would present, the restoration is achieved.

The confession of this son was first toward heaven and then to his father. This is the true order of all confession. It must be first to God and then to those who would be wronged by the withholding of our confession. Great is the power of a brokenhearted confession. No one can believe that the wandering son, after having been restored, and after resting again in the comforts of that fellowship and home, would immediately ask his father for more of his goods that he might return to the life of sin. Such action would be wholly inconsistent with the heart-broken confession he has made. True confession is real and transforming in its power (cf. 2 Cor. 7:11). He was a *son* during all the days of his absence from home. Had he died in the field with the swine, he would have died as a son. So far as this illustrates the estate of a sinning Christian, it may be concluded, from this and all the Scriptures on this subject, that an imperfect Christian, such as we all are, would be received into the heavenly home at death, though he suffer loss of all rewards and much joy, and though, when he meets his Lord face to face, he is called upon there to make his hitherto neglected confession.

From these seven major passages it may be concluded that the cure of the effects of sin on the spiritual life of a child of God is promised to the one who in repentance of heart makes a genuine confession of his sin. Sin is always sin in the sight of God. It is no less sin because it is committed by a Christian, nor can it be cured in any case other than through the redemption which is in Christ. It is because the redemption-price has already been paid in the precious blood of Christ that God can save sinners who only believe and restore saints who only confess. Not one degree of the punishment that fell upon our Substitute can ever fall on saint or sinner. Since Christ bore it all for us, believing or confessing is all that can righteously be demanded. Until confession is made by the one who has sinned, he is contending for that which is evil and thus is in disagreement with the Father. "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" God cannot agree with sin. The child can agree with the Father, and this is true repentance which is expressed in true confession. Again let it be said: repentance is a change of mind. By it

those who have sinned turn unto God from sin. The blessing does not depend upon sinless perfection; it is a matter of not grieving the Spirit. It is not an issue concerning *unknown* sin; it is an attitude of heart that is willing always instantly to confess every *known* sin. “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” The Christian who fully confesses all *known* sin will have removed one—if not all—of the hindrances to the fullest manifestation of the Spirit. “And grieve not the holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30).

From the foregoing discussion, it may be determined that one of the conditions upon which the believer may be Spirit-filled is met when that which grieves the Holy Spirit is removed by complete confession, which confession is the expression of a contrite heart. The secret by which this aspect of responsibility may best be maintained is to keep short accounts with God. Let the first impression of spiritual depression be a signal to ascertain at once the cause and as readily to apply the remedy—confession to God.

II. “Quench Not the Spirit”

The second direct command which governs the right relation between the Holy Spirit and the believer is stated in 1 Thessalonians 5:19, “Quench not the Spirit.” These are words of solemn import since they imply a most serious possibility in the Christian’s attitude toward the Holy Spirit. The thoughtful child of God is thus reminded of the heaven-high responsibility and reality which an unbroken companionship with the Holy Spirit imposes —a responsibility and a reality which cannot be lessened or avoided. Though the demands are superhuman, there is no ground upon which it properly can be considered a burden or bondage to avoid the quenching of the Spirit. Every demand which the presence of the Spirit engenders is in itself a path into untold riches of blessing. In truth, the presence of the Holy Spirit and the riches of His benefits constitute an earnest and foretaste of heaven’s immeasurable realities. Spiritual sanity will never shrink from the obligations which life in company with the Holy Spirit creates. Those obligations at best may be but partially discharged, but the ambition to comply with all that they exact should never be lacking. Again attention is

directed to the fact that this, like the former issue respecting the grieving of the Spirit, is a direct mandate which suffers no option relative to acquiescence. Both behests are negative, making request respecting specific things which must not be allowed if the full measure of the Spirit's blessing is to be realized. Though somewhat similar since they are addressed alike to the believer's inner life and power to react, they are different. The Spirit is grieved when sin occurs and remains unconfessed. This feature of the truth is altogether within the scope of the negative side of the spiritual life. The Spirit is quenched when the Christian resists or rejects the will of God for him, which body of truth as set forth in the Scriptures is usually within the scope of the positive side of the spiritual life, though it is possible to quench the Spirit by resisting God respecting issues which have to do with victory over sin as well as in issues which pertain to life and service. The three requirements which condition the Spirit's filling—(a) confession of every known sin, (b) yielding to the will of God, and (c) walking in dependence upon the Holy Spirit—are not based upon an irrational caprice in God. They indicate that which is the foundation of communion and fellowship—what is to be sustained between the Holy Spirit and the one in whom the Spirit dwells. Nothing is shrouded with mystery or veiled even from those who are the least capable of understanding. The problem is one of accepting and doing the will of God. This is the central issue in the whole problem of the spiritual life. In the last analysis, the confession of every known sin and the maintaining of the principle of reliance upon the Spirit in the daily walk depend on the action of the human will, but it is equally true and far more consequential that the human will be empowered by the Holy Spirit, else it does not act to God's glory. It is written, "For it is God which worketh [ἐνεργέω—*energize*] in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). The initial act is a surrender to the will of God, after which the human will may be depended upon to fulfill its responsibility as empowered by the Holy Spirit. In defense of a theoretical Calvinism and as a criticism of the teaching that the spiritual life depends upon the action of the human will even though energized of God, Dr. B. B. Warfield wrote that by so much it amounted to "subjecting all gracious workings of God to human determinating" (*Princeton Review*, April, 1919, p. 322). No worthy student of Biblical doctrine would question that God has a sovereign purpose or that all things are working toward the realization of that purpose, but it must be

acknowledged as well from such passages as Romans 12:1–2; Galatians 5:16; Ephesians 4:30; 1 Thessalonians 5:19; and 1 John 1:9 that the appeal is to the human will, with every implication present which might establish the truth that, in the divine plan, the human will determines the whole course of the believer's life. The failure at this point with extreme Calvinists arises from the fact that, in their zeal to defend the doctrine of divine sovereignty, they do not recognize how the very sovereignty of God in its outworking utilizes the human will as its instrument, not, however, by any form of coercion, but by that form of persuasion which enlightens and engenders holy desires to which the will may respond and by which it may be motivated. Here, again, it must be asserted with all possible force that when a decision is made regarding some step in the spiritual life, even under the most powerful, impelling inducements which God may impart, the action of the human will is sovereign and free in its own choice. As before demonstrated, this same procedure characterizes the whole undertaking when a soul is saved through faith in Christ. It matters nothing that the human will has no power in itself to accept Christ. The heart must be moved completely by the Holy Spirit or no choice of Christ is made; but just the same when the choice is made it is not due to coercion but to the will acting in its sovereign freedom. None can doubt the implication in the text which avers: "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." It is misleading to assert, as Dr. Warfield was wont to do, that "whosoever God wills may come." It nevertheless is true, but not in the same sense in which extreme Calvinists have presented it, namely, that whosoever God compels will come—rather it should be stated thus: that whosoever God calls with an efficacious call, which call is a persuasion sufficient to guarantee the determined choice, will, of his own sovereign determination, come. Let it not be supposed that this interpretation of an important Biblical doctrine lends any support to the Arminian notion that unregenerate men—because of some hypothetical, universal impartation of "common grace"—may at any time, under any circumstances, and by virtue of their own unaided vision and determination accept Christ as Savior if they will to do so. Only tragic misconceptions have been the fruit of an extreme Calvinism which conceives of the human will as overpowered by God, and of a fallacious Arminianism which makes no place in its reckoning for the inherent, constitutional necessity of immediate divine action upon the

human will before the right choice can be made at all. The spiritual life is in all instances presented as the result of the free choice of the believer's will; but this doctrine must not be left to stand alone. Another doctrine of even more vital significance is the truth that the will must be moved by God. This fact may well lead to consideration of the problem concerning the quenching of God's Spirit. Such a theme will be contemplated under five general divisions, namely, (1) resistance of the Spirit, (2) the yielded life, (3) the example of Christ, (4) the will of God, and (5) the sacrificial life.

1. Resistance of the Spirit. As used in 1 Thessalonians 5:19, the word *quench* does not mean to extinguish in the sense that the Spirit might become extinct or be expelled from the heart. Such an interpretation would come into direct contradiction with other Scriptures which assert that the Holy Spirit abides in the Christian forever. It refers rather to the suppressing of the Spirit's manifestations, or that which results when the divine forces are arrested upon which the spiritual life depends. As intimated above, the Spirit is quenched by an attitude of resistance or indifference toward the known will of God. More simply stated, it is saying No to God.

2. The Yielded Life. All the responsibility resting on the believer with respect to the quenching of the Spirit, like that resting on him with respect to the grieving of the Spirit, is summed up in the one word *yield*. In the following major division of this chapter it will be seen that the one requirement which secures a cure for a walk after the flesh is summed up in the one word *walk*—in its relation to the Holy Spirit. Thus in the briefest and most vital manner three great responsibilities—the three which condition spirituality—are gathered up in three words, namely, *confess, yield*, and *walk*. The context in which the yielded life may principally be found is Romans 6:1–23. The theme at that point, as before noted, is sanctification in daily life and by the power of the Holy Spirit alone. Daily victory over the flesh by means of the Spirit is made possible on a righteous ground by the fact that Christ has died the judgment death which belonged to the fallen nature of the believer. There follow two vitally essential responsibilities which rest directly and unceasingly upon the child of God: He is to *reckon* the judgment death of Christ which had the believer's fallen nature in view to be achieved wholly, and thus to believe that all

deliverance is provided and now made possible even at infinite cost; and he is to *yield* himself unto God as one who has passed through cocrucifixion, codeath, and coburial with Christ as a judgment upon his fallen nature, and thus to believe that now through union with Christ in resurrection he is "alive from the dead." The believer is to count the members of his body to be "instruments of righteousness unto God." Thus, yielding to God is seen to be more than a secondary or isolated responsibility. It is as essential as the whole doctrine of experimental sanctification which depends upon it. The appeal to live the yielded life as presented in Romans 6 is as follows: "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (vs. 11–13). The same appeal is made again in Romans 12:1–2, which states: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God." Presentation of the whole body unto God is termed a "reasonable service," or, perhaps better, "spiritual worship," which is not a sacrifice to be offered in death, but a living sacrifice that continues its dedication throughout all of a lifetime on earth. The life is not to be run into the mold of this age, but to be transfigured by the unhindered manifestation of that divinely renewed mind. The Authorized Version uses the word *transform* as a translation of μεταμορφόομαι, which word probably should be translated *transfigure* (cf. Matt. 17:2; Mark 9:2; 2 Cor. 3:18). This distinction is important. A thing may be transformed by a light shining upon it from without, but a thing is transfigured only as release is secured of a light from within. The transfiguration of Christ was not from without, but was rather the outshining of His essential Shekinah glory. The appeal in Romans 12:2 is for the manifestation or outshining of the divine nature which the believer possesses, that is, the manifestation of the Spirit in the realization of a truly spiritual life. Such a yielding as is called for would, it is assured, make full

proof of what is that *good*, that *acceptable*, and that *perfect* will of God. No richer experience is conceivable than that depicted by the help of these three words of description. It is the life supreme. The words "I beseech you" with which this passage begins (cf. Eph. 4:1) are far removed from a command; they are a pleading for a specific manner of life which becomes the child of God. It is not a plea for something the believer *must* do to be saved or to continue saved; it is rather something one *should* do because he is saved. The exhortation is for dedication and not, as so frequently misstated, for consecration, since consecration is an act of God alone by which He takes up and applies that which has been dedicated. The Christian surrenders, yields, and dedicates; God must employ what is thus presented. A so-called reconsecration is also terminology open to question, though it has been and is so generally mentioned and undertaken. Dedication, if done at all as God would have it, hardly needs to be done over. In other words, dedication is an all-determining act and not a process.

The question may well be asked, Why in the light of the inherent sovereign right of the Creator over the creature whom He has made should there be any hesitation in the human heart respecting an absolute conformity to the mind and will of God? As has been demonstrated at length under satanology, the first resistance of the Creator's authority was introduced by Lucifer, son of the morning, who is, according to the Scripture, the greatest of all the angels. He it was who led what may have been a third part of the angels of God after him in rebellion against God, and these became the demons and evil powers of supernatural origin who are described and identified in the New Testament. This same great angel entered the Garden of Eden and accomplished the constitutional degeneration of the first man and the first woman, and through them the ruin of the race, from which ruin only a lifeblood-redemption by the Son of God could rescue. That men are fallen and in a state of independence toward God is clearly indicated by the fact that it is so difficult, even for regenerate people, to be conformed to the will of God. Why should any creature find it difficult to be obedient unto God? Not only does God have the inherent, sovereign right over that which He has made, but the highest possible destiny for each individual, whether angel or human, is to be found in fulfilling precisely the thing for which he was created. Nothing is more irrational than to suppose that a creature can better his estate or improve his

prospects by keeping the direction of his life in his own hands. Satan him self is the supreme example of this folly. By turning from the exalted position and ever increasing glory that was his by creation over to a *cosmos*-world program in opposition to God, he evidently supposed that he was improving his fortunes; but in place of the eternal honor and glory as the highest of all angels which was once his portion, he must spend eternity in the lake of fire. There is no uncertainty about Satan's destiny. That destined lake was made for "the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41) and is God's answer to the creature who rebels against His rightful authority. If men go to the lake of fire, it is because they, too, have adopted the satanic philosophy of independence toward God (cf. Rev. 20:12–15). Lest in such a discussion and in view of the crushing defeat and eternal misery coming to the enemies of God an impression be created that God plays the tyrant who is disposed only to destroy such as resist Him, it should be remembered that only benefits commensurable with the infinite love of God are in store for those who do His will; and, as a message to the unsaved, that to obey the gospel, to conform to God's priceless plan of redeeming grace, is the first step in the doing of His will.

3. The Example of Christ. In the range of His humanity, Christ became the exemplar of that manner of life which alone will please the Father. To the end that He might in all respects represent the perfect divine ideal, Christ apparently drew not at all upon His own resources as a member of the Godhead, but suffered Himself to be wholly dependent, as every believer must do, upon the Holy Spirit. In the same perfection of conformity, He surrendered His human life and mind to the will of His Father. Having entered the human sphere, there was no other course open to the One who was appointed to become the perfection of the divine ideal. Above all else, it becomes one who enters the human sphere to be yielded utterly to the will of God. Anything less than complete yieldedness is anarchy in the household of God. Returning for the moment to the record respecting the insubordination of the highest angel, it will be remembered that his sin consisted in not only rejecting the will of God but substituting something of his own design in place of that will. As a consummation of five "I will's" set against the mind of God, Satan said, "I will be like the most High" (Isa. 14:13–14)—like God in the only particular in which the

creature may resemble Him, namely, acting in independence (of God); and such disobedience is the very essence of sin. It was the same disobedience that Satan prompted in the lives of the first man and the first woman. It was the same disobedience that Satan sought to excite in the humanity of Christ by and through the threefold temptation in the wilderness. As in the case of the first Adam there was no inherent evil in the thing proposed, so in the case of the Last Adam the things suggested were not in themselves evil. As it must always be, the sin consisted in the disobedience of the creature to the Creator. In this His perfect obedience, Christ became, in His humanity, the model of a right relationship to God. It is recorded of Him when about to descend into the world that He said: "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5–7). As He came near the cross He said: "Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42). Thus, too, it is recorded of Him that, in the darkest hour of His separation from conscious fellowship with the Father, He said, "But thou art holy" (Ps. 22:3). The Apostle records of Christ that "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2:8). He who could truthfully say, "I do always those things that please him" (John 8:29), is said Himself, though a Son, to have "learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. 5:8). The absolute yieldedness of the Great Son to His Father becomes thus the example of that surrender which is the rightful attitude of all those who through the regenerating work of the Spirit have become sons of God. To such the Apostle writes: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5). The first word of this injunction, *let*, is especially illuminating. By what ever word the Greek is translated, it suggests that the outworking of the mind of Christ will be produced in the believer by Another, and that the believer's responsibility is that of letting, allowing, or electing the mind of Christ. Such an exalted mind can never be produced by the believer, nor maintained by him; but He who worketh in the child of God "both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13) is fully able to accomplish this great end. It is essential that the Christian know what is included in the mind of Christ which is thus to be reproduced in him, otherwise there can be no intelligent cooperation in the undertaking. Hence

the essential elements which make up the mind of Christ are enumerated. The passage goes on to record: “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil. 2:6–11). The seven steps downward followed by seven steps upward, which altogether comprise this declaration of the mind of Christ (cf. Heb. 12:1–2), are not listed merely to relate vital facts respecting Christ, but to inform the believer and thus prepare him for the outworking of these great values in his own life. The seven steps downward represent sacrifice, while the seven steps upward represent glory. It is the cross followed by the crown. Not all the elements of the mind of Christ may find an immediate reproduction in the believer; however, three may be considered in particular and as representative of all. (1) The willingness of Christ to leave His native sphere and rightful abode and to come, as the Father chose for Him to do, into this world as an outworking of the saving grace of God, all of which could be expressed by the words: “I’ll go where you want me to go.” (2) Similarly, also, Christ was willing to become whatever His Father desired Him to become, even to becoming of “no reputation,” and in so doing He was saying in effect to His Father: “I’ll be what you want me to be.” And (3) in His obedience, even unto the death of the cross, He was saying virtually, “I’ll do what you want me to do.” These and similar words are often sung, and no doubt the singing of them is less demanding than an entry into the direct and immediate experience of all that these phrases delineate. Such, indeed, must be the pattern of the life which is yielded to God.

In another instance the surrendered life is likened by Christ to the branch abiding in the vine (John 15:1–16). As before indicated, abiding in Christ is not a matter of maintaining *union* with Christ, which union is secured rather by the Spirit’s baptism and endures as long as the merit of Christ endures, but a matter of maintaining *communion* with Christ. Abiding is continuance in the relationship wherein divine vitality may be imparted and God-

honoring fruit may be borne. When thus related to Christ in unbroken communion, prayer is effectual (John 15:7), joy is celestial (John 15:11), and fruit is perpetual (John 15:16). This life—so much to be desired—depends upon abiding, and abiding upon obedience. The Savior said: “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love” (John 15:10). Again Christ appears as the supreme example of faithfulness. The object in view with His own abiding or obedience to the Father’s commandments was not to maintain union, for that could never be broken; it was to maintain communion between Father and Son in the sphere of the Son’s humanity. In like manner, let it be repeated, keeping the commandments of Christ on the part of the believer is not to maintain union, which union could never be broken; it is to maintain unbroken communion—communion which depends upon finding and doing the will of God. Abiding is the result of being yielded to the known will of God, as Christ yielded to His Father’s will. In all this, Christ is set forth as the Pattern.

Here it is well to observe that yieldedness to the will of God is not demonstrated by some one particular issue alone; it is rather a matter of having taken the will of God as the rule or dominating principle of one’s whole life. To be in the will of God is simply to be willing to do His will without reference to any single distinctive feature of that will. It is electing God’s will to be final before any specific problem may have arisen for decision. It is not a willingness to do some one thing; it is the willingness to do anything, when, where, and how it may seem best to the wisdom and love of God. It is taking the normal position of childlike trust which freely consents to the wish of the Father before any detail thereof is discovered. The importance of this distinction is clear. It is too often said: “If he wishes me to do a certain thing, let Him show me what it is and I will determine what I will do about it.” To that attitude of heart nothing is revealed. There should and must be a relationship of trust in which the will of God is assented to once for all and without reservations. Why should it not be so? Is it lurking in the mind and heart to say, “Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man …”? Is He a hard taskmaster? Is there any hope whatsoever that the child of God may of himself choose what is best when keeping all of life in his own hands? No futile promises need be made Him that one will not sin or that the natural desires of the heart will be revolutionized just by

human strength. The Father delights only in that which is best for His child and He will never impose upon His child or be careless. On the basis that for every reason God's will is best, the covenant to do that will when it has been revealed is not difficult. From that point on, it is His part to work in the believer both to will and to do of His good pleasure. Long waiting may be endured before His will is revealed, but when it has been revealed there is no room for debate. To hesitate is to say No to God and to quench the Spirit.

4. The Will of God. Again this most vital feature of the spiritual life—guidance—must be introduced in a logical approach to all the truth now being considered. Certain general suggestions are in order: (1) The leading of the Spirit is only for those who are already committed to do the will of God. He is able to speak loud enough to make a willing soul hear. (2) The guidance of the Spirit will always be in harmony with the Scriptures which in their primary application direct the life of the believer in this dispensation. The Christian seeking guidance may go to the Scriptures with prayerful expectation; yet the Bible is not a magic lottery. The will of God is not found by opening the Bible to some chance verse and abiding by its message. Such notions disregard the essential truth that leading is from the Holy Spirit who, being the indwelling One, manifests His guidance within the believer's heart and mind, but not now by signs, dreams, or visions. The Spirit may use outward things, events, or circumstances; nevertheless it is still a matter of His leading and not of the mere instrument which He may employ. A general knowledge of the Word of God as a whole is most to be desired, since leading is in harmony with all that the Bible presents and not usually centralized on one particular text by itself. (3) There are no rules governing the Spirit's leading. No two are led altogether alike and it is equally probable that no one person is ever led twice in quite the same manner. General principles may be announced as are here set forth; the application of these, however, will vary in every instance. In view of the vital importance of the leading of the Holy Spirit in each Christian's life, the ability to be led is one of the most consequential factors in that life. This competency will be gained only through attention and personal experience. Every believer should learn to magnify the reality of the Spirit's indwelling presence and should become familiar with the Spirit's ways in respect to his

own life. In the light of the fact that leading by the Spirit proves so individual, it should be obvious that it is most dangerous to seek guidance from even the best of men. God may choose to use men to give the direction the believer needs; still, again, it is not guidance from men, but from the Spirit through such men. To be guided of the Spirit is to be moved through the most delicate relationships the heart can know. To be led by the mere gentle glance of His eye—He said, "I will guide thee with mine eye" (Ps. 32:8)—is far more to be desired than the harsh "bit and bridle" (cf. Ps. 32:9). The appeal of a morbid conscience, mistaken impressions about duty, or a lack of understanding of the Word of God may mislead, but the error may often be detected by the fact that the false leading proves to be irksome, painful, and disagreeable whereas according to Romans 12:2 the will of God is "good, and acceptable, and perfect." God it is who is working in the believer "that which is wellpleasing in his sight" (Heb. 13:21), for He "worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13).

5. The Sacrificial Life. Doing the will of God must ever be voluntary on the believer's part. He was saved from the bondslavery to sin into the glorious liberty of the children of God. He is commanded to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ hath made him free. Christ is no slave owner. His redeeming blood did not purchase the Christian with a view to his being passed from one slavery to another. He may say, however, as a Hebrew servant in the Old Testament was permitted to do: "I love my master … I will not go out free" (Ex. 21:5), and so by dedication, which is wholly voluntary, become the bondslave of Christ. It was thus that Christ became the bondslave in His human relation to the Father. The phrase "Mine ears hast thou opened" (lit., digged or pierced—Ps. 40:6, R.V. margin) doubtless relates the self-dedication of Christ to the type set forth in Exodus 21:5–6. The highest motive for yielding to God is not merely a desire for victory in daily life or for power or for blessing; it is for the Christ life, which is sacrificial, to be realized. Sacrificial does not necessarily mean painful; here it is simply descriptive of doing the will of Another. Some pain may lie in the path, but the prevailing note is one of joy and the experience of the heart is peace.

Every child of God, then, must definitely yield to the will of God, not concerning some one issue of daily life, but concerning all things as an

abiding attitude toward God. Apart from such self-dedication, there is no escaping the Father's scourging hand; for the Father cannot, and will not, suffer His child to live on without the priceless blessings which His love longs to bestow and which of necessity are conditioned on a surrendered will. Satan and Christ stand opposed in the matter of doing God's will. Satan by five awful "I will's" repudiated God's will; Christ in as many distinct declarations (and more) committed Himself to the will of His Father. Every unyielded will but perpetuates the crime of Satan. To be spiritual and Spirit-filled, the believer must not say No to God. "Quench not the Spirit."

III. "Walk in the Spirit"

Advancing at this point to a contemplation of the third condition upon which the Spirit's filling may be experienced, it should be restated that this condition is positive in character while the two already considered are negative—respecting that which should not be allowed. The positive requirement concerns that which is to be wrought in the life by the Holy Spirit and is far-reaching in what it includes. The Authorized Version translation of a determining verse like Galatians 5:16 is misleading. By this kind of rendering the text seems to impose responsibility upon the believer to maintain a walk in the Holy Spirit, whereas the more accurate rendering of the text assigns such achieving of the walk to the Holy Spirit and enjoins upon the Christian the attitude of dependence upon the Spirit. It is obvious that the Christian has no power within himself, in spite of the new nature, whereby to enter, promote, or maintain a walk in the Spirit. It is because of this native incapacity that the Spirit is given to indwell him. The whole situation is reversed and impossible assumptions are suggested when the believer is urged to walk by his own ability rather than by the Holy Spirit. The responsibility resting upon the Christian is not that of attempting the walk; it is rather the obligation to maintain an attitude of confidence and expectation toward the Holy Spirit, which dependence will make the Spirit's promotion of the walk a blessed reality. One interpretation of this passage in Galatians implies that the believer is to lead or direct the Holy Spirit, while the more defensible viewpoint makes out that the believer is to be led in a path of God's own choosing and to be empowered by the Spirit

unto every good work. The immediate promise to the believer is that when walking by means of the Spirit the lust of the flesh will not be fulfilled. In the same context (Gal. 5:16–23) it is declared at verse 18 that they who are led of the Spirit are not under the law. This declaration is more than an assertion that the believer when led by the Spirit is free from the Mosaic system of merit; rather it is implied that the Spirit's leading opens into an entirely different field of responsibility, which field incorporates the whole will of God—one vastly more extended regarding what is included than a mere conformity to standards and rules. In the sphere of the Spirit's leading, every phase of individual life and service is contemplated and its realization is assured. To "walk in the Spirit" means, then, to depend upon the Spirit. The use as a literary figure of the act of walking to represent the continued responsibility of living daily to the glory of God is apt. Every step in the process of physical walking is an incipient fall. In each step the body is thrown out of balance and onward without physical support, depending upon a step of the foot forward to recover balance and support. Thus the walk in the Spirit is not only a constant series of commitments, but a constant casting of one's self upon the Spirit with the confidence and anticipation that all needed support will be realized. All of this suggests personal intimacy with the Holy Spirit. His presence is to be an actuality in experience, and the practice of depending consciously and habitually upon His enabling power must be maintained. This specific manner of life is wholly unlike the natural ways and practices of men. The walk by means of the Spirit is an achievement which calls for unceasing attention and patient advancement, looking to its execution. All who are born into this world must learn to walk as a proper function of the physical body; it should not be deemed strange if it is required of those born of the Spirit that they too learn by experience and practice how to walk by means of the same Spirit. It is to be expected that a child will creep before it walks and that it will experience many failures and falls before being able to walk freely. It is equally reasonable to expect a certain amount of effort and failure to occur along the path before the walk by the Spirit is perfected. Doubtless it is only an unexperienced theoretical consideration in the minds of the great majority of believers that the Holy Spirit has taken up His abode in their hearts. To such it becomes a day of marvelous discovery when perhaps in feeble faith they rest their weight upon Him and discover by living

experience that He is there and ready and willing to accomplish that which is committed to Him. It need not be demonstrated further that if the power of the Spirit is to be actualized one must pass beyond the range of theories, and into the vital tests of a commitment of even the first step in a walk by means of the Spirit to His gracious person to accomplish. No intelligent step can be taken until there is some distinction borne in mind about the difference in method and practice between walking by dependence upon self or the flesh and walking by dependence upon the Spirit. Here, again, rules are of little aid. The walk by the Spirit must be the outworking of personal experience—not the attempted imitation of others, but the result of one's own trial of faith. It is probable that as a general method a definite commitment in the morning of all that awaits one during the day is effective, though often extra and special commitments will be required as the day advances. The important feature is the character of this commitment. It is not merely asking for help during the day—a practice far too common among spiritual believers; it is entering into a definite covenant-understanding with God in which natural ability and resources are renounced and confidence exercised toward the Spirit that He will Himself actuate and motivate the entire life. This exercise of faith should be sufficiently definite that real expectation is engendered and a time of evaluation and thanksgiving be observed at the close of the day. A true confiding in the morning will call for a survey and recounting when the day is done. Then, in the light of the success or failure, lessons may be learned about one's true progress in a spiritual walk.

At this point an added word over that presented earlier respecting the experimental feature of the walk by means of the Spirit is in order, namely, that, within the range of the believer's experience, there is no indication, manifestation, or identification of either the presence or the activity of the Spirit beyond the noticeable results that He achieves. The human mind continues to weigh all issues, the affections and desires are still dominant, and the will acts with normal freedom and responsibility. The point to be noted is that the Spirit, wholly apart from any intrusion of His own faculties, is "working in"—energizing—the believer to the willing and doing of that which is well-pleasing to God (Phil. 2:13). The fact and force of the Spirit's energy will be seen in the quality of the results and not in any recognition of the manner of His working. However, the truly sincere

believer will nevertheless, from the heart and because of the actual results, be moved to thanksgiving when a day thus lived is completed. In many instances the spiritual life has been misstated and therefore misunderstood. The impression has been created that the natural functions of human life are to be set aside and the mind and will are rendered dormant, to the end that the Spirit may exercise His own mind and will. Such a notion is foreign to the plan of God as that purpose is revealed in the New Testament. As He did with Gideon, the Spirit clothes Himself with the believer's body and faculties and, without manifestations of Himself, works in and through those faculties. Though thus hidden from observation, it is nonetheless the uncomplicated work of the Spirit. With the tremendous issue of the believer's life in view, it is evident that definiteness in the matter of the believer's attitude of trust is of major importance.

With this introduction to the subject in mind, attention may be given to the disclosure in Scripture that the Christian faces unceasingly on the negative side of his spiritual life three superior foes—the world, the flesh, and the devil—and on the positive side of his spiritual life that he faces the superhuman responsibility of filling to the measure of completeness all that enters into those manifestations which together constitute the Spirit's filling. A large portion of this volume has already been devoted to the contemplation of these far-reaching issues which make up the believer's life and service. To restate fully this body of truth is not necessary. It does remain to be seen, however, that the victory both in the sphere of conflict with foes and in the sphere of a God-honoring manner of life and service depends wholly on a relationship to the Spirit which is unhindered with respect to the presence of evil and actively reliant on Him for the outworking of His perfect will. Thus again the child of God is seen to confront the question of his actual dependence on the indwelling Spirit. It may easily become the beginning of effective spiritual living on the part of a Christian when he believes and heeds God's Word respecting the provisions which are his through the gift to him of the Spirit. Rationalism is directly opposed to faith. There are those who rebel at the teaching that salvation is by faith alone. They rebel either because they do not know, or do not believe, the Word of God. There are those, likewise, who rebel at the teaching that an unbroken victory in the believer's daily life is by faith alone, and this, too, is either because they do not know, or do not believe,

the Scriptures. The doctrine concerning a divinely produced sanctity of life does not rest upon one or two proof-texts. It is one of the great themes, if not the most extensive, theme in the epistles; for not only is the doctrine taught at length, but every injunction to the Christian is based upon the exact principles revealed in the doctrine. It is one of the most vital elements in the age-characterizing provisions of grace.

1. The World. The *cosmos* satanic system which is termed the *world* is defined at length in earlier portions of this work. In this *cosmos* system the Christian must live and yet keep himself unspotted from it (James 1:27). The border line between the world and that which is a rightful sphere of spiritual living cannot well be defined. Naught but the personal leading of the Spirit will determine these problems. It is here that Christians need to learn to be gracious one toward another. The Scriptures assert that those who are strong are free to do what those who are weak may not do with advantage. It becomes those who are weak to avoid judgment of the strong, and it is essential for those who are strong to avoid putting a stumbling block into the path of the weak. The Apostle declares: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him" (Rom. 14:1–3). Nothing could be more definite than this teaching, which avers that each man in sincerity is to be persuaded in his own mind. If, perchance, an error is made by anyone under these circumstances, it will be remembered that Christians are accountable to God and not finally to each other (cf. Rom. 14:4). Such indeed is the need, that there is introduced both guidance by the Holy Spirit regarding all that arises as a conflict between the world-system and the believer and also a definite provision whereby the believer may claim on the principle of faith the enabling power of the Holy Spirit to overcome the solicitations of the world-system. In executing a walk by means of the Holy Spirit in its relation to the *cosmos* system, it is required that positive dependence on the Spirit be exercised unremittingly.

2. The Flesh. That within the Christian which lusts against the Holy Spirit, creating various problems, is termed in the New Testament *the flesh*.

Careless Christians are not concerned with the Person and work of the Holy Spirit, or with the exact distinctions which condition true spirituality; but these distinctions and truths do appeal to those who really desire a life that is well-pleasing to God. Satan has pitfalls and counterfeit doctrines in the realm of the deepest spiritual realities. The majority of these false teachings are based on a misapprehension of the Bible teaching about sin, especially the sin question as this is related to the believer. The Scripture is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect [full-grown], throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:16–17); accordingly in the same epistle believers are urged to the end that they might "study" and "rightly divide" the Word of Truth. It should be noted that two out of four of the values of the Scripture in the life of the "man of God," as recorded in the above passage, are "reproof" and "correction"; yet how few, especially of those who are holding an error, are of a teachable spirit! It seems to be one of the characteristics of all satanic errors that those who have embraced them seem never inclined honestly to reconsider their ground. They read only their sectarian or misleading literature and often carefully avoid hearing any corrective teaching from the Word of God. This difficulty is greatly increased when their error has led them to assume some unwarranted position regarding a supposed deliverance from sin, or personal attainments in holiness. A "correction," or "reproof," to such seems to be a suggestion toward "backsliding," and no zealously minded person would easily choose such a course as that. Much error is thriving along these lines with no other dynamic than human zeal, and the Word of God is persistently distorted to maintain human theories. Many of these errors are reproved and corrected when the fundamental distinction is recognized between the Christian's *position* in Christ and his *experience* in daily life. Whatever God has done for believers in Christ is perfect and complete; but such perfection should not be confused with the imperfect conduct of daily life.

3. The Devil. The Bible represents Satan as the enemy of the saints of God, and especially is this seen to be true of the saints in this age. There is no controversy between Satan and unsaved people, for they are a part of his world-system. They have not been delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of the Son of God's love. Satan is the

energizing power in those who are unsaved (Eph. 2:2), as God is the energizing power in those who are saved (Phil. 2:13). Every human being is either under the power of Satan or under the power of God. This is not to say that Christians may not be influenced by Satan or the unsaved not influenced by the Spirit of God, but that each man's life as a whole is linked with one domain or the other; and, furthermore, Satan's domain is not at all points characterized by things that are inherently evil as life is estimated by the world. Satan's life-purpose is to be "like the most High" (Isa. 14:14), and he appears as "an angel of light" and his ministers "as the ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:13–15). His followers, in their role as ministers of righteousness, preach a gospel of reformation and a salvation won by human character, rather than salvation won by grace alone unrelated to any human virtue. Therefore, the world, notwithstanding all its moral standards and culture, is not necessarily free from the power and energizing control of Satan. He it is who would ever promote forms of religion and human excellence apart from the redemption that is in Christ, and the world is evidently being energized to undertake that very thing. He has blinded the unsaved, but only concerning one thing: they are blinded by Satan lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them (2 Cor. 4:3–4).

The enmity of Satan has always been directed against the Person of God alone and not against humanity as such. It is only when men have been made "partakers of the divine nature" that they are confronted with this mighty foe. The thrusts of his "fiery darts" are aimed really at God who indwells them. However, the conflict is nonetheless real and the foe superhuman. "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles [or, strategies] of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. 6:10–12). These world-rulers of the darkness of this age, the spiritual powers of wickedness who are here said to wage a ceaseless conflict against us, cannot be overcome by human strategy or strength. The Bible lends no sanction to foolish suppositions that the devil will flee at the mere resistance of a determined human will. We are to "resist the devil," but it must be done while "stedfast in the faith" and "submitting" ourselves unto God (James 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:9). Satan, being by reason of creation superior in glory to all

other creatures, cannot be conquered by any of them unaided. Even Michael the archangel, it is said, “when contending with the devil … durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee.” Michael the archangel does not contend unauthorized with Satan. He must depend rather on the power of Another, thus acting on a principle of dependence rather than on a principle of independence. Certainly a Christian, with all his many present limitations, must appeal to the power of God in the conflict with this mighty foe, and he is indeed directed to do this: “Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked [‘evil one,’ R.V.]” (Eph. 6:16).

The believer’s conflict with Satan is as fierce and unceasing as that superhuman being can make it. Before him Christians of themselves are as nothing; but God has anticipated this helplessness and provided a perfect victory through the indwelling Spirit: “… because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world” (1 John 4:4). A Christian, because of the power of his new enemy, must “walk by means of the Spirit” if he would be triumphant over the devil.

Chapter XVI

Related Doctrines

Since the problem of the influence of the flesh in the Christian is inward and ever present, there are altogether three important doctrines involved in this discussion, namely, (1) the doctrine of the believer's share in Christ's death, (2) the doctrine of perfection, and (3) the doctrine of sanctification. These are closely related, especially the latter two, and the first, it will be seen, is the ground upon which the last two are made possible. Many unwarranted assumptions and fanatical notions regarding both perfection and sanctification would be avoided if the Scriptures bearing on these doctrines were heeded. Here, again, reproof and correction (2 Tim. 3:16–17) might take an important place if allowed to do so.

Though considered extensively on earlier pages, attention must be called first of all to the terms "old man"—παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος—and "sin"—ἁμαρτία, as referring to the nature. The word *flesh* is broad in its significance, and within its boundaries and pertaining to it are these two factors—the "old man" and "sin." Though these factors are similar to such a degree that few may distinguish between them, it is well to give attention to the Scripture related to each.

The terminology "old man" is used only three times in the New Testament. Once it has to do with the present *position* of the "old man" through the death of Christ (Rom. 6:6). In the other two passages (Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 3:9) the fact that the "old man" has been put off forever is made the basis of appeal for a holy life. In Romans 6:6 it is written: "Knowing this, that our old man is ['was,' R.V.] crucified with him." There can be no reference here to the *experience* of the Christian, but rather to a cocrucifixion "with him" and most evidently at the time and place where Christ was crucified. In the context this passage follows immediately upon the statement concerning the Christian's transfer in federal headship from the first Adam to the Last Adam (Rom. 5:12–21). The first Adam, as perpetuated in the believer, was judged in the crucifixion of Christ. The "old man," the fallen nature received from Adam, *was* "crucified with him." This cocrucifixion, as has been seen, is of the greatest importance, on the divine side, in making possible a true deliverance from the power of the "old man." A righteous judgment must be gained against the sin nature before

any divine work can be undertaken toward deliverance. The judgment is now by the cross secured, and the way is open for blessed victory through the Spirit. In the second passage in which the term “old man” is used, the fact that the old man was already crucified with Christ is the basis for an appeal to follow next: “That ye [did, Greek] put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye [did, Greek] put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4:22–24). In the third passage the position in Christ suggests again a corresponding experience: “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him” (Col. 3:9–10). *Positionally* the “old man” has been put off forever. *Experimentally* the “old man” remains as an active force in the life which can be controlled only by the power of God. Christians avail themselves of that divine sufficiency when they renounce entirely the thought of compromise with, or toleration of, the fruit of the old nature and by faith apply the divinely provided counteragency for victory through dependence on the Spirit. The result of “reckoning” as dead and “mortifying your members” will be to make way for the Spirit to work out in the life the manifestations of the “new man,” Christ Jesus. The child of God could not of himself judge the “old man.” That, however, has been done *for* him by Christ. Nor can he control the “old man.” That has to be done *for* him by the Spirit. “Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof” (Rom. 13:14). The fruit of the “old man” and the fruit of the “new man,” it will be remembered, are clearly contrasted in Galatians 5:19–23: “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. … But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance,” (‘self-control,’ R.V.). There is no Biblical ground for a distinction between the Adamic nature and “human nature.” The unregenerate have but one nature, while the regenerate have two. There is but one fallen nature, which is from Adam, and but one new nature, which is from God. The “old man,” then, is the Adamic nature which has been

judged in the death of Christ. It still abides with the saved one as an active principle in his life, and his *experimental* victory over it will be realized only through a definite reliance upon the indwelling Spirit. The "old man" is a part, therefore, but not all, of the "flesh."

In certain portions of the Scriptures, notably Romans 6:1–8:13 and 1 John 1:1–2:2, there is also an important distinction between two uses of the word ἁμαρτία, *sin*. The two meanings will be obvious if it is remembered that the word sometimes refers to the Adamic nature, and sometimes to evil resulting from that nature. Sin, as a nature, is the source of sin which is committed. Sin is the root which bears its own fruit in sin which is evil conduct. Sin is the "old man," while sins are the manifestations in daily life. Sin is what the individual is by birth, while sins are the evil he does in life. There is abundant Biblical testimony to the fact that the "flesh," the "old man," or "sin," are the source of evil, and are the possession of the child of God so long as he remains in this earthly body. Believers have a blessed treasure in the possession of the "new man" indwelling them; but they have this treasure "in earthen vessels." The earthenware is the "body of our humiliation" (2 Cor. 4:7; Phil. 3:21, R.V.). Personality—the ego—remains the same individuality through all the operations of grace, though it experiences the greatest possible advancement, transformation, and regeneration from its lost estate in Adam to the positions and possessions of a son of God in Christ. That which was lost is said to be forgiven, justified, saved, and receives the new divine nature which is eternal life. That which was dead is born again and becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus, though it remains the same personality which was born of certain parents after the flesh. Though born of God and possessing a new divine nature, the weakness of the flesh and the dispositions of the sin nature abide until the final change of residence from earth to heaven. In 1 John 1:8, 10 is given clear warning against any presumption concerning sin. First of all, Christians are warned against saying that they have no sin nature: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." This is distinctly a word concerning the sin nature of the Christian and has no application whatever to the unsaved. It is addressed to believers, and to *all* believers. It will not do to suppose that reference is made in the passage to some unfortunate, unenlightened, or unsanctified class of Christians. There is no class distinction whatsoever here. It is the testimony of the

Spirit of God with reference to *every* born-again person. For any such to say that he has no sin nature means that the person is self-deceived and the truth not in him. This passage is evidently intended for correction of those Christians who are claiming to be free from the sin nature and who may have made themselves believe that they are free. A self-satisfied mind is not necessarily the mind of God. In the same passage Christians are also warned against saying that they have not sinned as sins are fruit of the old nature: "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1 John 1:10). Nothing could be more explicit than this statement. It is possible that a Christian may have been instructed to say that he has not sinned; but here is a word of reproof when he confronts the testimony of the Spirit of God. Again, this is not said concerning some unsanctified class of Christians; it is something concerning all Christians. To depart from the clear teaching of this great corrective passage is to make God a "liar" and to disclose the fact that "his word is not in us." The source of sin is, then, the sin nature, rather than the new divine nature. This important truth is pointed out in the same epistle a bit later in a passage which primarily teaches that the Christian does not now *practice* sin lawlessly as he did before he received the new divine nature, but which also teaches that sin cannot be traced to the divine nature as its source: "Not anyone that has been begotten of God practices sin, because his seed [i.e., the divine nature] abides in him, and he [with particular reference to the 'seed'] is not able to sin, because of God he [with particular reference to the 'seed'] has been begotten" (3:9, Greek). It is evident that the new nature is something which has been begotten of God, and because of the presence of this nature the one in whom it dwells does not now practice sin as he did before he was saved, nor can sin ever be produced by the new nature which is from God. The passage does not teach that Christians do not sin, or even that some Christians do not sin; for there is no one class of Christians in view, and what is here said is true of all who have been "begotten of God." It is further taught in the Scriptures that, since there are two natures in the believer, there is a conflict between the new nature, as operative through the Spirit, and the old nature, as operative through the flesh: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that [when walking by the Spirit] ye cannot do the things that ye

[otherwise] would" (Gal. 5:16–17). Another aspect of this truth is taken up at length in Romans 7:15–8:4. In this passage the old "I" is seen to be in active opposition to the new "I." It is sometimes claimed for this passage that it refers to an experience in the Apostle's life before he was saved. This is open to serious question. No such conflict can Biblically be related to the life of Saul of Tarsus, nor for that matter to any other unregenerate man. Saul of Tarsus was not a "wretched man": he was a self-satisfied Pharisee, living "in all good conscience" and "touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." It was only when he began to "delight in the law of God after the inward man" that this deeper conflict was experienced. So, also, the claim is sometimes made that this passage had to do only with Paul as once a Jew under the Law of Moses and so could not apply to any Gentile, since the Law of Moses was not addressed to Gentiles. It is quite true that the law was not given to Gentiles. The primary purpose of this passage is not to set forth some distinguishing characteristic of a Jew convicted under the law; it plainly represents a saint of today confronted with the impossibility of living according to the revealed will of God, not only because of human impotence, but because of an active opposing principle to be found in the "flesh." The mind and will of God for the believer under grace, as has been seen, is infinitely more impossible to human strength than the Law of Moses. So much the more are Christians found to be "wretched" men when attempting their present conflict with no more than the "arm of flesh." The law of God, as referred to in the New Testament, sometimes means His present will for His people rather than simply the "law of Moses." It is clear that the conflict in this Romans passage is between *evil* and *good*, in general terms, rather than a matter of the Law of Moses. If believers under grace are not in view in Romans 7, neither are they in Romans 8; for in passing from one chapter to the other there is no break in the development of the doctrine or its application. In combating this viewpoint it has been pointed out that there is a particular crisis being indicated by the words in 7:25, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." However, this really is not a word of thanksgiving for salvation; it is praise for deliverance from the reigning power of sin. And it is deliverance for the one who could say next: "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." This statement scarcely describes the experience of an unregenerate man. Earlier

in the context the Law of Moses has been set aside as the believer's rule of life today (6:14; 7:1–6), and the new law of Christ (1 Cor. 9:21; Gal. 6:2; John 15:10), the "life in Christ Jesus" (Rom 8:2), or that which is produced *in* the believer by the Spirit (Rom. 8:4) has come into view. No mention of the Spirit is made in this passage. It is therefore not even a conflict between the Spirit and the "flesh"; it is rather one between the new "I" and the old "I." It is the new "I"—the regenerate man—isolated, for the time being, from the enabling power of the Spirit, and seen as confronting by itself the whole law of God (vs. 16), the unchanging "flesh" (vs. 18), and the capacities of the new man (vss. 22–23, 25). A vital question is raised: Can the regenerate man, apart from the Spirit, fulfill the whole will of God? The answer is clear. Though he "delight" in the law of God (in which no unregenerate man delights; cf. Rom. 3:10–18; 1 Cor. 2:14), he must discover the divinely provided power to live which is released only through the death of Christ (vs. 25), and through the power of the Spirit (8:2). Apart from this there is even for him only continued defeat.

The passage, with some interpretations, as before presented, is as follows: "For that which I [because of the old nature] do I [because of the new] allow not: for what I [the new] would, that do I [the old] not; but what I [the new] hate, that do I [the old]. If then I [the old] do that which I [the new] would not, I consent unto the law [or, will of God for me] that it is good. Now then it is no more I [the new] that do it, but sin [the old] that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me [the old] (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I [the new] would I [the old] do not: but the evil which I [the new] would not, that I [the old] do. Now if I [the old] do that I [the new] would not, it is no more I [the new] that do it, but sin [the old] that dwelleth in me. I find then a law [not, a law of Moses], that, when I [the new] would do good, evil [the old] is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members [the old], warring against the law of my mind [the new that delights in the law of God], and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin [the old] which is in my members. O wretched [Christian] man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (vss. 15–24).

The answer to this great question and cry of distress with which the above passage closes is given in a following verse (8:2): "For the law of the

Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." This is more than a deliverance from the Law of Moses; it is the immediate deliverance from sin (the old) and death (its results; cf. Rom. 6:23). The effect of this deliverance is indicated by the blessedness recorded in the eighth chapter, in contrast to the wretchedness recorded in the seventh chapter. It is all of the helpless and defeated "I" in the one case, and of the sufficient and victorious "I," by enablement of the Spirit, in the other. Christians, then, are to be delivered by the law or power of the Spirit. But attention must be called again to the fact, as stated in 7:25, that it is possible only "through Jesus Christ our Lord." Believers are delivered *by* the Spirit; but it is made righteously possible "through Jesus Christ our Lord" because of their union with Him in His crucifixion, death, and burial.

I. The Believer's Share in Christ's Death

The doctrine which discloses the believer's share in Christ's death fills a large place in the Pauline epistles and is the ground upon which the spiritual life is made righteously possible. Nothing could be more explicit or determining than the Apostle's word in Galatians 5:24, which declares: "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Reference is made in this text to that special aspect of Christ's death which was and is a judgment of the believer's sin nature and on the basis of which the Holy Spirit, who indwells the believer, is rendered righteously free to take control of the sin nature. All forms of perfection and sanctification (soon to be considered) which relate to daily experience in the matter of deliverance from the sin nature are wholly dependent upon this substitutionary death of Christ in behalf of the sin nature. Deliverance is wrought by the Spirit alone and the Spirit's freedom to overcome the sin nature depends wholly upon the truth that the sin nature has been judged by Christ on the cross. However, what Christ has wrought is provisional and awaits intelligent appropriation on the part of the believer.

Three verbs are introduced by Romans 6:11–13 which present in logical order the responsibility of the Christian in directing the action of his own will.

First, *reckon*. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (vs. 11). The

exhortation presented in this passage means simply to believe these revealed facts of union with Christ as having regard to one's self, and to believe them enough so as to act upon them with confidence.

Second, *let not*. "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof" (vs. 12). *Give no sanction to sin* is the thought here, but the prohibition found in the words "let not" implies that the plan pursued should be according to God's promise of overcoming sin by a dependence upon the Holy Spirit.

Third, *yield*. "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (vs. 13). This exhortation lays bare the very essence of the act of dependence on the Spirit: "yield" your members for instruments of righteousness as those who stand on resurrection ground should do.

In a reconsideration of the death of Christ as related to the sin nature—which restatement seems demanded to complete this final declaration of truth respecting the walk by means of the Holy Spirit and to conclude the study of the larger body of Scripture relative to the spiritual life—it may be said that by the death of Christ both the *penalty* of sins committed was borne for all men and the *power* of sin was judged and broken for the children of God. The accomplishment of all this was a problem of infinite dimensions; for sin is primarily against God and He alone can deal with it. The Bible pictures sin as it is seen from the divine standpoint. It also unfolds God's one problem, which was created by sin, and records His exact manner and method of solution.

The theme under consideration is concerned with the death of Christ only as that sacrifice is related to the divine judgment of the sin nature in the child of God. The necessity for such a judgment and the sublime revelation that the work of judgment is now fully accomplished for the believer is unfolded in Romans 6:1–10. This passage is the foundation of as well as the key to the possibility of a "walk in the Spirit." Herein it is declared that Christians need not "continue in sin," but instead may "walk in newness of life." "Sin shall not have dominion over you," it is said, and the child of God need no longer be a bondslave to sin. To this end He hath wrought in the cross. How important in His eyes, then, is the quality of the Christian's daily life; for Christ's death not only contemplated his eternal

blessedness in the glory, but his present "walk" as well! The old nature must be judged in order that God may be free to deal with it in the believer's daily life and apart from all judgments. What destruction would fall on the unsaved if God had to judge them for their sins before they could be saved! "O LORD, correct me, but with judgment; not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing" (Jer. 10:24). How great is His mercy! He has already taken up the sin question and solved it for all men in the death of the Substitute. Because of this He now can save from the *penalty* of sin. Even so, to what greater lengths His mercy has gone since He has also entered into righteous judgments of the "old man"! And because of this God is able now to deliver His child from the *power* of sin. The "old man" is said to have been "crucified with him" and "dead with Christ," "buried with him" and partaking as well in His resurrection life. All this, it is revealed, was to serve one great purpose: that "we also should walk in newness of life," even as Christ "was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father." What a deliverance and walk may be experienced since it is according to the power and glory of the resurrection! Resurrection, it may be added, is not the mere reversal of death; it is introduction into the power and limitless boundaries of eternal life. In that new sphere and by that new power the Christian may now walk.

The passage opens thus: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin ['We who have died to sin,' R.V.; so, also, vss. 7–8, 11; Col. 2:20; 3:3], live any longer therein?" In the preceding chapters of this epistle salvation unto *safety* has been presented. At the beginning of this passage the question of salvation unto *sanctity* of daily life is taken up. This second aspect of salvation is provided only for the one who is already saved unto safety. "Shall we [who are now saved and safe in grace] continue in sin?" It would not *become* them to do so, as the children of God, and it is not *necessary* for them to do so since they are now "dead to sin." But who is "dead to sin"? Is it true that any Christian ever *experienced* a death to sin? Never was there one. But the death which is mentioned in this passage is said to be accomplished for *every* believer. All Christians are here said to have died unto sin. A death which is all-inclusive could not be accounted *experimental*. It is *positional* the rather. God reckons *all* believers, relative to their sin nature, to have died *in* Christ and *with* Christ; for only thus can they

“walk in newness of life” as those who are “alive unto God.” It is no longer necessary to sin. Christians cannot plead the power of a tendency over which they have no control. They still have the tendency, and it is more than they can control; but God has provided the possibility of a complete victory and freedom both by judging the old nature and by giving them the presence and power of the Spirit. Then follows the important explanation of the believer’s present relation to the death of Christ as forming the ground of his deliverance from the power of sin. First an outline is given (Rom. 6:3–4), and then the same truth is repeated, but more in detail (vss. 5–10). It is not within the scope of this discussion to consider the importance of a sacrament that purports to represent the truth of the believer’s death with Christ. Such, at best, is but the shadow of the substance. No ordinance performed by man can accomplish what is here described. The Christian’s baptism *into* Jesus Christ can be none other than the act of God in placing him *in* Christ (cf. Gal. 3:27). This evidently is a baptism into His Body performed by the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13); for in no other sense are *all* “baptized into Jesus Christ.” Being by the baptism of the Spirit vitally united and placed “in him” those who are saved partake of what He *is* and what He has *done*. He is the righteousness of God, and the Scriptures teach that they are *made* the righteousness of God *in Him* (2 Cor. 5:21) and *made* accepted *in the Beloved* (Eph. 1:6). All this is true because they are “in him.” So, also, He has substituted for them, and what He has done is reckoned unto them because they are “in him”—or in other words because they are baptized into Jesus Christ.

The argument in this passage of Romans 6 is based on the vital union by which Christians are organically united to Christ through their baptism into His Body: “Know ye not [or ‘are ye ignorant,’ R.V.], that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?” As certainly as believers are “in him” do they partake of the *value* of His death. So, also, the passage states: “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death” (cf. Col. 2:12). Then too Christians are declared to be actually partakers of His crucifixion (vs. 6), death (vs. 8), burial (vs. 4), and resurrection (vss. 4–5, 8) and as essentially as they would partake in this union had they been crucified, dead, buried, and raised themselves. Being baptized into Jesus Christ is the *substance* of which cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection are *attributes*. One is the *cause*, while the

several others are the *effects*. All this uniting is unto the realization of one great divine purpose, namely, "that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life," or by a new life-principle. The Christian's "walk," then, is the divine objective. Christ died in the believer's stead. The judgment belonged to the believer, but Christ became his Substitute. He is thus counted as a copartner in all that his Substitute did. What He did forever satisfied the righteous demands of God against the "old man" and opened the way for a "walk" well pleasing to God (cf. 2 Cor. 5:15). As the passage proceeds, this truth of the believer's copartnership in Christ is presented again and with greater detail: "For if [or 'as'] we have been planted [conjoined, united, grown together; the word is used but this once in the New Testament] together in the likeness [i.e., oneness, cf. Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7] of his death, we shall be [now, and forever] also in the likeness of his resurrection." The Christian is already conjoined to Christ by the baptism of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:12–13), which places him positionally beyond the judgments of sin, and he is therefore free to enter the experience of the eternal power and victory of His resurrection. "Knowing this [or, because we know this], that our old man is ['was,' R.V.] crucified with him [and for the same divine purpose as stated before], that the body of sin might be destroyed [our power of expression is through the body. This well-known fact is used as a figure concerning the manifestation of sin. The body is not destroyed; but sin's power and means of expression may be annulled. Cf. vs. 12], that henceforth we should not serve [be bondslaves to] sin [i.e., the *old man*]. For he that is dead is freed ['justified,' R.V.] from sin [i.e., they who have once died to sin, as the believer has in his Substitute, now stand free from its legal claims]. Now if we be dead with Christ [or, since we died with Christ],we believe we shall also live with him [not only in heaven, but *now*. There is as much certainty for the *life* in Him as there is certainty for the *death* in Him]: knowing ['For we know,' R.S.V.] that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him [the Christian is thereby encouraged to believe as much concerning himself]. For in that he died, he died unto sin [i.e., the nature] once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God" (and hence so may the believer live unto God). Such facts are recorded in the Scriptures concerning the meaning and value of the death of Christ and the Christian's present position in Him, that he may be led to believe that it is all a blessing

for him and is actually true of him now. Believing this, he can fearlessly claim a position in His boundless grace and dare to enter the life of victory. So far in this passage nothing has been said touching any human obligation, nor has reference even been made to any work of man. It is all the work of God for the child of God, indeed, and the conclusion of this great passage is to the effect that it is His plan and provision that he should know that God has already provided for him a deliverance from bondservitude to sin. Based on this knowledge gained from the Word concerning all that God has done in Christ, an injunction immediately follows the passage being discussed which presents the Christian's responsibility: "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." He is not exhorted to reckon the sin nature to be dead; but he is exhorted to reckon himself to be dead unto it.

Did the death of Christ literally destroy the power of the "old man" so that the believer can have no disposition to sin? No, for the passage goes on to state: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Evidently, then, the "old man" will remain active, apart from sufficient control. The union with Christ has provided a possible deliverance; but it must be entered into and claimed by acts of faith like those expressed in the words "reckon," "let not," and the additional words which follow in the passage: "But yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin [i.e., the nature] shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law [which provides no power for its fulfillment], but under grace" (which provides for its fulfillment the sufficient Substitute and the limitless enablement of the Spirit of God). Every provision has been made. "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Who can measure the truth that is compressed into the one word heading this plea, "therefore"? It refers to all of the divine undertakings in the death of Christ by which the Christian has been conjoined to Him in order that he may receive the eternal values of Christ's crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection. All this was accomplished for him before he was born. "Therefore," because of all this which is now accomplished and provided, the believer has limitless encouragement to enter into God's plan and purpose for his deliverance. Faith, which believes the victory to be possible because it reckons the "old

man" to have been judged, is the normal result of such a revelation. Christians are nowhere enjoined to *re-enact* His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection; but they are encouraged by the revelation of what has been done to *reckon* the divine requirements for their deliverance from the "old man" to have been met perfectly and to believe that, because of this, they can now "walk in newness of life."

Would any Scripture justify the claim of some Christians that they have died to sin as a personal experience? Several New Testament passages refer to the believer as being already dead. None of these, however, point to an *experience;* they refer rather to a *position* into which the believer has been brought through his union with Jesus Christ in His cross death. "Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ" (Col. 2:20); "For ye are dead ['ye died,' R.V.], and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3); "I am crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:20); "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14); "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24). In the last passage, as in the others, reference is made to something that is accomplished in all those who are Christ's. It could not, therefore, refer to some experience, the result of a special or particular sanctity on the part of a few. These passages, since they refer to all believers, can have but one meaning: in their union with Christ the "flesh with the affections and lusts" has *positionally* been crucified. The word "crucify" as related to believers is always dated in the past, implying the judicial fact and not a spiritual experience. The believer may "mortify," which means to reckon to be dead; but he is never called upon to crucify. Even mortifying is possible only by the enabling power of the Spirit: "But if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Rom. 8:13). It is plainly stated in Scripture that crucifixion is accomplished once-for-all. In view of this basic divine accomplishment, the child of God is exhorted to "reckon; yield; mortify [count to the dead]; put off; let not; put away; take unto you the whole armour of God; set your affection on things above; put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him; deny himself; abide in Christ; fight; run the race; walk in love; walk in the Spirit; walk in the light; walk in newness of life." Such is the human responsibility toward the deliverance which God has provided through the death of His Son and proposes now to accomplish by

the Spirit. The divine objective, then, in all that is recorded in Romans 6:1–10 is a "walk in newness of life." God has met every demand of His holiness in accomplishing for the believer, through Christ, all the judgment against the sin nature that He could ever demand. It is recorded now for him to understand and believe. "Knowing this," or, "because he knows this," he is justified in possessing confidence that he may "walk in newness of life" by the enabling power of the Spirit. What rest, peace, and victory would be the portion of the children of God if they really did know that the "old man" was crucified with Christ and so, on the divine side, it is made possible for them to live where sin's power and manifestation may be constantly annulled!

The whole doctrinal statement concerning a possible deliverance from bond-servitude to sin, as contained in Romans 6:1–8:4, is summarized and concluded in the last two verses of the context (8:3–4). In these two verses seven factors which enter into the revelation concerning a possible victory over sin, and which have been the subjects of discussion in the whole context, are mentioned again as a consummation of all that has gone before. The seven factors are: (1) "the law" (8:3), which represents here the righteous will of God because not limited to the Law of Moses (cf. 6:14; 7:4, 25) which passed away as a rule of life (7:1–6; 2 Cor. 3:7–18; Gal. 3:24–25). It rather includes that which the Spirit produces in the one who is spiritual (8:4; Gal. 5:22–23). The attempt, in mere human strength, to secure perfect righteousness through obedience to any precepts will always fail. Grace provides well enough that its heaven-high standards may be realized through the energizing power of the Spirit. (2) Being "weak through the flesh" (8:3), or the utter inability of human resources in the presence of heavenly requirements (7:14–23; John 15:5). (3) "Sin in the flesh" (8:3), or that in the flesh which is different from "weakness"; now it is something opposed to the Spirit (7:14–23; Gal. 5:17). (4) Christ came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (8:3). He took the place of vital union with the sinner (6:5, 10–11); but did not become a sinner, or partake of the sin nature (Heb. 4:15; 7:26). (5) "And for sin, condemned [or 'judged'] sin in the flesh" (8:3). Thus He met every claim of the righteousness of God against the "old man" (6:10; 7:25). (6) "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us" (8:4; cf. 7:4, 22, 25), though never fulfilled *by* us (6:4, 14; 7:4, 6). It is therefore the "fruit of the Spirit." (7) "Who walk not after the flesh, but

after the Spirit" (8:4). Such is the human condition for a victorious "walk." It must be wrought by the Spirit (6:11–22). Full provisions are made through the divine judgment of the flesh and the old man for the spiritual life of every Christian, even the fulfilling of the whole will of God in him by the Spirit. But these provisions become effective only to those who "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The believer has clear revelation and instruction from God, and it is perilous to neglect or confuse these or to fail in the exact responsibilities committed to him.

II. Perfection

Closely related to the doctrine of the spiritual life and especially the death of Christ as a part of it are the two kindred doctrines of perfection and sanctification. A brief reference to each of these is necessary here.

In the Word of God, perfection is presented under seven aspects:
(1) the Old Testament use of the word as applied to persons. The word in the Old Testament has the meaning of "sincere" and "upright." Noah was "perfect" (Gen. 6:9); Job was "perfect" (Job 1:1, 8); through avoiding the sins of the Gentile nations, Israel was bidden to be "perfect" (Deut. 18:13); the end of the "perfect" man was said to be peace (Ps. 37:37); so, also, the saints of the Old Testament order will appear in the heavenly city as "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. 12:23). The Bible does not teach that such people were sinless.

(2) Positional perfection in Christ. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14), i.e., those set apart unto God by their salvation. The extent and force of this passage will be seen if the word *saved* is substituted for the word *sanctified*. This is clearly a verse on the perfection of the work of Christ for the believer and so must not be related to the Christian's daily life.

(3) Spiritual maturity and understanding. "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect" (i.e., full-grown, 1 Cor. 2:6; cf. 14:20; see, also, 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 3:15; 2 Tim. 3:17).

(4) Perfection which is progressive. "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made [or, to be made] perfect by the flesh?" (Gal. 3:3).

(5) Perfection in some one particular. (a) In the will of God: “That ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God” (Col. 4:12). (b) In imitating one aspect of the fullness of God: “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect” (Matt. 5:48). The context is of the Father’s love for His enemies and so the injunction is to the effect that this aspect of the Father’s goodness should be reproduced. (c) In service: “Make you perfect in every good work” (Heb. 13:21). (d) In patience: “But let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect [or, mature] and entire, wanting nothing” (James 1:4).

(6) The ultimate perfection of the individual in heaven. “Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus” (Col. 1:28; cf. 1:22; Phil. 3:12; 1 Thess. 3:13; 1 Pet. 5:10).

(7) The ultimate perfection of the corporate body of believers in heaven. “Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Eph. 4:13; see also 5:27; John 17:23; Jude 1:24; Rev. 14:5).

The noun *Perfection* as found in the New Testament is a translation of two Greek roots, τέλειος meaning *mature* and καταρτίζω meaning *adjust*. And it is obvious that neither of these words, etymologically considered, has any reference to sinlessness. These facts should be estimated most carefully by any who have attempted the formation of a doctrine on the somewhat misleading use of the English word, *perfect*. There is a complete deliverance by the Spirit for every child of God, but this should not be confused with any use of the word *perfect* when the incapacity to sin is implied by that word.

III. Sanctification

Again the doctrine must not be made to exceed that which is actually expressed by the Biblical use of its fundamental word, *sanctify*. To discover the full scope and meaning of this word it is necessary to include all passages in the Old and New Testament where it is used, and add to these as well all passages where the words *saint* and *holy* are used, since these three words ordinarily are all translations both in Hebrew and Greek of the same root word. The basic meaning of *sanctify, saint*, and *holy* is such that a

person or thing is thereby said to be set apart, or classified, usually as pertaining unto God. Though these words and the truth they express are found throughout the whole Bible, the discussion now is concerned only with that aspect of the teaching which applies to the child of God under grace. Here it will be found that believers are the objects of a threefold sanctification.

First, positional sanctification. “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us … sanctification” (1 Cor. 1:30); “By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10:10). Thus, also, the Apostle addresses all believers as *saints*, and in the Scriptures reference is made to “holy prophets, holy brethren, a holy priesthood, holy women, a holy nation.” Such they are by their position in Christ. Paul addressed even the Corinthian believers as *saints* and as already *sanctified* (1 Cor. 1:2; 6:11); yet his very letter for Corinth was written to correct those Christians because of sin (1 Cor. 5:1–2; 6:1, 7–8). They were saints and sanctified as in Christ, but were far from being such in daily life.

Second, experimental sanctification. This second aspect of the sanctifying work of God for the believer is *progressive* in some of its aspects, so is quite in contrast to the *positional* sanctification which is “once for all.” It is accomplished by the power of God through the Spirit and through the Word: “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth” (John 17:17; see also 2 Cor. 3:18; Eph. 5:25–26; 1 Thess. 5:23; 2 Pet. 3:18). Experimental sanctification is advanced according to various relationships. (1) In relation to the believer’s yieldedness to God. In virtue of presenting his body a living sacrifice, the child of God thereby is set apart unto God and so is experimentally sanctified. The presentation may be absolute and thus admit of no progression, or it may be partial and so require a further development. In either case it is a work of experimental sanctification. (2) In relation to sin. The child of God may so comply with every condition for true spirituality as to be experiencing all the provided deliverance and victory from the power of sin, or, on the other hand, he may be experiencing but a partial deliverance from the power of sin. In either case, he is set apart and thus is experimentally sanctified. (3) In relation to Christian growth. This aspect of experimental sanctification is progressive in every case. It therefore should in no way be confused with incomplete yieldedness to God or incomplete victory over sin. Its meaning is that the knowledge of truth,

devotion, and Christian experience are naturally subject to development. In accord with their present state of development as Christians, believers experimentally are set apart unto God. That development should be advanced with each passing day. And thus, again, the Christian is subject to an experimental sanctification which is progressive.

Third, ultimate sanctification. Even *experimental* sanctification will be perfected when the saints are gathered into the Savior's presence in glory. "When he shall appear, we shall be like him" and "conformed to the image of his Son" (1 John 3:2; Rom. 8:29).

The Bible teaching in regard to sanctification, then, is (1) that all believers are *positionally* sanctified in Christ "once for all" at the moment they are saved. This sanctification is as perfect as He is perfect. (2) All believers are *being* sanctified by the power of God through the Word, and this sanctification is as perfect as the believer is perfect. So, also, (3) all believers *will be* sanctified and perfected in glory into the very image of the Son of God. The Bible, therefore, does not teach that any child of God is altogether sanctified experimentally in daily life before that final consummation of all things.

IV. Eradication Teaching

That there is a sin nature in the Christian which God recognizes as such and for which He has made complete provision to the end that it may be dealt with in a manner satisfying to His infinite holiness is an apparent and solemn truth that revelation discloses, and with that truth every right and real Christian experience must of necessity be in harmony. Revelation is equally as explicit regarding the divine plan to be followed for sanctification as regarding the divine provisions to be employed if this nature is to be brought into the place of control God has designed for it. On the other hand, rationalism in a veiled and pious form and passing as that which is superspiritual has advanced a theory respecting the disposition of the sin nature. No Scripture, when rightly interpreted, teaches this rationalistic theory, and no human experience has ever conformed to it actually. The whole subject is metaphysical to an advanced degree and in its consideration human opinion or supposed experience can prove or establish nothing. It is the plain, direct testimony and instruction to be found in the

New Testament which must be accepted. The theory assumes that it is God's purpose to eradicate the sin nature and for this every believer should be seeking. Hence strange human ideas and requirements are introduced which are foreign to Scripture. Truths and doctrines are distorted or wholly misstated to sustain an unfounded human notion. This statement of criticism is not merely one person's opinion ranged against another person's opinion. But those who teach eradication of the old nature cannot and therefore do not base their claims upon the Word of God. They not only ignore the Scripture teaching that the sin nature abides in its active power in spite of the fact that it is judged for the believer by Christ in His death, but they ignore as well the extended body of Scripture which directs the believer to gain constant deliverance through the power of the indwelling Spirit. In fact, if eradication is God's way of dealing with the fallen nature, there is practically no need for the present work of the Holy Spirit. All of this divine work, then, is damaging to the theory, while the theory is itself dangerous to sincere souls. Being without Biblical ground upon which to stand, this theory is stated in as many ways as there are teachers to promote it. The present discussion can concern itself only with the principles involved and the conclusions therefrom which are to be drawn. A sincere determination to be well-pleasing unto God doubtless actuates many who promote the eradication idea; however, the Biblical doctrine of an unceasing overcoming of evil by the power of the Spirit in answer to a definite dependence upon the Spirit is diametrically opposed and contrary to the eradication theory. If one is true the other cannot be. Consideration of some definite issues involved may serve to make these assertions of criticism conclusive.

First, eradication is not the divine method of dealing with the believer's three great foes. These, as before indicated, are the world, the flesh, and the devil. No one has ever suggested a plan for becoming free from the influence of the world that would get the world eradicated. As truly, the flesh in its larger sphere of reality, which includes the sin nature, is never said to be eradicated, but is definitely said to be held in subjection by the Spirit when the daily walk is committed to Him (Gal. 5:16–17). Nor has any person been relieved from satanic influence by the eradication of Satan. Why, then, and to what great advantage in itself if standing alone, would be the eradication of the sin nature, which is only an integral part of one of these mighty foes none of which can ever be eradicated?

Second, eradication is not according to human experience. Though some boldly claim the eradication of their sin nature, few have ever demonstrated very successfully a sinless life. The acid test of these assumptions would be taken if a man and a woman, each of whom believed themselves—and upon the best evidence known to such claims—to have experienced eradication of the sin nature, married and had a child. Would that child be born without a sin nature? It would not, and simply because of the fact that the sin nature, regardless of suppositions, had not been eradicated in the case of either parent. Some have claimed that eradication returned them to the estate of innocence from which Adam fell; but that estate, if ever regained, would not be maintained for a moment under the present stress of life. The first lapse necessarily would return the supposed unfallen one to the fallen estate. Scripture, however, knows nothing of a fall on the part of any human being other than the first parents, but it does assert that redemption is wrought for all and that a way of deliverance from the inherited fallen nature has been secured for the child of God through Christ's death and through the power of the Holy Spirit.

Third, Eradicationists ignore the great body of truth which presents the overcoming work of the Holy Spirit in the believer and the deeper aspect of Christ's death that serves as the ground of all deliverance. That death to sin which is positional and which includes every believer, on the other hand, is interpreted as being experimental and limited to a few who have claimed some estate that the New Testament knows noththing of. Nevertheless, all that has been wrought by God is to the end that the believer may "walk" upon a new life-principle (Rom. 6:4). The human responsibility in this walk is far removed, indeed, from what it would be if perchance the sin nature were actually removed. No place could be made under such circumstances for the words "reckon, yield, let not sin reign, put off, mortify, or abide." The nature is not so much to be reckoned dead as that the believer is dead to it.

Fourth, Eradicationists magnify human experience to the point that they disregard any revelation which disagrees with their experience. Of what value is revelation, think such, when one has had an experience, especially if the revelation tends to correct or contradict the experience?

Fifth, the New Testament warns specifically against the eradication error. In 1 John 1:8 it is said: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive

ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Reference here is to a sin nature, whereas in verse 10 reference is to sin which is the fruit of the evil nature. To say as an assumption that one does not have a sin nature may be due to self-deception; nevertheless, to any such it is declared: "The truth is not in him." The basic claim of the Eradicationist is well stated in the words: "Because my sin nature is eradicated, I am not able to sin," whereas the testimony of the one who follows the divine provision and pattern is: "Because of the death of Christ and the immediate power of the Spirit, I am able not to sin." The two theories, then, are not to be reconciled. For believers are, according to a rationalistic theory, to be relieved from stress by an abrupt removal of the disposition to sin, which removal terminates all future conflict with a sin nature and exalts the beneficiaries to the supposed high level of existence wherein the Word of God respecting deliverance by the Holy Spirit through the death of Christ does not apply to them. On the other hand, the New Testament teaches a perfect victory over all evil—the world, the flesh with all its component parts, and the devil—by the constant enabling power of the Holy Spirit. There is not even room for discussion to determine which of these two propositions is taught in the Bible.

Conclusion

The third condition, then, upon which one may be spiritual, is a definite reliance upon the Spirit, which means a “walk by means of the Spirit.” Such a reliance upon the Spirit is imperative because of the impossible (humanly speaking) heavenly calling, the unspiritual power of the world, the opposing power of Satan, and the continued presence of the “flesh” with its Adamic nature. The child of God cannot meet tomorrow’s issues today. The walk is something undertaken step by step and this demands a constant appropriation of the power of God. The Christian life is never likened to an ascension in which one might go up spiritually above the earth-level once-for-all and have no trouble or temptation here again. It rather is “a walk, a race, a fight.” All this speaks of continuation. The good fight of faith is that of continuing an attitude of reliance upon the Spirit. To those who thus walk with God, there is opened a door into “fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” and into a life of fruit-bearing and service with every spiritual manifestation of power, to the glory of God. What, then, is true spirituality? It is the unhindered manifestation of the indwelling Spirit. There are, in all, seven aspects of manifestation. These blessed realities are all provided for in the presence and power of the Spirit and will normally be produced by the Spirit in the Christian who is not grieving the Spirit, but has confessed every known sin; who is not quenching the Spirit, but is yielded to God; and who is walking in the Spirit by an attitude of dependence upon His power alone (Gal. 5:22–23). Such a one is spiritual because he is Spirit-filled. The Spirit is free to fulfill in him all the purpose and desire of God for his life. There is nothing in daily life and service to be desired beyond this. “Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

“Our blest Redeemer, ere He breathed

His tender last farewell
A Guide, a Comforter, bequeathed
With us to dwell …

“And every virtue we possess,
And every victory won,
And every thought of holiness,
Are His alone.”

Chapter XVII

AN ANALOGY

THOUGH WITHIN the positive aspect of the spiritual life a comparison may be drawn between those things which are bestowed or imparted when one is saved and the manifestation of the Spirit in the daily life of the Spirit-filled Christian, there also are various well-defined features of comparison which suggest an analogy between deliverance from the *penalty* of sin in the salvation of those who are out of Christ and deliverance from the *power* of sin on the part of those who among believers comply with the conditions governing the spiritual life. Without doubt, the positive benefits received when God saves are of primary import; yet the analogy now to be pursued, as suggested above, contemplates nothing other than two forms of salvation —one from the penalty and one from the power of sin. It is perhaps needful to point out the fact that the Bible treats the believer's deliverance from bond-servitude to sin as a distinct form of salvation. As would be expected from the Epistle to the Romans, which epistle declares the whole scope of salvation from both the penalty and the power of sin unto absolute security forever, there appears as itself the main structure of the book this differentiation between salvation from the penalty of sin unto forgiveness, imputed righteousness, and justification through Christ's death (Rom. 1:1–5:21), on the one hand, and salvation from the power of sin unto sanctification, which is both positional and experimental, as made possible through the same death of Christ (Rom. 6:1–8:27), on the other hand. This very structure of the doctrinal portion of the Epistle to the Romans will serve to emphasize the force of the fivefold analogy which follows.

I. The Lost Estate

The Word of God presents an extended description of the estate of all the unregenerate in their need of salvation from the guilt and penalty of sin. They are said to be "lost, condemned, and [spiritually] dead"; "there is none righteous, no, not one"; "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." But back of all this is the revelation that in themselves they are helpless and without power to alter or improve their condition. Their only

hope is to depend completely on Another for His saving power and grace. “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.”

In like manner, the Scriptures reveal the estate of the regenerate in relation to the power of the sin nature to be one of impotence and helplessness: “For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing”; “I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.” The hope of the child of God in his salvation from the power of sin is also linked with a complete dependence upon the power and grace of Another. “For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death”; “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world”; “If by the Spirit ye are walking, ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.”

II. The Divine Objective and Ideal

The greatest of all contrasts exists between the estate of the unregenerate person and the estate of that same individual after he is saved. Eternity alone can measure this transformation. Forgiveness is infinitely perfect for him, even unto such purification as will qualify the child of God to be void of even a shadow of sin in the presence of God for ever; likewise, sonship to God actual and eternal, the divine righteousness which is imputed, perfection once-for-all, justification without a cause, reception of the very πλήρωμα or fullness of the Godhead whereby he is being “conformed to the image” of the Greater Son, to name a few blessings of position.

With no less of a perfect divine ideal in view, the Christian is called to a heaven-high manner of life and victory, through Christ’s death unto the sin nature and the limitless enabling power of the Holy Spirit. The believer is besought to “walk worthy” of the glorious positions which are his through infinite grace and power. He is bidden to “walk in the light.”

III. The Gift of God

Salvation must be of God alone, for every aspect of it is beyond human power and strength. Of the many great miracles which taken together constitute salvation from the guilt and penalty of sin, not one of them could

even be understood, let alone be accomplished, by man. “It [the gospel of Christ] is the power of God unto salvation”; “… that he might be the justifier of him which believeth.”

It is equally true that the believer is helpless to deliver himself from the power of sin. God alone can do it, and He proposes to do it according to the revelation contained in His Word. There is no power in man whatsoever to deliver from “the world, the flesh, and the devil.” “If by the Spirit ye are walking, ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh”; “It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure”; “The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death”; “Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might”; “Who shall deliver me? … I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

IV. The Work of the Cross

Were the sinner unsheltered and should God judge his sins in the man himself, there would be nothing left to save. It is only as God has already judged the sinner’s life in a Substitute that He can save him from consuming judgments; indeed, since that substitution was perfect and complete, the sinner is now saved from every punishment or penalty and unto infinite perfection in Christ. Such a salvation both satisfies the love of God for the one He saves and glorifies God forever. Because no moral obstacle remains to hinder divine love from its utmost expression, God proceeds to do all that infinity can do—He causes the one who is saved to become like Jesus Christ, His Son. A marvel of divine grace like this can be wrought by God on no other ground than the substitution that Christ has accomplished. It is essential, too, that the sinner take cognizance of the ground upon which he is saved. He then must come voluntarily and intelligently to God through the provided Savior. By the death of His Son, God has rendered Himself free to save the chief of sinners, i.e., to do it in such a way that He is righteous and just.

In like case there could be no salvation for the Christian from the power of sin had not God first taken the flesh with its sin nature, its “old man,” into judgment. The believer’s condition would be hopeless indeed if Christ had not first thus brought the sin nature into judgment. As in the case of the penalty for sin, the judgment work on the cross is done now and God is

rendered propitious toward both sinner and saint. The "old man" was judged in a cocrucifixion, a codeath, and a coburial with Christ. "… knowing this, that our old man is ['was,' R.V.] crucified with him." Since Christ has died unto the sin nature, perfecting all divine judgments against it, God is now infinitely free to take direct control of the flesh and its sin nature to the end that He may achieve deliverance for the saint from bond-servitude to sin. All this is something for the believer to "reckon" to be true and on the accepted ground of Christ's judgment of the "old man" to "yield himself unto God."

V. The Place of Faith

Since salvation is always and only a work of God, the only relation man can sustain to it is that of expectation toward the One who alone can undertake and accomplish it. Salvation from the guilt and penalty of sin is wrought for the unsaved the very *moment* he believes. It is conditioned on a solitary *act* of faith. Men are not saved, or kept saved, from the consequences of sins because they *continue* in their faith. Saving faith, as related to this the first aspect of salvation, is a completed transaction. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16); "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life" (John 5:24); "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house" (Acts 16:31).

Salvation unto sanctity of daily life is equally a work of God, and the only relation the child of God can sustain to it is an *attitude* of expectation toward the One who alone is able. There should be an adjustment of the life and will to God, and this salvation must then be claimed by faith; but in this case it is still only an attitude of faith. Believers are saved from the power of sin as they believe. The one who has been justified by an *act* of faith must now henceforth *live* by faith. There are a multitude of sinners for whom Christ has died who are not now saved. On the divine side, everything has been provided and they have only to enter by faith into His saving grace as it is available for them in Jesus Christ. Just so, there are a multitude of saints whose sin nature has been perfectly judged and every provision made

on the divine side for a life of victory and glory to God who are not now realizing a life of victory. They have only to enter by faith into the saving grace available to deliver from the power and dominion of sin. This step would introduce them to the reality of “a walk, a race, a warfare.” All of this signifies a constant attitude. Christians are told to “fight the good fight of faith.” Sinners are not saved until they trust the Savior, and saints are not victorious until they trust the Deliverer from the reigning power of sin. God has made this rescue possible through the cross of His Son. Salvation from the power of sin must be claimed by faith. Discussing this fifth aspect of the analogy, Bishop H. C. G. Moule of Durham, England, writes:

> The first case is in its nature one and single: an admission, an incorporation. The second is in its nature progressive and developing: the discovery, advancing with the occasion for it, of the greatness of the resources of Christ for life. The latter *may*, not *must*, thus include one great crisis in consciousness, one particular spiritual act. It is much more certain to include many starting-points, critical developments, marked advances. The act of self-surrendering faith in the power of Christ for inward cleansing of the will and affections may be, and often indeed it is, *as it were* a new conversion, a new “effectual calling.” But it is sure, if the man knows himself in the light of Christ, to be followed by echoes and reiterations to the end; not mere returns to and beginnings from the old level (certainly it is not the plan of God that it should be so), but definite out-growths due to new discovery of personal need and sin, and of more than corresponding “riches” in Christ. With each such advance the sacred promise of the *fulness of the Spirit* will be received with a holy and happy realization.—*Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, 2nd rev. ed., p. 199

The Spirit, when saving from the reigning power of sin, does not set aside the personality of the one He saves. He merely takes possession of the faculties and powers of the individual. It is the power of God acting through the human faculties of the will, emotions, desires, and disposition. The experience of the believer who is being empowered is only that of a consciousness of his own power of choice, his own feelings, desires, and disposition as related to self. The strength which he possesses, however, is “in the Lord, and in the power of his might.”

Conclusion

Because so far this discussion has dealt primarily with the theory or doctrine of the spiritual life, the addition of a few practical suggestions may not be amiss. Since a life in the power of the Spirit depends upon a continuous attitude of reckoning and appropriation, it is important for most

Christians to have a time of definite dealing with God in which they may examine their hearts in the matter of sin and their need of yieldedness, and in which they may acknowledge both their insufficiency and His sufficiency as revealed by the Spirit. Then, at that particular time, they may claim His power and strength to supplant their weakness. The Bible makes no rules about the time or conditions. It is a case of the individual child, in all the latitude of his own personality, dealing with his Father.

Spirituality is not a future ideal; it is to be experienced *now*. The vital question is, "Am I walking in the Spirit now?" The answer to this question should not depend on the presence or absence of some unusual manifestation of the supernatural. Much of everyone's life will be lived in the uneventful commonplace; but even there the believer should have conviction that he is right with God and in His unbroken fellowship. "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God" (1 John 3:21). Likewise, the child of God should not mistake worn nerves, physical weakness, or depression for unspirituality. Many times sleep is more needed than prayer, and physical recreation than heart-searching.

Be it remembered, too, that His provisions are always perfect, but that the Christian's entrance into these provisions is often imperfect. There is doubtless too glib a reference to human attitudes and actions in relation to God as if they were absolute, such as absolute surrender, absolute consecration, and absolute devotion. If there are well-defined conditions upon which the believer may become spiritual, let him remember that, from the standpoint of the infinite God, his compliance with those conditions is often imperfect. What God provides and bestows is in accord with the fullest divine perfection, but the Christian's adjustment is human and therefore usually subject to improvement. The fact nevertheless of the believer's possible deliverance, which depends upon the Spirit alone, does not change. The child of God will have as much at any time as he makes it possible for the Spirit to bestow.

Normally, the spiritual Christian will be occupied with effective service for his Lord. This, however, is not a rule. Christians need only to take care that they are yielded and ready to do whatever He may choose. To "rest in the LORD" is one of the essential victories in a spiritual life. "Come ye yourselves apart … and rest a while." A child of God is just as spiritual

when resting, playing, sleeping, or incapacitated, if it is His will for him, as he is when serving.

The spiritual life is not passive. Too often it is thus misjudged and because of the fact that one, to be spiritual, must cease from self-effort in the direction of spiritual attainments and learn to live and serve by the power God has provided. True spirituality knows little of quietism. It rather is life much more active, enlarged, and vital because it is energized by the limitless power of God. Spirit-filled Christians are quite apt to be exhausted physically at the close of day. They are weary *in* the work, but not weary *of* it.

The Spirit-filled life is never free from temptations; but "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." The plain teaching of this promise, in harmony with all Scripture on the subject, is that temptations as phenomena which are "common to man" attack all Christians, but that withal there is a divinely provided way of escape. The child of God does not need to yield unto temptation. There is always the *possibility* of sin, but never the *necessity*. It has been well said that spiritual believers are honored with warfare in the front-line trenches. There the fiercest pressure of the enemy is felt. But they are also privileged to witness the enemy's crushing defeat, so abundant is the power of God; and thus the spiritual believer is highly honored.

Living in unrealities is a source of hindrance to spirituality. Anything that savors of a "religious pose" is harmful. In a very particular sense the one who has been changed from the natural to the spiritual sometimes needs to be changed back to a naturalness again—meaning, of course, a naturalness of manner and life. The true spiritual life presents a latitude sufficient to allow the believer to live very close to all classes of people without ever drawing him from God. Spirituality hinders sin, but should never hinder the friendship and confidence of sinners (Luke 15:1). Who can see the failure of others more than the one who has spiritual vision? And because of this fact, who needs more the divine power to keep him from becoming critical, with all that follows there from? Christians need to study most carefully the adaptation practiced by the Apostle Paul as he revealed it in 1 Corinthians 9:19–22. If one's kind of spirituality makes Christ unattractive to others, it needs some drastic changes. May God save His

children from assuming a holy tone of voice, a holy somberness of spirit, a holy expression of face, or a holy garb (if by the garb they wish to appear holy) ! True spirituality is an inward adorning. It is most simple and natural and should be a delight and attraction to all.

It will not do to *impersonate* ideals or to *imitate* others. Just here is the great danger in analyzing experiences. Some are so easily induced to try to imitate someone else. That which gives a believer priceless distinctiveness is his own personality, and he cannot please God more than by being what He designed him to be. Some Christians are disposed to traffic in unlived truth, repeating pious phrases the truth of which they have never really experienced. This must always grieve the Spirit.

Children of God are dealing always with their Father. Too often the walk in the Spirit is thought to be a mechanical thing. The believer is not dealing with a machine: he is dealing with the most loving and tenderhearted Father in all the universe. The deepest secret of his walk is just to know Him, and so to believe in His Father-heart that he can cry out his failures on His loving breast if need be, or speak plainly to Him in thanksgiving for every victory. When Christians know the consolation and relief of such communion, they will have less occasion to appeal to anyone else. It is theirs to tell Him just what they feel, just how bad they are at heart—and even their darkest unbelief. To do this only opens the heart to Him for His blessed light and strength. Separation from close-up communion is the first thing that one should fear, and the first aid in every spiritual accident is the simple act of telling Him everything repentantly. Having made confession, the believer should reckon his forgiveness and restoration fully accomplished and immediately return to His fellowship and grace.

The teaching that “the bird with broken pinion never soars so high again” is most unscriptural. Through the sacrifice of Christ, no penalty because of sin remains today for saint or sinner (if the latter will receive Him). Rather “the bird with broken pinion may higher soar”; but of course there should be no complacency with failure and defeat for that reason.

Christians are never wonderful saints of whom God may justly be proud; they are His little children, immature and filled with foolishness, with whom He is endlessly patient and on whom He has been pleased to set all His infinite heart of love. He is wonderful: Christians are not.

Believe what is written. Remember the vital words of Romans 6:6, 9: “Knowing this …” or, “because we know this.” One is always justified in acting on good evidence. Where, then, is there a safer word of testimony than the imperishable Word of our God? From that very Word believers *know* that God has provided a finished judgment for their sins and for their sin, and that the way is open for an overflowing life in the power of the blessed Spirit. The believer should know that such a life is His loving purpose for him. He is to believe His unfailing promise. So far from imposing on Him if he claims this grace, to fail to claim *all* that His love would bestow will hurt Him more than all else.

True spirituality is a great reality. It is *all* of the manifestations of the Spirit in and through the one within whom He dwells. He manifests in the believer the life which is Christ. He came not to reveal Himself but to make Christ real *to* the heart, and *through* the heart, of man. Thus the Apostle Paul could write: “For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.”

Volume Seven

DOCTRINAL SUMMARIZATION

by

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER

D.D., LITT.D., TH.D.

Late President and Professor of Systematic Theology

Dallas Theological Seminary

Grand Rapids, MI 49501

Copyright ©1948, 1976 by Dallas Theological Seminary

LIST OF DOCTRINES

DOCTRINAL SUMMARIZATION

Abiding Adam

Adoption Advocacy Angels

Anthropology Antichrist Apostasy Ascension Assurance Atonement Authority Babylon Baptism, Real Baptism, Ritual Bibliology Blasphemy Blindness Blood

Body

Bread

Bride

Buried

Calling Carnality Chastisement Christian Christianity Christology Cleansing Commandments Confession Conscience Conversion Conviction Covenants Creation Creeds

Criticism Cross

Darkness Days

Death

Demonology Depravity Disciples Dispensations Dispersions of Israel Ecclesiology Elders

Election Eschatology Eternity Evangelism Evolution Faith

Fall

Fatherhood of God First-Fruits Flesh

Foreknowledge Foreordination Forgiveness Genealogy Gentiles Gentile Times Glory

God

Gospel

Government Grace

Guilt

Hades

Headship Healing Heart

Heaven

Holiness Hope

Horn

Humility Immortality Imputation Incarnation Infant Salvation Infinity Inheritance Innocence Inspiration Intercession Intermediate State Interpretation Israel

Jehovah Jerusalem Jesus

Judaism Judgment Just, The Justice Justification King

Kingdom Law

Life

Logos

Lord's Day Lord's Supper Love

Man of Sin Marriage Mediation Mercy

Mercy Seat Messiah Millennium Ministry Miracle Mystery Name

Natural Man Numbers Obedience Omnipotence Omnipresence Omniscience Only-Begotten Ordain

Ordinance Paraclete Paradise Parousia Pauline Theology Peace

Perfection Power

Praise

Prayer

Preaching Predestination Priesthood Prophecy Propitiation Providence Punishment Reconciliation Redemption Regeneration Repentance Resurrection Revelation Rewards Righteousness Sabbath Sacrifice Saint

Salvation Sanctification Satan

Security Separation Sin

Sonship Soul and Spirit Spirit, the Holy Spirituality Standing and State Stewardship Stone

Substitution Suffering Tabernacle and Temple Temptation Throne

Tithing Tongues Transfiguration Tribulation Trinity Types

Will

Woman

World

Zion

A

ABIDING

The word μένω, which is translated *abide*, is used about 120 times in the New Testament. Other English terms used to translate this word are equally significant—'remain, dwell, continue, tarry, endure' (Matt. 10:11; Luke 19:5; Acts 9:43; 27:31; 1 Cor. 13:13; 2 Tim. 2:13). The Apostle John employs this verb sixty-four times and in his writings the Authorized Version translators have rendered the word *abide* twenty-one times. The meaning of this Greek term is thus clearly indicated as that which remains, dwells, continues, tarries, or endures; it is what abides in the position in which it is placed. In reference to spiritual reality the word *abide* indicates a constancy in relation to Christ. It is also true that Christ referred to His own abiding in the believer (cf. John 15:5), which relationship could never fail since it depends only on His faithfulness. There is little basis, consequently, for the sentiment expressed in certain hymns wherein Christ is petitioned to abide with the believer.

The general meaning of the word *abide* lends itself to at least two ideas—one which suggests a continuing in union with Christ and another which suggests a continuing in communion with Christ. The most revealing passage is John 15:1–17, where the believer is enjoined to abide in Christ as a branch abides in the vine. This passage will not support the notion that to abide in Christ means to remain in *union* with Him; when this superficial rendering is accepted, only false doctrine ensues. On the other hand, it is clear that the word of exhortation directs the believer to remain in *communion* with Christ as He remained in communion with His Father. As the sap flows from the vine into the branch that remains in contact, so the spiritual vitality flows from Christ to the believer who abides. Communion depends upon agreement and agreement requires complete subjection of one to his superior: thus it is imperative that the commandments of the one shall be kept by the other. Christ said that by keeping His Father's commandments He abode in His love. There was, of course, no attempt on Christ's part to preserve a union with His Father. That had been unbroken and unbreakable from all eternity; but, on the human side, He did maintain communion by doing the Father's will.

Three verses in this context (John 15:1–17) set forth the doctrinal significance of abiding in Christ, namely,

John 15:2. "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit."

Having asserted that He is the True Vine and that His Father is the Husbandman and, later, that the saved ones are the branches, Christ declares that a *branch in Him*—which terminology connotes the most vital and immutable union that could ever exist—may fail to bear fruit. It is at this point that the meaning of the word *abide* as used in this context is determined. The branch is not in Christ because it bears fruit; but being in Christ, the branch may or may not bear fruit. Thus it is demonstrated that abiding in Christ is not a matter of maintaining union with Christ, but of maintaining communion with Him. When communion with Christ is preserved on the part of one in Christ, the sap of spiritual vitality is imparted which results in fruit being borne. This verse declares

plainly that there are those in Christ, by so much therefore saved and safe forever, who at a given time are not bearing fruit. Respecting such, God reserves the right to remove them from their place in this world (cf. 1 Cor. 11:30; 1 John 5:16), directly to heaven's glory. It should not be supposed that any ever go to heaven because they are fruitful, because they keep the commandments of Christ, or because they abide in Christ. Entrance into heaven depends only on union with Christ. A branch in Him will go to heaven without being fruitful, though unfruitfulness must be accounted for in the loss of rewards before Christ's judgment seat in heaven. Branches in Christ which are fruitful are not said to be saved or kept saved thereby, but are "purged" or pruned that they may bear more fruit.

John 15:6. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

This verse—most depended upon by those who contend that the believer's salvation is not secure—must be approached, as this whole theme of abiding requires, on the basis of the outworking of divine power in the one who is saved. Those believers who do not abide in communion with Christ, though saved, are powerless with respect to testimony and all service. Being broken off from communion, they are withered in spiritual power. The judgment which falls immediately upon them is not from God, however, but from men (cf. 2 Sam. 12:14). It is what James refers to when he states that justification is by works (James 2:14–26). Justification must be on the ground of works in the sphere of the believer's relation to men; for they judge only by that which they observe. Before God justification is by faith, but the world knows nothing of such a faith. It is, indeed, most demanding to require that the one who professes to be a child of God should adorn the doctrine which he follows. The Christian is admonished, nevertheless, to walk circumspectly before those who are without. By a reasonable manifestation of the divine life in the believer, the world may come to "know" and "believe" regarding Christ (cf. John 13:34–35; 17:21–23). To the children of the kingdom Christ said that the world, seeing their good works, would glorify the Father in heaven for this reason (Matt. 5:16). As used in this passage, the figure which likens the judgments which men impose to "gathering" and "burning" of withered branches is exceedingly strong and must be interpreted in the light of existing facts. Men do not gather and burn their fellow men in a literal sense; but they do enter into very drastic judgment of the one who professes to be saved and yet does not manifest the ideals which belong to that life. This warning of Christ's to believers respecting the merciless attitude of the world is timely and important. It is probably the only instance in which Christ introduces this theme when contemplating the Christian in his relation to the *cosmos* world. The unrelenting attitude of the world towards the believer is indicated by the words of Christ following verses 1–17: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John 15:18–19).

John 15:10. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love."

This particular verse, referred to above, determines what is actually required of the believer to the end that he may abide in communion with Christ. The issue is stated simply: "If ye keep my commandments." Keeping the commandments of Christ is easily recognized as the ground of fruit-bearing communion with Christ; it is in no sense the ground of union with Christ, which is gained by faith alone. By keeping His perfect will, communion is sustained, which communion opens the way for the divine inflow of vital power by which fruit will be borne. No reference is made by Christ in this connection to the commandments of Moses. The phrase *my commandments* is not employed by

Christ until He reaches the upper room and is an anticipation of the present heavenly relationship to Christ true of all who believe. Christ cites His own relation to the Father as an illustration—"even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." He kept His Father's commandments, not to create or preserve union with the Father but to preserve communion with the Father.

The results of abiding are both negative and positive. On the negative side Christ said, "Without me [apart from me, or separated from life-giving communion] ye can do nothing" (John 15:5). On the positive side four effects are listed which flow from the abiding life: the purge which is pruning (vs. 2), prayer effectual (vs. 7), joy celestial (vs. 11), and fruit which is perpetual (vs. 16).

In conclusion, it may be restated that the context is addressed to those who are saved and does not concern their salvation nor its endurance; but it does concern a life-receiving contact or fellowship with Christ—an abiding in His love which results in the outflow of fruit to the glory of God, the experience of celestial joy, and immeasurable efficacy in prayer.

ADAM

God sees but two representative men and all humanity is comprehended either in one or the other. He sees the first Adam with a race fallen and lost in him, and He sees the Last Adam with a new creation redeemed and exalted in Him. Vital distinctions are observable between these two headships. The truth revealed respecting Adam may be divided into that found in the Old Testament and that found in the New Testament.

1. According to the Old Testament. The Old Testament contribution to this doctrine from which important facts and features may be drawn is almost wholly historical. Adam appears as one directly created by God and as the progenitor of the human race. Record is made of his estate as created, of his relationship to God, of his temptation, and of his fall. He is thus presented as a living person and endowed with the same capacities as all other men who appear in the Sacred Text. Not only does Genesis record Adam's origin and estate, but all subsequent Scripture builds its teaching on the reality and truthfulness of the Genesis account. In this the Bible is consistent with itself. Having declared the origin of the race after the manner set forth in Genesis, it treats those records as true. There is no shadow of suspicion that any other theory relative to man's origin exists. Thus he who rejects the Genesis account rejects the whole Bible in so far as it bears upon the origin, development, history, redemption, and destiny of the race. In the doctrinal scheme of the Bible Adam and Christ are so interwoven and interdependent that it must be concluded that if the Genesis account respecting Adam be erroneous—on the theory he was a character who never existed—the record respecting Christ is subject to question also.

It is evident that Adam was created a full-grown man with the capacity which belongs to maturity. He is said to have given names to all creatures as they passed before him. He walked and talked with God, and of him God could say that His creation was very good. There would be little meaning to Adam's temptation and fall as the head of the race if, as has been asserted, he was immature in his mind and character.

2. According to the New Testament. The New Testament teaching regarding Adam and Christ is one of type and antitype; but in every respect save one—namely, that each is the head of a

creation of beings—the typology is one of contrast. Two primary passages are to be considered and also other secondary passages.

a. ROMANS 5:12–21. Observing but two representative men, God sees likewise just two works—one of disobedience and one of obedience—and two results—one of death and one of life. The race is thus divided into two main classifications: those in Adam, lost and undone, and those in Christ, saved and secure forever. This most important passage bearing upon the relation between Adam and Christ—theological to the last degree—draws out the distinctions which exist between Adam and Christ.

As he was warned of God, Adam died both spiritually (which took place at once) and physically (which occurred eventually) as a result of his first sin, and the race that was included with him shared in the same twofold judgment of death. Resulting from Adam's first sin are two lines of effects reaching down alike to every member of Adam's race. One is the sin nature, which results in spiritual death and is transmitted *mediately* from parent to child; the other is imputed sin with its penalty of physical death, which is transmitted *immediately* from Adam to each individual member of his race. A person dies physically not because Adam alone sinned, not because of personal sins, and not because of the sin nature; he dies because of his own share—in the seminal sense—in the original sin which drew out the judgment of death. Because its natural head in creation, Adam is seen as representative of the entire race. In that headship position he contained the race and his lapse, or sin, is imputed with its penalty of physical death to his posterity as an *actual* imputation; because of what is antecedently their own sin, then, physical death as a judgment falls on all alike, even on those, such as infants, who have not sinned—as Adam did—willfully (Rom. 5:14). This divine principle of reckoning heavy responsibility to an unborn posterity is seen again in Hebrews 7:9–10 where Levi, the great grandson of Abraham, is declared to have paid tithes to Melchizedek, being yet in the loins of his great grandfather Abraham (cf. Gen. 14:20). Romans 5:12 declares that all his race sinned in Adam and when Adam sinned. No other interpretation than that will carry through the remaining verses of this context.

b. I CORINTHIANS 15:22. This Scripture reads: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Such is the Authorized Version reading of this important declaration. There is no difficulty regarding the first clause, that "in Adam all die"; but as for the rest of the verse, the same numerical all—πάντες—who suffer the death penalty are not necessarily in Christ, though all—πάντες—will be made alive: for, as Christ said, "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" (John 5:28–29). It is more fully in accordance with the context which follows (1 Cor. 15:23–24) if the passage is understood to mean that all men die because of Adam and all men—the same numerical all—will be raised by or because of Christ. For the context continues by saying that every man will be raised in his own classification; every man will be raised—that disclosure precludes a restriction of the context to those only who are in Christ by position. Such a limited type of resurrection, nevertheless, is later declared by the words "they that are Christ's at his coming" (vs. 23). The subject in view is clearly universal death through Adam and universal resurrection through Christ. Romans 5:18 presents a similar case with a twofold use of πάντες.

c. SECONDARY PASSAGES. In 1 Corinthians 15:45 it is asserted that, in contrast again, Adam was made a life-receiving soul while Christ is a life-giving Spirit. In like manner (vs. 47), Adam was "of the earth, earthy"; the Second Man is none other than the Lord from heaven. Though the believer has borne the image of the earthy, he is appointed to bear the image of the heavenly. He will be "conformed to the image" of Christ (Rom. 8:29). Again in 1 Timothy 2:13–14 it is said that Adam,

quite in contrast to Eve, was not deceived in his transgression. Adam sinned knowingly and willfully. In Romans 5:14 reference is made to those who, because of immaturity and incompetency, have not sinned after "the similitude of Adam's transgression" (that is, knowingly and willfully). Thus also in Jude 1:14 Enoch is declared to be the "seventh from Adam," as throughout the entire Bible Adam is recognized for a living man, the beginning of the human race. In the genealogy of Christ given by Luke Christ is traced back to Adam who, it is averred, *was the son of God* (Luke 3:38). Christ Himself upholds the Genesis record respecting Adam and Eve (cf. Matt. 19:4–6; Mark 10:6–8).

ADOPTION

1. The Usual Meaning. The Bible recognizes the usual meaning of the word *adoption*, which is the placing of one rightfully outside blood ties into the position of a legal child (not, a natural child) in the family. Though not known at first among Jews, adoption was practiced by the Egyptians. Exodus 2:10 records the adoption of Moses by Pharaoh's daughter (cf. 1 Kings 11:20). The adoption of Esther (cf. Esther 2:7, 15) demonstrates that the custom was practiced by Jews in Babylon. Greece and Rome were evidently included among those who followed this custom. The Apostle Paul, indeed, uses this term only when writing to Gentiles. He writes to such about the national placing of Israel above other peoples—"To whom pertaineth the adoption" (Rom. 9:4–5)—as an adoption, but this instance bears closely upon the spiritual, New Testament use of the word. However, it is evident from Exodus 4:22; Deuteronomy 32:6; Isaiah 64:8; Jeremiah 31:9; and Hosea 11:1 that Israel, though called the son of Jehovah, is a son only by virtue of decree or sovereign placing and not by virtue of natural or spiritual ties in their relation to Jehovah as a child.

2. The New Testament Meaning. The spiritual use of the word *adoption* signifies the placing of a newborn child—in point of maturity—into the position of privilege and responsibility attached to an adult son. Here an important distinction appears between two Greek words, namely, τεκνίον—used to denote little children who are under the authority of parents, tutors, and governors (cf. John 13:33)—and υἱός—used to denote an adult son. Christ accordingly spoke of Himself as *Son of man*, and by employing the latter meant that He is One of full maturity. Perplexity may arise over why a born, and thus a natural, child should be adopted at all; for adoption, as usually conceived, could add nothing to rights which are gained by natural birth. It is thus, however, that the true spiritual meaning of *adoption* appears. The naturally born child is by adoption advanced positionally to his majority and given at once the standing of an adult son. Since spiritual adoption occurs at the time one is saved and thus becomes a child of God, there is no childhood period recognized in the Christian's experience. The one reference in 1 Corinthians 3:1 to "babes in Christ" sustains no relation to an immaturity which is due to brief experience with the Christian life; it is a reference to limitations which belong to an unspiritual or carnal state. The believer who is carnal may have been saved for many years.

In its distinctive significance, spiritual adoption means that the one thus placed has at once all the privilege—which is that of independence from tutors and governors—and liberty of a full-grown man. The Christian is enjoined to "stand fast" in the liberty wherewith Christ has made him free and not to be "entangled again with the yoke of bondage," which is evidently a reference to the legal or merit system (Gal. 5:1). Spiritual adoption also imposes the responsibilities belonging to full maturity. This is clear from the fact that, whatever God addresses to any believer, He addresses to all who believe. No portions of the hortatory Scriptures intended for Christians are restricted to

beginners in the Christian life. The same holy walk and exercise of gifts is expected from all the children of God alike. Since the Christian life is to be lived in the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit, this requirement is reasonable; for the enabling power of the Spirit is as available for one as for another. Practically, long years of experience in the Christian life will doubtless tend to skilled adaptation to that new manner of life; but those years add no more resource than is given by the Spirit from the beginning to those who are saved. The whole field of Christian responsibility is by so much related to this doctrine of adoption.

Adoption assumes a practical meaning as set forth in the Galatian and Roman Epistles. In the former it becomes a deliverance from slavery, from guardians, and from nonage; in the latter it signifies a deliverance from the flesh (cf. Rom. 8:14–17). All of this is directly due to the new, complete responsibility which full maturity imposes and to the divine plan that the believer's life is to be lived from the start in the power of the Holy Spirit.

The final placing as exalted mature sons awaits the redemption of the body, which will occur at the return of Christ (Rom. 8:23). This, too, is related to the "glorious liberty of the children [not, little children] of God" (Rom. 8:21).

Dr. C. I. Scofield presents this same definition of adoption in the notes of the *Scofield Reference Bible:* "Adoption (*huiothesia*, 'placing as a son') is not so much a word of *relationship* as of *Position*. The believer's relation to God as a child results from the new birth (John 1:12, 13), whereas adoption is the act of God whereby one already a child is, through redemption from the law, placed in the position of an adult son (Gal. 4:1–5). The indwelling Spirit gives the realization of this in the believer's present experience (Gal. 4:6); but the full manifestation of the believer's sonship awaits the resurrection, change, and translation of the saints, which is called 'the redemption of the body' (Rom. 8:23; 1 Thes. 4:14–17; Eph. 1:14; 1 John 3:2)" (p. 1250).

ADVOCACY

In its usual or general meaning an advocate is one who undertakes in the cause of another person. The original word used in the New Testament is παράκλητος and its translation as in John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7—comforter—is unsatisfactory. It doubtless is the work of the Holy Spirit to lend comfort unto those to whom He ministers, but His work as Advocate in their behalf is much more extended, including all the work of the Spirit in and through the believer. In its Biblical or spiritual meaning, advocacy represents divine enablement and assistance. Two Persons of the Godhead are recognized as Advocates.

1. Christ. In His earthly ministry of three years Christ was Advocate for His own in the world, and before He left the world He promised another Advocate to continue this service. By the use of the word *another*, Christ implies that His own ministry has been that of an advocate (John 14:16).

As a legal representative in the court of heaven Christ now functions as the Christian's Advocate or defense (1 John 2:1), but never does He assume the work of prosecution. That charges are preferred in heaven against the believer and before the Father on the throne is certified in Revelation 12:10, which reads, "For the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." The heavenly Advocate's ministry is twofold, namely, advocacy and intercession. In the latter service He is concerned with the Christian's weakness, ignorance, and

immaturity, while in the former service He undertakes even on behalf of the Christian that has sinned. The declaration is: “If any [Christian] man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (1 John 2:1). In the first chapter of 1 John the effect of the believer’s sin upon himself is set forth; but the second chapter opens with a contemplation of the far more serious problem of the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God. When recognizing this problem of evil, the Arminian assumes that there is no specific cure through Christ’s advocacy for the Christian’s sin and that the saved one who has sinned must be dismissed from his saved estate because of the sin. Such, indeed, would be necessary were it not for the present advocacy of Christ in which He pleads the value of His death for that very sin which is in question. As Advocate in heaven, Christ pleads the fact that He bore this sin. The righteous ground of His death for sin secures the believer’s release—so far as divine condemnation is concerned. God accepts always the death of His Son as the basis of His release of those who have sinned. The advocacy of Christ in heaven respecting the believer’s sin is so complete and perfect that by it He wins a title which He gains nowhere else, namely, *Jesus Christ the righteous*.

The present advocacy of Christ in heaven is self-appointed. It is included in His work as Savior. It is wrought for every believer at all times without regard to the believer’s own understanding of it or any supposed cooperation with it. It is not therefore a subject of petition; it is rather a subject of praise and thanksgiving.

2. The Holy Spirit. When about to leave the world Christ promised another advocate (John 14:16), and thus pointed to the Holy Spirit with clear instructions respecting the work which the Spirit would undertake. The advocacy of the Spirit is also one of intercession and direct aiding. Reference is made to His intercession in Romans 8:26–27. It is declared that “he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.” In His enabling ministry the Spirit empowers unto every good work and overcomes every foe. So great are the provisions for the child of God in this present age!

The Spirit is not a mere substitute for, or a successor to, Christ; He has His own incomparable ministry which is peculiar and specific. He is the all-sufficient One who has been sent into the world by both the Father and the Son.

3. Three General Uses of the Word *Advocate*. From the foregoing it will be seen that there are three general meanings to the word *advocate*—a legal advocate, which Christ is now in heaven; an intercessor, which Christ and the Holy Spirit now are; and a general helper, which Christ was while on earth and which the Holy Spirit is throughout this age.

AGE

(See DISPENSATIONS)

ANGELS

According to Colossians 1:16, creation included “things” invisible as well as things visible and angels are among the things that are invisible. They comprise a vast company of spirit beings concerning whom the Scriptures bear abundant testimony, but whose existence and ministrations

have been strangely neglected in works on theology. Angels are mentioned about 108 times in the Old Testament. From the Greek word for angels, ἄγγελος, is derived the term used in English. In any case, the word means simply *messenger* and in rare instances is used thus of men (cf. Luke 7:24; James 2:25; Rev. 1:20). Christ used the term when referring to departed human spirits (Matt. 18:10; cf. Acts 12:15). The position angels hold by creation is above men (Ps. 8:4–5; Heb. 2:6–7; 2 Pet. 2:11). The record of the origin of the angels by creation is given in Psalm 148:2–5 and in Colossians 1:16.

The angels are classified as follows: (1) The Angel of Jehovah, which terminology refers to the preincarnate appearing of the Son of God and therefore is not rightly classified as reference to an angel; yet the term is used of Him. His appearings in this form are recorded as ten theophanies. As the Revealer of God and the One whom Jehovah sends, He is a veritable Messenger (Ex. 23:20; cf. 32:34; 33:2). (2) Gabriel, meaning "the mighty one" (Dan. 8:16; 9:21; Luke 1:19, 26–38). (3) Michael, the archangel, a name meaning "Who is like God?" and he is head of the armies of heaven (1 Thess. 4:16; Jude 1:9; Rev. 12:7), and Israel's prince (Dan. 10:21; 12:1). (4) Cherubim, the defenders of God's holiness (Gen. 3:22–24; Ex. 25:17–22; Isa. 37:16; Ezek. 1:5; 28:14). (5) Seraphim (Isa. 6:2). (6) Principalities and powers—sometimes used of good and sometimes of evil angels (Rom. 8:38; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; cf. 2:10, 15; Titus 3:1; 1 Pet. 3:22; Luke 21:26). (7) "The elect angels" (1 Tim. 5:21). (8) Angels known by their ministries—angel of the waters (Rev. 16:5), angel of the abyss (Rev. 9:1), angel with power over fire (Rev. 14:18), seven angels with trumpets (Rev. 8:2), "the watchers" (Dan. 4:13, 17, 23). (9) Satan and the demons, and (10) Jeremiel or Uriel, Raphael, etc., mentioned only in the Apocryphal writings.

The general facts regarding the angels are: (1) They are legion (Ps. 68:17; Dan. 7:10; Matt. 26:53; Heb. 12:22; Rev. 5:11); they form the hosts of heaven (Luke 2:13. Note the R.V. term, *Jehovah of hosts*). Numerically, angels neither increase nor decrease. (2) Whether they have any kind of bodies cannot be determined. They appear as men when so required (Matt. 28:3; Rev. 15:6; 18:1). They are said to fly (Isa. 6:2; Ezek. 1:6; Dan. 9:21; Rev. 4:8; 14:6). (3) Their abode is evidently in heaven; but reference is thus made to the second heaven, the stellar spaces (Matt. 24:29). Christ passed through the angelic sphere going to and coming from earth (Eph. 1:21; Heb. 2:7; 4:14). (4) The ministries of the angels are varied and are all described in the Sacred Text (Ps. 34:7; 91:11; 103:20; 104:4; Dan. 4:13, 17, 23; 6:22; Matt. 4:11; Luke 16:22; Acts 5:19; 8:26; 10:3; 12:7; 27:23; 1 Cor. 11:10; Col. 2:18; Rev. 22:8–9). (5) The vast empires of angels are doubtless occupied with many enterprises and the execution of their governments. They do behold the things of earth (Luke 12:8–9; 15:10; 1 Cor. 11:10; 1 Tim. 3:16; Rev. 14:10). (6) Their presence is recorded at creation (Job 38:7), at the giving of the law (Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2; cf. Rev. 22:16), at the birth of Christ (Luke 2:13), at the scene of His temptation (Matt. 4:11; cf. Luke 22:43), at the resurrection (Matt. 28:2), at the ascension (Acts 1:10), and just so they will be at the second coming (Matt. 13:37–39; 24:31; 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:7).

Angels are generally classified as unfallen or holy angels (Mark 8:38) and fallen (Matt. 25:41). There will yet be war in heaven between the two classes of angels (Rev. 12:7–10). The fallen angels are either free (cf. the demons) or bound (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6).

ANTHROPOLOGY

Like Angelology, Anthropology is a major division of Systematic Theology and has had its due treatment in an earlier portion of this work (Vol. II). As a review of some salient features of the subject, certain truths may be restated.

1. As a Modern Science in secular education Anthropology is treated wholly apart from Biblical revelation, having in view only man's development and achievements. Whatever is said respecting man's origin is from an evolutionary point of view and nothing is included relative to spiritual values or man's destiny. Biblical Anthropology enters a much wider field, then, and contemplates important considerations.

2. The Origin of Man, according to the stand taken by intrabiblical Anthropology, is accepted as declared in Genesis and as incorporated in all subsequent Scriptures, namely, that man is a direct creation of God. To deny the Genesis account is not only a denial of that portion of God's revelation, but becomes a fostering and sustaining of unbelief respecting every word God has spoken.

3. Man Made in the Image and Likeness of God. This is the unqualified declaration of the Bible. It therefore follows that God may be known somewhat with regard to the character of His Being by that which man is, apart from that in man which the fall has engendered. The comparisons thus drawn must be restricted to spiritual, rather than supposed physical, divine characteristics.

4. The Material Part of Man was a direct creation from existing substances.

5. The Immaterial Part of Man was breathed into him as the very breath of God and thus he became a living soul.

6. The Fall of Man was accomplished through the design and influence of Satan. The sin which caused the fall of man was not only suggested by Satan, but was the identical form of it which Satan had himself followed and by which he fell from that high estate into which he was placed by creation, namely, acting independently of God through disobedience and thus repudiating all divine right and authority over himself (cf. Gen. 3:5; Isa. 14:12–14).

7. The Fall and Its Penality are visited upon the whole human family. That penalty to which spiritual death is due is transmitted *mediately* from parent to child, while the penalty of physical death is imputed *immediately* from Adam to each individual member of his race, the divine reckoning being that each member of the race was seminally in Adam when the first man sinned and therefore each member shared in that sin. This reckoning of Adam's sin to his race is a *real* imputation, rather than a *judicial* imputation. This divine principle of reckoning is clearly indicated in Hebrews 7:9–10, where Levi, who as a priest was supported by the tithes of the people, did, nevertheless, pay tithes when Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek since he was as a great grandson in the loins of father Abraham.

8. God Has Moved in the direction of a cure for man's lost estate. The terms upon which this cure may be received are as definite as any can be. He who in the beginning disobeyed God and sinned is called upon to obey the gospel of God's grace. In the present age the salvation which God offers is unto a place in the highest glory and in no way to be compared with that estate of innocence from which Adam fell.

ANTICHRIST

If the doctrine of antichrist is built on etymology of the word, the field is going to be broad indeed, for all that is opposite to Christ is antichrist. Thus, as John says, “Even now are there many antichrists” in the world (1 John 2:18)—and this reference includes the spirit of antichrist (1 John 4:3)—alluding to any who in spirit or in person is opposed to Christ.

On the other hand, if the doctrine is limited to a future person, there is occasion for some discussion about who that person is and the Scriptures bearing upon him. If the person predicted is identified by his ambitious assumption to be Christ, he is rightly called *antichrist* and is easily represented by the first beast of Revelation (13:1–10). If he is identified as the one who declares himself to be God, as in Ezekiel 28:1–10, he is at once likened to the man of sin of whom Paul writes in 2 Thessalonians 2:3–10. Likewise, Daniel sees a little horn or king who conquers other kings and assumes a place of authority over the other kingdoms.

Though the titles differ, the beast of Revelation 13:1–10, the man of sin of 2 Thessalonians 2, the little horn of Daniel 7, and the wicked prince of Daniel 9 seem to be no other than the one who will federate kingdoms, but will be destroyed at the coming of Christ. His way evidently is being prepared by those who, according to the Spirit, teach antichristian doctrine, denying the fact of the incarnation of the Logos. Probably these are even now preparing for the coming of the person of antichrist. Christ referred to one who would come in his own name (John 5:43) whom the Jews would receive. His nationality is believed to be Jewish since Ezekiel predicts of him that he shall “die the deaths of the uncircumcised” (Ezek. 28:10). A true child of God is justified in observing the direction of events which take place in the fulfillment of prophecy.

APOSTASY

Two words of quite different meaning are often confused, namely, *apostasy* and *heresy*. The former describes one who has first embraced some creed or doctrine and afterwards turned from it. Apostasy is well described as “a total departure from one’s faith or religion; abandonment of creed and renunciation of religious obligations” (*Standard Dictionary*, 1913 edition). On the other hand, heresy refers to a belief which is held in variance with standards or accepted features of doctrine. The term *heretic* does not imply having embraced doctrine from which one has finally departed. That which is branded as heretical may have been an unaltered conviction or contention. The history of the church in its treatment of heretics is deplorable. Of this history the same Standard Dictionary records: “Heresy was formerly a crime in most European countries, and as such punishable by law. It consisted generally of a refusal to accept a prescribed article of faith, altho the canon law enumerates 82 different varieties. Punishment for heresy was common in medieval times on the part of all dominant religious sects and was practised by the first colonists in America. The writ ‘*de heretico comburendo*, ’ by which heretics could be burnt, was passed originally against the Lollards in 1401, and was repealed under Charles II., 29 Car. c. 9, in England, and several toleration acts have since stopped civil punishment for heresy. Ecclesiastical penalties are still enforced against heretical members both in the Protestant and Catholic churches.”

Nothing could be more beside the point than persecution based upon the supposition that credence respecting doctrine is something subject to the control of the individual’s will. An enlightened mind may change the attitude of some heretic, but nothing else could avail. This fact reaches far into the field of practical effort, in behalf of the saved that they may be more spiritual, and of the unsaved that they may come to a saving knowledge of Christ. Teachers of doctrine and

evangelists would do well to analyze their methods and appeals that these may be brought into conformity with the unalterable fact respecting the ability or inability of the human mind. That every truth of Scripture is a revelation from God means more than the fact that God has caused it to be written as Scripture; it reaches on to the individual, to whom it must come as a personal discovery to the mind by the power of the Holy Spirit. It must be a profound intuition respecting a given truth, to which the unaided mind—because of inherent limitations—could not attain. As for the progress which saved people may make in the knowledge of God's truth, it would be well to give attention to two major passages—John 16:12–15 and 1 Corinthians 2:9–3:3.

The experience of apostasy is to the human mind one of God's great mysteries. Why, indeed, should evil ever be found in His universe, which universe was in the beginning as free from evil as its maker? Scripture without hesitation records various apostasies. These are:

1. That of the Angels. Of the fallen angels it is said that they "kept not their first estate" (Jude 1:6), and of Satan it is said that "he abode not in the truth" (John 8:44) and that "iniquity was found in" him (Isa. 14:13–14; Ezek. 28:15). For the apostasy of the angels there is no remedy; on the contrary, it is predicted in words which cannot be revoked that all fallen angels are to spend eternity in the lake of fire (Matt. 25:41), which is God's answer to the apostasy of the angels.

2. That of Adam. Of this aspect of truth much has been written earlier; but it should be observed that Adam became an apostate by his one sin and that as he fell he could and did propagate only after his fallen nature. The first to be born into the world by natural birth proved a murderer.

3. That of Israel. Apostasy with some degree of restoration was the constant experience of the nation Israel, all of which was predicted, which prediction but discloses the fact that sin is never a surprise to God. He can always foresee it, as He does. Israel is now in her last apostasy. There will never be another after she is restored from the present estate of separation from covenant blessings (cf. Deut. 28:15–68; 30:1–8; Isa. 1:5–6; 5:5–7).

4. That of Christendom. The Church of Rome represents the extent of apostasy to which men can go regardless of the fact that it was quite pure and scriptural in its beginning. The final "falling away" is predicted for the days of tribulation (2 Thess. 2:3) and the period of the "last days" of the Church on earth is marked by apostasy (cf. 1 Tim. 4:1–3; 2 Tim. 3:1–5).

Some have declared that there is no hope for an apostate. Such a declaration overlooks the power and grace of God. Some apostates, such as are named in the New Testament and have lived in all generations, will never be restored; but this is not saying that they could not have been restored. A heretic who has held heretical ideas from the beginning of his mature life may be instructed and so led into the truth. Those in error are always subject to correction in love. So unbelief may be overcome by a revelation of the truth.

ASCENSION

So much that is vital within the field of typology is involved in this specific feature of Christology that there is occasion for an individual doctrinal consideration of its character. While it may be true that during the forty days of His postresurrection ministry Christ moved back and forth freely between earth and heaven, it is of doctrinal importance and within the bounds of that which is written to recognize two ascensions—one directly following the resurrection and the other when He

visibly departed on the clouds at the end of the forty days. Though no Scripture directly describes the first ascension, it is implied in the record of what Christ said to Mary in the early morning at the tomb, “Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God” (John 20:17). That He ascended on this same day subsequent to the resurrection is evident, for He said unto His disciples at evening of that day, “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see” (Luke 24:39).

In this first ascension which followed directly upon His resurrection, two important types were fulfilled. It would not have been reasonable for this twofold fulfillment to have been delayed until the end of the forty days on earth—especially as one of the types, that of the “wave sheaf,” represents Christ in resurrection. Of all the sheaves of grain on the hills of Palestine but one from each homestead was waved ceremonially before Jehovah, and that on the day following the Sabbath (cf. Lev. 23:11) and as a representation of all the sheaves of the harvest. Thus Christ when He ascended from the tomb appeared as an earnest of the mighty harvest of souls whom He had redeemed, who came with Him out of the tomb and who share His resurrection life and glory. He was thus the “firstfruits of them that slept,” a representation of that resurrection of believers that is yet to be (cf. 1 Cor. 15:20–23).

The other type which Christ fulfilled in connection with His first ascension was that of the high priest presenting the blood in the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. Thus Christ the true High Priest presented His own blood and the acceptance of that sacrifice for sinners answers every need of the sinner forever. The importance of the presentation in heaven of the emblem of His finished work in redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation cannot be estimated nor should it be slighted.

At His second ascension, which occurred at the end of His postresurrection ministry of forty days, Christ was seen returning on the clouds of heaven. He then undertook His present session at the Father’s right hand, and with it the far-reaching ministries which continue throughout this age and which provide all security for those who are saved. It was then that He became “Head over all things to the church” (Eph. 1:21–22), the Bestower of gifts (Eph. 4:7–11). He took up the twofold, priestly ministries of intercession (Rom. 8:34; Heb 7:25) and advocacy (Rom. 8:34; Heb. 9:24; 1 John 2:1).

ASSURANCE

In the general signification of the doctrine, assurance is a confidence that right relations exist between one’s self and God. In this respect it is not to be confused with the doctrine of eternal security. The latter is a fact due to God’s faithfulness whether realized by the believer or not, while the former is that which one *believes* to be true respecting himself at a given time. Assurance may rest upon personal righteousness, which assurance was in the past age a recognition of one’s own righteous character; but in the present age it is a recognition of that righteousness of God which is imputed to all who believe. Isaiah declares, “And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance for ever” (Isa. 32:17). Thus also the Apostle writes of the confidence which is engendered by understanding (Col. 2:2), and they who understand God’s provisions and who have entered intelligently into them have just this. Likewise in Hebrews 6:11 there is reference to “the full assurance of hope,” and in 10:22 to “full assurance of faith.” Although it may be concluded that assurance is altogether experimental, resting as it does on a true faith, a true hope, a true understanding, and an imputed righteousness, such feeling may lead one to say without

any presumption, “I know that I am saved,” or, as the Apostle testified of himself: “I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day” (2 Tim. 1:12). So far as the Scripture cited above is concerned, assurance rests not only on the Word of God but as well upon Christian experience. These two grounds of confidence—that of experience and that based on the Word of Truth—should be considered specifically.

1. Based on Charistian Experience. The inward witness of the Holy Spirit is a definite Christian experience. The Apostle Paul states: “The Spirit itself [R.V., himself] beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God” (Rom. 8:16), and the Apostle John declares, “If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son” (1 John 5:9–10). In Hebrews 10:2 it is asserted that those “once purged” should have had no more conscience of sins. That is to say, the removal of all condemnation (cf. Rom. 8:1) should create a corresponding experience. In 1 John 3:10 a real experimental distinction between the “children of God” and the “children of the devil” is manifested. The difference is exhibited in the matter of lawless sinning. The context, which begins with verse 4, has altogether to do with lawless sinning, that is, sinning with no consciousness of its seriousness. The Christian lives with a grieved or an ungrieved Holy Spirit inside, and he cannot sin without an inner distress (cf. Ps. 32:3–5). 1 John 3:9–10—“Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother”—does not teach that Christians do not sin (cf. 1 John 1:8, 10); it rather teaches that the believer being indwelt by the Spirit of God cannot sin lawlessly. It is also to be observed that the presence of this living Christ in the heart through the advent of the Spirit should cause a suitable experience, if the believer’s relations to God are spiritual rather than carnal. Again, the Apostle writes in respect to the indwelling Christ: “Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?” (2 Cor. 13:5). It is inconceivable that Christ should dwell in the heart without some corresponding experience. Therefore the Apostle directs that self-examination be undertaken on the one issue of the indwelling Christ. Certain results from that indwelling are normal.

a. THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD A REALITY. It is one thing to know about the triune God and quite another thing to *know* God. Knowledge of God as Father is achieved in the human heart by the work of the Son, Christ Jesus. He said, “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest” (Matt. 11:27–28). The rest which is thus promised to the soul is that which results when God is known as Father. This knowledge is secured to all who believe in Christ as Savior.

b. A REALITY IN PRAYER. Doubtless unsaved persons attempt to pray, though without the ground of access to God which Christ is; but the individual who comes really to know God finds a new experience in prayer. It is incredible that He who lived by prayer when here on the earth should not impel the one in whom He lives to the exercise of the potentialities of prayer.

c. THE WORD OF GOD DESIRED. Similarly, if Christ indwells, there must be a new interest created in the heart for the Word of God on the part of the one who is saved. The new spiritual life which came by the second birth, like physical life, must be fed and thus the Word of God becomes

the “sincere milk” to some and “strong meat” to others; so all who are saved do have a normal desire for the Truth of God. If there is no appetite for spiritual food, there is some serious reason.

d. A NEW PASSION FOR THE SALATION OF MEN. If Christ who died that lost men might be saved has come to live in a human heart, there must be of necessity and normally a new passion for lost souls created in that heart. Divine love, it will be remembered, is the first-named section of the manifold fruit of the Spirit.

e. A NEW SENSE OF KINSHIP. And, finally, to be born of God is to enter the family and household of God. It is because of the truth that saved ones are actually sons of God that Christ is pleased to call them *brethren* (Rom. 8:29). This relationship is so genuine that there must be, of necessity, a corresponding sense of kinship arising in the heart. The Apostle John, therefore, presents this searching test of reality: “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death” (1 John 3:14).

In all the lines of evidence relative to personal salvation to be based on Christian experience one qualifying feature must be considered, namely, that it is possible to be saved and at the same time to be living a carnal life, and when in the carnal state no believer’s experience can be normal. The evidence cited above, then, since it is drawn from Christian experience, applies only to those who are adjusted to the mind and will of God. The conclusion to be reached in this aspect of the present theme is not that carnal believers are unsaved, but rather that Christian experience, depending as it does upon that which is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit, will not be normal when the Spirit’s work in the heart is hindered by carnality. Thus for a very great proportion of believers the evidence of assurance based on Christian experience is without validity because of carnality.

2. Based on the Word of God. Since that which God covenants and promises cannot fail, evidence respecting one’s salvation which is based upon the Word of God proves absolute. In 1 John 5:13 it is written: “These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.” Thus has God revealed it is the divine purpose that everyone who believes to the saving of his soul may *know* that he is saved, not in this instance through uncertain Christian experience but on the ground of that which is written in Scripture. Though the truth stated in the above passage no doubt applies to all the promises of God unto those who are saved, the Apostle evidently is referring to that which he has just stated (vs. 12), namely, “He that hath the Son hath life.” It becomes, then, a matter of self-knowledge whether one has had a recognized transaction with the Son of God regarding one’s salvation. When such a transaction occurred may not be known, but the saved one must recognize that he depends only on Christ as his Savior. He may say with the Apostle (2 Tim. 1:12), “I know whom I have believed.” The Lord has said, “Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” (John 6:37). To those who have thus come to Christ for His salvation there can be no other conclusion, if Christ’s word is honored, than that they have been received and saved. The Word of God thus becomes a title deed to eternal life, and it should be treated as an article of surety, for God cannot fail in any word He has spoken.

a. DOUBTING ONE’S OWN COMMITTAL. Multitudes are in no way certain that they ever have had a personal transaction with Christ regarding their own salvation. Obviously the cure for any uncertainty about one’s acceptance of Christ is to receive Christ *now*, reckoning that no self-merit or religious works are of value but that Christ alone can save.

b. DOUBTING THE FAITHFULNESS OF GOD. Others who lack assurance of their own salvation do so because they, though having come to Christ in faith, are not sure that He has kept His

word and received them. This state of mind is usually caused by looking for a change in one's feelings rather than looking alone to the faithfulness of Christ. Feelings and experiences have their place, but, as before stated, the crowning evidence of personal salvation—which is unchanged by all these—is the truthfulness of God. What He has said He will do, and it is not pious or commendable to distrust personal salvation after having definitely cast one's self upon Christ.

ATONEMENT

Complexity arises in some minds respecting the use of the word *atonement* and this is due to certain facts.

1. In the Old Testament. So far as the English translation is concerned, the use of the term *atonement*—excepting the mistranslation of Romans 5:11—is restricted to the Old Testament. Though there it is a translation of two Hebrew words, but one of them, *kāphar*, is generally in view and it is used about seventy times. Its meaning is 'to cover.' This, the distinct and limited meaning of the Hebrew word, should not be invested with New Testament ideas, which contemplate a finished or completed work. Under the Old Testament provision the one who had sinned was himself fully forgiven and released, but the ground upon which it could be wrought was itself only typical and not actual. God forgave and restored where sin was only *covered* by animal sacrifices, but the true basis upon which forgiveness could ever be granted was the intention on God's part to take up the sin later that He had forgiven and deal with it righteously and effectively through the sacrificial death of His Son on the cross. That efficacious death was typified in the required animal sacrifice. According to Romans 3:25—"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God"—the fact that Christ bore the sins which were committed before, which sins had already been forgiven on the typical ground that they were covered, ranks as one of the major accomplishments of His death. It is as though unnumbered promissory notes had been handed to Christ for Him to pay. If the notes are paid as promised, God is thereby proved to have been righteous in the forgiving of sin with no other demands having been made upon the sinner than that an offering be brought which, regardless of how much it was understood by that sinner, was in God's sight an anticipation and recognition of His final meeting of every holy demand against sin by the efficacious blood of Christ. In other words, God pretermitted or passed over the sins, not judging them finally at the time they were forgiven. Such a course, it is obvious, would be a very unrighteous dealing if those sins were not in due time to be brought into judgment. All sins of the Mosaic age were thus shown to have been "covered" but not "taken away." In contrast to this temporary expedient, all sin which God forgives has been and is now "taken away." In two New Testament passages that vital contrast appears. It is written: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. … And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:4, 11–14). Added to this is the direct statement of John 1:29, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." This great declaration from John was a doctrinal innovation of immeasurable proportions. The same contrast between the divine dealings with sin in the past dispensation and in the present dispensation is indicated again at Acts 17:30.

2. In the New Testament. Though appearing once by an unfortunate translation in the New Testament (cf. Rom. 5:11), the word *atonement* is not really found in the New Testament. It is as though the Holy Spirit in jealousy for the truth is not allowing room for such an error respecting the divine plan of dealing with sin in the present age. The etymological meaning of *atonement* is 'at-one-ment'; those once estranged are brought into agreement. The New Testament word for this great truth is *reconciliation*. There would be no doctrinal error committed should *at-one-ment* be substituted for *reconciliation*, but the careful student must be much influenced by the fact that 'atonement' as such is confined to the old order and is not used by the Spirit respecting any feature of the new order in Christianity.

3. In Theology. By common usage and yet with little reason, modern theologians have seized upon the word *atonement* as a term to represent all that Christ did on the cross. In earlier portions of this work (Vol. III) upwards of fourteen stupendous achievements by Christ in His death have been indicated. These reach beyond all present time into other ages and past human situations into angelic spheres. It is not possible that the limitless outreach of Christ's death should be represented in any single one or a dozen words; and from the fact that the term in question does not belong to the New Testament vocabulary and from the fact that it is employed in the Old Testament to represent one idea wholly foreign to and superseded in the New Testament, no word related to Christ's death is more inapt as a reference to that which He really wrought for men of the present age. As the extent of Christ's death is understood, so, correspondingly, the use of the term *atonement* will cease.

This discussion may be summarized by quoting from an extended article on the theme to be found in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia:*

> In the English New Testament the word "atonement" is found only at Romans 5:11 and the American Revised Version changes this to "reconciliation." While in strict etymology this word need signify only the active or conscious exercise of unity of life or harmony of relations, the causative idea probably belongs to the original use of the term, as it certainly is present in all current Christian use of the term. As employed in Christian theology, both practical and technical, the term includes with more or less distinctness: (*a*) the fact of union with God, and this always looked upon as (*b*) a broken union to be restored or an ideal union to be realized, (*c*) the procuring cause of atonement, variously defined, (*d*) the crucial act wherein the union is effected, the work of God and the response of the soul in which the union becomes actual. Inasmuch as the reconciliation between man and God is always conceived of as effected through Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 5:18–21) the expression, "the Atonement of Christ," is one of the most frequent in Christian theology. Questions and controversies have turned mainly on the procuring cause of atonement, (*c*) above, and at this point have arisen the various "theories of the Atonement" (I, 321, 1915 edition).

AUTHORITY

Though recognizing God as supreme, the general theme of *authority* may be extended from that point on almost without end. All the material is subject to a twofold division, namely, (1) authority which is external to man, and (2) that which is internal.

1. External. This conception includes the authority of God, of the separate Persons of the Godhead, of angels, of human governments, of the apostles, of the Bible, and of the church. The

subject matter in cludes every situation wherein one or more intelligences determine the actions of others. Comment bearing upon each of these several divisions is in order.

a. THE TRIUNE GOD. By right of creation—the most absolute of all prerogatives—comes the ground of divine authority. To be the Originator, the Designer, and the Executor of all that exists becomes at once the basis for transcendent, peerless, and incomparable authority. Whatever lesser authorities there may be, it must be predicated of them that they are only relative and such as are allowed by the One who is supreme. The fact and extent of other authorities than that of God should not be contemplated apart from recognition of the over-all authority of God. Authority in the hands of those who are unworthy of it is most dangerous, and so it is cause for great thanksgiving that God is what He is; His is perfect trustworthiness, perfect wisdom, perfect purpose, infinite power, and infinite love.

b. THE FATHER. In the present relationship which exists within the Godhead, the Father is revealed as granting authority to the Son and directing the Holy Spirit. It is to the Father that Christ ever turned in prayer and expectation, and the believer is directed to pray to the Father (John 16:23) with the same recognition of His supreme authority and power.

c. THE SON. Though Christ could say, "All power [R.V., authority] is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18; cf. 1 Cor. 15:25–28), He does, nevertheless, acknowledge that the power is granted Him by the Father. He said accordingly, "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man" (John 5:26–27). Much indeed is implied when He claimed "all authority" and "judgment." These are the prerogatives of God. There is no intimation here that in His adorable Person the Son is inferior to the Father. In the outworking of creation and redemption, however, it has pleased the Persons of the Godhead to be related to each other as They are. Christ in consequence did His mighty works through the power and authority of the Holy Spirit. All such representation of the Son is better understood when it is remembered that Christ was living in the human sphere and adapting Himself to that limitation. Respecting Christ's authority, note Matthew 7:29; 9:6, 8; 21:23–27; Mark 1:22, 27; 11:28–29, 33; John 5:27.

d. THE HOLY SPIRIT. The Holy Spirit is sent forth by both the Father and the Son, which fact indicates that He receives authority from those who send Him; He indeed exercises great authority in the world. He it is who restrains evil, who convicts the world, and who guides and empowers the believer (cf. Acts 13:2).

e. THE ANGELS. When angelic creation is described as in Colossians 1:16, there is mention of "thrones, dominions, principalities," and "powers." By these terms reference is made to the authority which the angels exercise within their own order and sphere. It is true, as in the case of Satan, that some authority is granted them in their appointed relations with men (cf. Luke 4:6; 12:5; 22:53; Acts 26:18; Eph. 2:2; Col. 1:13; Rev. 6:8; 9:3, 10, 19; 13:4–5, 7, 12; 20:6).

f. THE CIVIL RULERS. The Word of God not only requires subjection to earthly authority, but declares that rulers are appointed of God. Such, indeed, is the supreme authority of God over all else as to control even government (cf. Prov. 24:21; Rom. 13:1–7; 1 Pet. 2:13–17).

g. THE APOSTLES. Very special authority was extended to the apostles and for this the Apostle Paul contended throughout his ministry; not for self-advancement, of course, but that his God-given right might be exercised in full according to the plan and will of God (Luke 9:1; 2 Cor. 10:8).

h. THE BIBLE. Reflecting the supreme authority of God as actually His revealed will, the Word of Truth is to be obeyed by all who come under His divine rule.

i. THE CHURCH. This kind of rule may be perverted, as in the case of Rome, but the Word of God directs that subjection be rendered by all within the church to those who are set over them in authority. The practical outworking of ecclesiastical authority has been the cause of endless strife throughout the history of the church.

2. INTERNAL. Without perhaps the same degree of definiteness, there is to be recognized the authority which arises through spiritual and moral appeal, through conscience, through customs, and through sentiment. All this and more like it may so dominate the mind and heart as to become a motivating influence.

B

BABYLON

The Old Testament traces the origin, history, and destiny of the ancient capital city of Shinar (Gen. 10:10; 14:1). It is not within the scope of this outline study to trace the history and development of the ancient city itself. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* presents this history quite fully and from the Biblical viewpoint. The name *Babylon* means 'confusion,' and is linked with disorder from the day of the confounding of human language as recorded in Genesis onward to the final destruction of great Babylon as recorded in Revelation. Of the theory that the ancient city will yet be rebuilt for it to be destroyed in fulfillment of prediction, little can be said in its favor. On the contrary, such a fruition directly contradicts the Scriptures (cf. Isa. 13:19–22; Jer. 51:61–64); however, confusion or babel continues until order is restored in the earth by Christ when He comes again. No more accurate or complete statement with respect to the local and larger meaning of Babylon has been found than that prepared by Dr. C. I. Scofield in the notes of his *Reference Bible* under Isaiah 13, verses 1 and 19:

> The *city*, Babylon, is not in view here, as the immediate context shows. It is important to note the significance of the name when used symbolically. "Babylon" is the Greek form: invariably in the O. T. Hebrew the word is simply Babel, the meaning of which is *confusion*, and in this sense the word is used symbolically. (1) In the prophets, when the actual city is not meant, the reference is to the "confusion" into which the whole social order of the world has fallen under Gentile world-domination. … Isa. 13:4 gives the divine view of the welter of warring Gentile powers. The *divine* order is given in Isa. 11. Israel in her own land, the centre of the divine government of the world and channel of the divine blessing; and the Gentiles blessed in association with Israel. Anything else is, politically, mere "Babel." (2) In Rev. 14:8–11; 16:19 the Gentile world-system is in view in connection with Armageddon (Rev. 16:14; 19:21), while in Rev. 17 the reference is to apostate Christianity, destroyed by the nations (Rev. 17:16) headed up under the Beast (Dan. 7:8; Rev. 19:20) and false prophet. In Isaiah the political Babylon is in view, literally as to the then existing city, and symbolically as to the times of the Gentiles. In the Revelation both the symbolical-political and symbolical-religious Babylon are in view, for there both are alike under the tyranny of the Beast. Religious Babylon is destroyed by political Babylon (Rev. 17:16); political Babylon by the appearing of the Lord (Rev. 19:19–21). That Babylon the *city* is not to be rebuilt is clear from Isa. 13:19–22; Jer. 51:24–26, 62–64. By political Babylon is meant the Gentile world-system. … It may be added that, in Scripture symbolism, Egypt stands for the world as such; Babylon for the world of corrupt power and corrupted religion; Nineveh for the pride, the haughty glory of the world.
>
> Verses 12–16 look forward to the apocalyptic judgments (Rev. 6–13). Verses 17–22 have a near and far view. They predict the destruction of the literal Babylon then existing; with the further statement that, once destroyed, Babylon should never be rebuilt (cf. Jer. 51:61–64). All of this has been literally fulfilled. But the place of this prediction in a great prophetic strain which looks forward to the destruction of both politico-Babylon and ecclesio-Babylon

in the time of the Beast shows that the destruction of the actual Babylon typifies the greater destruction yet to come upon the mystical Babylons (pp. 724–25).

The end of symbolical Babylon or confusion is described in Revelation under three aspects—the ecclesiastical, commercial, and political. Chapter 17 records the final destruction of ecclesiasticism. This destruction is of the great system known as Rome. The identification is so exact that the Church of Rome does recognize it to some extent. She incorporates all the mysteries of ancient Babylon with those of her own forming. Being centered in the city of Rome, she sits upon seven hills (Rev. 17:9), she reaches her agelong ambition to rule the kings of the earth (Rev. 17:18), she was in the day that John wrote the center of world trade (Rev. 18:3, 11–13), she is the corrupter of nations (Rev. 17:2; 18:3; 19:2), and the persecutor of saints (Rev. 17:6). Following the removal of the true Church from the earth, this apostate church will gather into her fold all that remains of a professing Christendom (Protestantism) and will be permitted to realize her unholy ambition to rule over the earth, riding the scarlet-colored beast. From this place of authority she is cast down and destroyed by political Babylon as headed up by the beast. That apostate church is by inspiration termed "THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS." In chapter 18 commercialism with its confusion is brought to destruction. It falls under the hand of God in a judgment which the kings execute as God wills (cf. Rev. 17:17, 20). The destruction of commercialism as recorded by John is in three parts—(a) the fact of the destruction (Rev. 18:1–8), (b) the human viewpoint thereof (vss. 9–19), and (c) the angelic viewpoint (vss. 20–24). A world system which is built on greed and desire for riches can have no understanding of a future state of society wherein that element will be wholly lacking. For the sake of gain nations have gone into devastating wars and destroyed the lives of their young men and wasted their resources. A world undominated by greed is in prospect but beyond human imagination. Finally, the whole structure of human government, Gentile authority in its last form under the rule of the beast and all that belongs to this vast political structure, gives way under the mighty crushing power of the returning King of kings (Rev. 19:11–21). Thus the way is cleared for "the God of heaven" to "set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (Dan. 2:44–45; cf. Ps. 2:7–9; Isa. 63:1–6; 2 Thess. 2:8–12).

Confusion must reign in every part of human existence on the earth when the divine order and arrangement is disturbed, which arrangement provides for Israel, the center of all earthly realities, to be inside her land in blessing under Messiah's rule with the nations sharing in that benediction. Such is the glorious future predicted, but it cannot be realized apart from the destruction of every form of babel that now infests the earth.

BAPTISM, REAL

Early writers on the general theme of baptism distinguished between *real* baptism, which is wrought by the Holy Spirit, and *ritual* baptism, which is administered with water. These terms well serve to distinguish between the two forms of baptism which are so clearly identified in the New Testament. Great significance should be attached to the fact that the same term, βαπτίζω, is used in defining each of these baptisms, and it follows that any definition of this great New Testament word, if it is to be true, must be as applicable to the one form of baptism as to the other. The root word, βάπτω, which is used but three times by the New Testament—cf. Luke 16:24; John 13:26; Revelation 19:13—occurs in the first two passages with its primary meaning, which is *to dip*, while the use of the word in the third passage—Revelation 19:13—illustrates its secondary meaning, which is *to dye*

or *stain* (cf. Isa. 63:1–6). This evolution of the word from its primary meaning to a secondary meaning is reasonable. That which is dyed or stained by dipping—βάπτω—persists as βάπτω when dyed or stained by any other method. In like manner, the word βαπτίζω in its primary import means *to immerse* or *submerge;* but in its secondary meaning, which is a development from the primary import, it refers to an influence which one thing may exercise over another, or as Dr. J. W. Dale defines it "to bring into complete subjection to an influence or to imbue with virtues." As an immersion serves to bring the thing immersed under the influence of the element into which it is submerged, so in the evolution of the present word a thing becomes baptized by another when even without physical intusposition or envelopment one thing exercises a positive influence over another. Apart from the recognition of this distinction, little understanding of many uses for this word will be gained. A complete baptism is recognized in the New Testament, for example, when without an intusposition or physical envelopment an individual is baptized into the remission of sin, into repentance, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, baptized by drinking the cup of suffering, or as Israel was baptized into Moses by the cloud and the sea, or when one is brought under the power of the Holy Spirit, or when by the Spirit all believers are baptized into Christ's Body. The term *secondary* as related to the latter sense or use of βαπτίζω does not imply inferiority; it is secondary only so far as one meaning is derived from the other. The secondary import of this word is employed in all passages which refer to real (the Spirit's) baptism and the relative importance of this baptism over every other is immeasurable. No less an authority than Dr. J. W. Dale, who with great scholarship and sincerity spent much of his lifetime in preparing four large volumes on the subject of baptism, has asserted that in his opinion βαπτίζω is used only in its secondary meaning in the New Testament.

Baleful neglect of the doctrine of the Spirit's baptism is reflected in lexicons and theological works on baptism. Definitions are given and statements made which seem not to recognize the special use of βαπτίζω in relation to the Holy Spirit or the Body of Christ. Men may differ, as they have, over the meaning of this word in ritual baptism, but there is no room for a difference of opinion over the use of the word or its meaning and implications when employed to indicate that baptism which the Holy Spirit accomplishes. Some writers, indeed, have assumed to discuss this word without reference to its use in relation to real baptism.

Much has been written earlier in this work (Vol. VI more especially) on real baptism or that baptism which the Holy Spirit accomplishes, and it has been pointed out that, according to the definition assigned the secondary meaning of this word, the gift of the Spirit by Christ is a baptism (cf. Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:4–5), and since the Holy Spirit is received by every believer at the moment he is saved, he is thus baptized by the Spirit, having been brought under the influence of the Spirit. However, as true as this interpretation is, it should be distinguished from the erroneous teaching which contends that the Spirit is received as a second work of grace, which teaching confounds the Spirit's filling—that which is unto an empowered life—with the Spirit's baptism into Christ's Body, that which is unto position and standing before God.

What is termed *the baptism by the Spirit*—not, *in* or *unto the Spirit*—is His mighty undertaking by which He joins the individual believer to Christ's Body and thus to Christ Himself as the Head of the Body. Because of this great achievement on the part of the Spirit, the believer is from that moment in Christ and is thus brought under the influence of His Headship. No influence could be more transforming, more purifying relative to position, or more vital in its outworking than that engendered by a removal from the fallen headship of Adam into the exalted Headship of Christ. No other transformation is comparable to this. Though there is no physical intusposition when one is

brought under the influence which the gift of the Spirit provides and though there is no physical intusposition when one is brought by the Spirit into the Headship of the resurrected Christ, the New Testament designates these influences as baptisms and sets them forth as vital and real above all other baptisms. Especially is union to Christ seen to be distinctive in point of far-reaching transformations. It is thus properly designated the real baptism. This vast theme has its due consideration under Pneumatology (Vol. VI).

BAPTISM, RITUAL

In approaching the theme of ritual baptism it is recognized that over this subject the most bitter divisions have been allowed to arise in the church—divisions and exclusions for which it is difficult to account in the light of two facts: (1) the great majority of those who are given to separations confess that there is no saving value in the ordinance and (2) all who look into it with freedom from prejudice recognize that fruitful, spiritual Christians are to be found on each side of the controversy. In a work on Systematic Theology which purports to be faithful in declaring all aspects of Biblical doctrine, the consideration of ritual baptism cannot be eliminated, though to do so would be easier and to avoid countering good men would in itself be desirable. If the history of the controversy as it has been waged in the past few generations is a fair basis on which to estimate the present and the future, an extended work on theology itself—in spite of the way it reaches into all such vast fields of inexhaustible themes—may, like friendships, Christian unity, and fellowship, be discredited and shunned for no other reason than that this one ordinance is presented in a way which is contrary to the views which another holds. In such a matter as the mode of ritual baptism and what it represents, agreement with all good men is impossible when some of them are on each side of the controversy. It is reasonable, however, that those who are quite free to publish their own views should accord the same liberty to those who disagree. Securing converts to an idea certainly is not intended in the discussion to follow. That which is sincerely believed on each side of the controversy is to be stated as nearly as can be done apart from personal prejudice. The value to the student of such a declaration may not be questioned, for, regardless of his own convictions and however they were formed, he should know precisely what others believe who hold different views, else how can he be assured that he is justified in the position he defends? A man is on weak ground when he speaks vehemently and dogmatically respecting his own belief and yet does not know or understand what, in exact terms, his opponent believes. That an individual after many years of investigation should come to the point of personal convictions on such a divisive theme as this needs no apology.

This unhappy discussion has usually centered upon the question of the mode by which ritual baptism should be administered. The immersionist (this designation though inaccurate, as will be demonstrated later, is used here by way of accommodation) is one who demands an intusposition of the whole body in water. The affusionist is one who sprinkles or pours the baptismal water. With regard to proportion in membership, the former class of Christians may claim perhaps one third and the latter two-thirds of the Protestant Church. However, the issue is not one of the mode of expressing an idea or teaching; it concerns the actual idea to be expressed. In the case of the immersionist, the object believed to lie back of the ordinance is to enact the believer’s codeath, coburial, and coresurrection with Christ, and with that in view the mode he employs is to him appropriate. In the case of the affusionist, the object lying behind the ordinance is to represent the coming of the Holy Spirit into the believer’s life with all the varied values of that Presence. With this in view, the mode he employs is to him appropriate. The immersionist rejects all forms of affusion

simply because it does not express his understanding of the meaning of the ordinance. In like manner, the affusionist rejects the mode the immersionist employs simply because it does not express his understanding of the meaning in the ordinance. The disagreement, when centered on the mode without reference to the meaning, has been carried on in aimless and hopeless fashion. Less assertive human determination of mode and more humble and gracious consideration of the meaning in ritual baptism is greatly to be desired.

The instructed affusionist recognizes much significance in the facts that the greatest operations of the Holy Spirit are in the New Testament termed baptisms—the same word being used as is employed when referring to ritual baptism—and that the Apostle writes of "one baptism" (Eph. 4:5), not, one mode of baptism. By the affusionist this reference to "one baptism" is explained on the grounds that ritual baptism is but the outward sign or symbol of an inward reality, which reality is wrought by the Holy Spirit, and that the real and the ritual baptisms thus combine to form *one baptism* as substance and corresponding shadow (cf. 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27). The affusionist also believes that, as there is one unquestioned ordinance—the Lord's Supper—which represents the death of Christ, it is reasonable to expect.that there would be, not a second ordinance representing that death, but an ordinance representing the work of the Holy Spirit.

When ritual baptism is deemed to be a cleansing from defilement (cf. Acts 22:16), the immersionist contends that, in so far as baptism is a cleansing, water symbolizes the cleansing blood of Christ and that the water when applied must cover the entire body. On the other hand, the affusionist, believing that it is the blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin and that His blood must be applied by the Holy Spirit, understands ritual baptism to be related thus to the work of the Holy Spirit. The affusionist observes that all ceremonial cleansings prescribed in the Old Testament were accomplished by sprinkling, pouring, or laving, but not by intusposition.

The immersionist relates ritual baptism to Christ's death, burial, and resurrection and on the ground of the fact that the believer is said to have been baptized into Christ's death, burial, and resurrection according to Romans 6:1–10 and Colossians 2:11–13. It is believed by the immersionist that, on the strength of these passages, the candidate for ritual baptism should enact the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ as a recognition of the relation which these hold to salvation, forgiveness, and justification, whereas the affusionist believes that these Scriptures cited above are related only to the ground of sanctification, concerning which no ordinance has been prescribed. The affusionist, if instructed in the truth at all, believes that the codeath, coburial, and coresurrection referred to in these two passages have only to do with the judgment of the sin nature, that no instruction is given to enact what Christ has done but rather the believer is enjoined to "reckon" that to be achieved which Christ has wrought and to be encouraged to believe that deliverance from the power of sin is thus made possible, the Holy Spirit being free so to act for children of God.

The claim of the affusionist is that, though immersion may have been practiced from early times, it was not until the last three or four hundred years that ritual baptism was given any meaning other than as related to the Holy Spirit's work in the believer. On the basis of this, it is believed that through a misinterpretation of both Romans 6:1–10 and Colossians 2:11–13 ritual baptism came to be considered by those practicing immersion to be an independent, unrelated, and sufficient baptism in itself, thus proposing so to speak two distinct baptisms. Affusionists, it may be said, are often misunderstood because they do not stress the mode of ritual baptism. They believe that ritual baptism does not consist in the *way* it is done, but in the *thing* that is done.

So, also, those among immersionists who practice trine immersion require that the candidate be dipped face down (since Christ bowed His head in death) three times—once in the name of the Father, once in the name of the Son, and once in the name of the Holy Ghost. The majority of immersionists reject trine immersion as having no direct warrant in the New Testament and because they see in it an enacting three times of that which Christ did but once.

Since it is true that the meaning of ritual baptism is expressed to some degree by the mode of its administration, it is important to note that which may be intimated in the Scriptures respecting the mode. The vast majority of adherents to the church assume that the mode practiced by their denomination and to which they have been accustomed from childhood is the right and only mode. Some, however, upon reading the Authorized Version translation, which reflects the personal convictions of some of its translators, believe that the mode is there indicated in the text and this without an understanding of what the original declares. Though beyond the field of investigation on the part of those who consider only the text in English, the truth here, as in every doctrinal issue, is determined by the original. In this connection it is of interest to note that, while in every generation of recent history there have been scholarly men who believed in and practiced immersion, there have been, as pointed out by Dr. A. T. Robertson, the Greek scholar of the Southern Baptist Church, but eighteen worthy New Testament lexicographers and every one of these, being clergymen, practiced affusion in their ministry. Dr. Robertson also declares that no immersionist has ever written a New Testament lexicon; but he fails to give a reason why these eighteen men, though in their lexicons they give *immersion* as the primary meaning of βαπτίζω, practiced affusion as he asserts they did. In seeking the answer, rather than to assume that these good men were untrue to their convictions, it would be well to look more carefully at the Greek text which they interpret and to give scope, as these men evidently did, to the more vital, secondary meaning of the word βαπτίζω. This line of investigation should consider (1) the meaning of the word, (2) the Scriptures involved, (3) the prepositions employed, and (4) the baptism incidents recorded.

1. The Meaning of the Word. Continuing the discussion, as begun above under real baptism, respecting the primary and secondary meanings of the two words βάπτω and βαπτίζω, it is now to be emphasized that the secondary meaning of βαπτίζω obtains in all instances where there is a baptism apart from a physical intusposition or envelopment. To illustrate this, Christ termed His anticipated sufferings a baptism (Matt. 20:22–23). This could not refer to the ritual baptism by John which was then long accomplished, nor to a baptism with the Spirit in which He as Son could have no part. This passage means nothing unless suffering is itself a true baptism. Hence the affusionist in his credence believes that even ritual baptism, which to him represents the work of the Holy Spirit, calls for no physical envelopment.

Again, the same technical distinction in meaning obtains between the two Greek words βάπτω and βαπτίζω in their primary sense as is seen between *dip* and *immerse*, which are the English equivalents. A dipping involves two actions—*putting in* and *taking out*, whereas to immerse involves but one action—*putting in*, and in the case of the baptism into Christ with its limitless advantages (cf. 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27) to be taken out is the one thing not desired. In the light of this it is clear that to say, as has commonly been said, that "βαπτίζω means *to dip* and only *to dip* throughout all Greek literature" is erroneous and misleading when the word does not mean *to dip* in any Greek literature. All of this indicates the inaccuracy in use of the word *immersion* to represent a ritual baptism by dipping. In this same connection, it is both suggestive and instructive to consider the use of βαπτίζω in the Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Old Testament thought to have been made by seventy scholarly men about two hundred years before Christ. The accepted meaning of this word is disclosed

there. It will be found that βαπτίζω translates five Hebrew words—*to affright* (once), *to come* (once), *to Pierce* (once), *to dye* (three times), and *to cleanse* (sixteen times). Some of these actions could not include an intusposition and none of them require it. Truth, then, must be established by more than bald, dogmatic, erroneous human assertions. The affusionist claims it cannot be proved that the mode of ritual baptism is indicated in the meaning of the word βαπτίζω.

2. The Scriptures Involved. Three passages develop the doctrinal significance of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection as one achievement on His part and as a substitution for others, namely, Romans 6:1–10; 1 Corinthians 15:3–4; and Colossians 2:11–13. 1 Corinthians 15:3–4 clearly declares Christ's death, burial, and resurrection as a substitute for sinners that they may be saved; it is unto forgiveness and justification for them. However, in the other passages—Romans 6:1–10 and Colossians 2:11–13—Christ's death, burial, and resurrection are referred to (in Colossians His death is termed a circumcision) as a judgment of the old nature. Not apprehending the stupendous importance and meaning of Christ's death for the believer's sin nature and not realizing that this achievement by Christ calls for no re-enacting by an ordinance, some, being impressed with the meaningful words in these Scriptures (baptism, burial, and resurrection), have concluded that the mode of ritual baptism is indicated by these two passages. Over against this the affusionist, if aware of the truth at all, contends that these Scriptures, like 1 Corinthians 15:3–4, teach that which Christ has done—a thing to believe—and not a thing to be done. Cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection, being wrought and accomplished for the believer, become a baptism, a dominating influence over the believer which is as immeasurable in its extent and value as infinity itself. Considering further the Scripture involved, it may be observed that much has been made of the statement in John 3:23 which reads, "And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized." When the arresting words *much water* are properly understood as *many springs*—such as would be required for the physical needs of the throngs of people and their beasts—the passage contributes nothing toward a modal ideal for ritual baptism. Ænon is likely to be identified as a sloping hillside with springs of water, but no body of water available.

Thus, again, the affusionist contends that it cannot be proved from the important Scriptures involved that ritual baptism is appointed to be given by immersion.

3. The Prepositions Employed. The usual impression regarding the mode of ritual baptism which one might gain who reads only the English text of the New Testament is molded more by the prepositions that are used in the English text than by any other factor in the case. Four prepositions come up at once for consideration. The point to be developed which concerns all of serious mind is that the particular translation of these prepositions as found in the English text is not the only meaning which the same English text assigns to these words in other like instances. All familiar with the Greek text recognize that a great latitude of meaning is given to prepositions, and that usually the correct sense will be determined by the more or less obvious meaning belonging to the text in which the word is found. It should hardly be needful to state that because a certain translation appears in the English text it is not necessarily the best rendering. The prepositions to be considered are:

a. 'Εν, which has 36 possible meanings and which in Matthew 3:6 has been translated '*in* Jordan' is also translated in the English Bible by the words *at, on,* or *with* 330 times, could be so translated in the text cited. The sense is somewhat changed when it is translated 'at Jordan' rather than 'in Jordan.'

b. 'Από has 20 English meanings, and is used thus in Matthew 3:16: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." This preposition, here translated *out of,* is translated

by the word *from* 374 times in the New Testament and could properly be so translated in Matthew 3:16, in which case the declaration would be that Jesus went up straightway *from* the water.

c. Εἰς has 26 meanings in English and is used in Acts 8:38 for the declaration that "they went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." This preposition is translated in the New Testament 538 times by the word *unto* and could as accurately be so rendered here. It will be observed that going unto or into the water did not constitute the baptism, for Philip also went in with the eunuch.

d. Ἐκ has 24 English meanings and is translated in Acts 8:39 thus, "And when they were come up *out* of the water …" This same word is translated *from* 168 times in the New Testament and could as correctly have been so translated here. Thus it would read that Philip and the eunuch went down unto the water and came up from the water.

Though the immersionist depends much on the way these prepositions are translated in order to establish the mode of ritual baptism, the affusionist contends that the mode of baptism cannot be determined by the prepositions used.

4. The Incidents Recorded. First in this kind of list would be the baptism of Christ, which event has had an extended treatment as a division of Christology (Vol. V) and need not be restated here. It is often declared by those who practice immersion that the believer is to "follow Christ in baptism" assuming that Christ was baptized by immersion; but, whatever the mode employed, the believer may follow Christ in moral issues only—not in His official acts—and His baptism, being altogether unique and wholly unrelated to any feature of the Christian ritual, is official and therefore never presented in the New Testament as an example. Christ was baptized at the hands of John but not by John's baptism as such, which was unto repentance and the remission of sins. Similarly, what is termed *John's baptism*, since it was not accepted by the Apostle Paul—he rebaptized twelve men who had submitted to John's baptism (cf. Acts 19:1–7)—does not constitute Christian baptism. It is pointed out by the affusionist that the baptism of all three thousand converts of Pentecost by immersion is an impossibility owing to the unpreparedness of the vast throng and of those who officiated, and owing also to the lack of adequate facilities for such a stupendous undertaking. But the case of the three thousand being baptized could easily be a reference to the Spirit's baptism. So, also, it is noted by the affusionists that the Apostle Paul stood up where he was upon the arrival of Ananias (Acts 9:18) and was baptized. The case of Philip baptizing the eunuch, as has been indicated, is much varied by the interpretation given the prepositions that are used.

The affusionist claims that no mode of ritual baptism is directly taught in the New Testament, but that as sprinkling, pouring, and laving were prescribed in the Old Testament for consecration and cleansing and as the Jews of Christ's day were accustomed only to such modes, it is most probable that these modes were brought forward into the new order. Had there been a change from the Old Testament requirement to a new mode for the church, it ought to have been indicated clearly. It may be concluded, then, that the mode of ritual baptism is not determined either by the meaning of the word βαπτίζω or the Scriptures involved, the prepositions or the incidents recorded. Had these obvious facts been recognized, much of the present useless contention and separation might have been avoided.

Pedobaptism. Any consideration of the general theme of ritual baptism is not complete unless some attention is given to pedo or infant baptism. Here again there is difference of opinion and practice, but the same demarcation which divides over mode of baptism is not found at this point.

Though the great majority of affusionists practice pedobaptism, some practice it and have infants baptized by dipping in water. The pedobaptism problem is not so much one of mode, then, as of baptizing infants at all. Those who reject infant baptism do so with emphasis upon the idea that ritual baptism must be restricted to believers, therefore it could not apply to children. The same company declare that they find no warrant in the New Testament for the practice. On the other hand, the very large proportion of the professing church do baptize infants and for various reasons. (1) By some who practice pedobaptism it is assumed that there is saving merit in ritual baptism, which feature of the doctrine is rejected by the great majority of Protestants administering infant baptism. (2) It is believed by a large percentage that there is some connection between the rite of circumcision as required for the Jewish child according to the Old Testament and the baptism of children according to the New Testament. In the attempt to establish and magnify its one-covenant idea, Covenant Theology has contended for this supposed relationship between the two dispensations. Israelites, however, were not partakers of their covenants on the ground of circumcision; they were born into covenant relationship to God. Therefore, it is not demonstrated that children by baptism become "children of the covenant." To be consistent, those who baptize infants because of an assumed covenant relationship should baptize only male children and only on the eighth day. (3) Others believe that since the household was included in five out of seven baptisms mentioned in the Acts infants were included. Those opposing pedobaptism claim it cannot be demonstrated that there were infants or small children in these particular households. But such as defend pedobaptism believe that it is highly probable some children were included and that the term *household* is not intended to represent childless homes, but the normal family with its children. (4) Instructed parents in presenting children for baptism magnify the household promises set forth in the New Testament (cf. 1 Cor. 7:12–14), believing that the promises for blessing, though not for salvation, extend to the families of God's children. It is contended that it is the right of Christian parents to assert their faith respecting the future salvation of their child by the baptism of that child. The energy with which pedobaptism is rejected often all but implies that the one who so resists holds perhaps unconsciously that ritual baptism is a saving ordinance. Whatever may or may not have been included in the records set forth in Acts, household baptism was enjoined and practiced.

In concluding this discussion of ritual baptism it may be stated that all who claim the right of private judgment in the matter of the mode of their baptism should accord the same right to others. There should be latitude enough in any assembly of believers for these variations. The sin—if such there be—of administering this ordinance in an unscriptural way could never compare with the greater sin of exclusion, separation, and the breaking of the outward manifestations of the unity of the Spirit. That believers remain in the unbroken bonds of fellowship and affection is, according to the New Testament, far more important than is the mode of ritual baptism. The world is to be impressed with the love of Christians one for the other (cf. John 13:34–35; 17:21–23). It is needless to point out that separations and contentions over a mode of baptism have little value in the eyes of the unsaved.

BIBLIOLOGY

Having been considered at length in Volume I of this work, this, the first major division of Systematic Theology, need be given no more than a brief restatement here. Nothing could be more fundamental in the sphere of human knowledge than that God has caused His own Word to be written in a form which man can comprehend and has preserved that Word through the ages of human history for the benefit of all men. The extent of the field of knowledge thus added to man's own restricted

observation is beyond human computation. Since this vast unfolding of added truth has come to men and has been their possession for more than three millenniums and has all been incorporated into that which man now understands, it becomes no more than a speculation to talk of what man could have known had he been left to himself or to ponder what, in its far-reaching effect, has been revealed to him through the ages. Man began under the direct tutelage of God in the Garden of Eden and has ever been indebted to God for many and varied revelations. Shutting God out of all consideration and thus ignoring the source of practically all that they know, unbelieving men are filled with vainglory over what is assumed to be the attainments of man. Some facts are discovered about the stars and their systematic arrangement, yet with little or no disposition to recognize the One who created the stars and who upholds all things. Thus in astronomy, as in other branches of science, the inability of fallen man to see beyond the reach of his own limited powers is evident. No sense of appreciation seems to exist that he has been given an eye to see or an arm to achieve. All of this is exceedingly unnatural, as likewise is the rejection of God's revelation, and speaks of a fallen humanity under the domination of the great enemy of God. On the other hand, to the mind that by saving grace has been rescued from the insanity of sin and is enlightened by the Spirit of God, the Bible becomes what it actually is, the very Word of God to man which imparts treasures of knowledge as marvelous as the realms of light from whence they proceed. No declaration is more revealing nor could there be a more accurate analysis of the mass of unregenerate humanity in its attitude toward the Scriptures than that which affirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14). And how the sphere of human limitations is unveiled by Christ when He said: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3)! So, also, it is declared, "Through faith we understand" (Heb. 11:3).

As science creates nothing but rather seeks to discover the character of the realities which God has caused to exist, so the theologian strives to comprehend, analyze, and systematize that which God has revealed. The theologian creates nothing; his sphere of endeavor, strictly speaking, is not even that of demonstrating that the materials he handles are real or trustworthy. If by him the Word of God is held in doubt, he is by so much disqualified even to enter the theologian's field of investigation. Accepting all that the Bible claims for itself, however, the theologian is concerned with the Bible's message.

Evidence that the Bible is God's Word written appears in a form both *external* and *internal*. That which is external lies in the field of the Bible's unique history, its essential character, and its effects. That which is internal relates to its own claims for itself, which claims are fully sustained.

Various major divisions of the structure of the Bible and consideration of its doctrinal message have already been presented and enlarged upon throughout this work. The more vital facts respecting the character of the Bible are:

1. A Revelation from God. By this declaration it is asserted that the Bible presents material and facts which could not otherwise be known by man. To become aware of these truths and to list them may well occupy the student for a lifetime. Though there are many subjects presented in the Bible about which men would naturally have some information apart from revelation, it is clear that in the greater spheres of truth he is wholly restricted to that which God has disclosed, and the true value of what he might know naturally is completely qualified when seen in its relation to that which is revealed.

2. Inspired by God, which means that all Scripture proceeds from God as if His very breath (cf. 2 Tim. 3:16). Portions of the truth revealed may have some recognition by men apart from revelation. Its declaration in the Sacred Text of God's utterance, nevertheless, is said by God in God's own way, and therefore is correct to infinity. Such a statement refers only to the original writings and not to translations of Scripture, though doubtless God has exercised competent direction and protection over translations; certainly there is no direct statement from God that translations would be made without error. Concerning the original text, it is said that holy men "spake as they were moved" (or borne along) by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21).

3. Understood Only by Divine Illumination. Even things of Scripture otherwise commonplace are known in their true value only by the illuminating of the Spirit. Three human attitudes toward the Bible are declared in 1 Corinthians 2:14–3:1. The unsaved or "natural man" cannot "receive" revealed truth, the spiritual man "discerneth all things," and the carnal Christian can receive only the milk and not the meat of the Word of God. Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would guide into all truth (John 16:13–15), and the Apostle states that the Spirit is given to the believer that he may know the things of God (1 Cor. 2:12).

4. Must Be Rightly Interpreted. The whole field of hermeneutics, which is a theological discipline in itself, is introduced here. Doubtless the key to the understanding of the Bible is the recognition of the specific purpose of God in each of the succeeding ages of human history. Dispensational distinctions have always engendered true expository preaching, while Covenant Theology has tended toward a closing and slighting of the Word of God.

5. A Life-Imparting Message. The Word of God is active and dynamic. Isaiah declares that it will "accomplish" that which God purposes for it to do (Isa. 55:11), Jeremiah likens the Word of God to fire and to a hammer that breaketh in pieces the rock (Jer. 23:29), and in Hebrews 4:12 it is said to be "quick and powerful"—that is, living and active. Happy is he who through knowledge of the Scriptures is able to wield this living power.

6. Its Canonicity Determined by God, that is, the choice from all existing literature of the books that were to form the two Testaments was under the care of God. Having caused certain documents to be written with a view to their place in the Sacred Volume, it is certain that He would cause them to take the place which He had assigned them. It is true that men acted in the forming of the canon, including in it such books as had the evident imprint of God upon them; but still God was guiding them in the selection, just as He guided the men who wrote the text itself.

7. Speaks with the Authority of God. The primary character of the Bible is such as to lend it authority. It speaks as the voice of Him who created all things and to whom all things belong. To those who believe the Bible and heed its precepts it becomes an unerring lamp unto the feet and a light unto the path (Ps. 119:105). The Word of God fails not.

BLASPHEMY

No sin of man is more obviously a repudiation of God and insult to His holy Person than that of blasphemy, which sin in its usual form consists of taking a name of Deity upon the lips in an empty, idle, and trifling manner. There is such a sin as that of addressing God Himself with blasphemy. In his coming day the beast, or man of sin, will assault God and His name (Rev. 13:6), and thus in the

hour of God's judgments upon men they will blaspheme God and curse His name (Rev. 16:9, 11, 21). However, blasphemy in general is not addressed to God and consists in a more or less irreverent use of His name in oaths and curses addressed to other people or things. Over against this may be cited the formal reverence on the part of Israel when for centuries they, with more or less real consideration, refused to pronounce the name of Jehovah, considering that particular name too sacred for human utterance.

1. The Old Testament Doctrine. This doctrine is set forth in the following Scriptures: Exodus 20:7; Leviticus 24:10–16; 1 Kings 21:10–23; 2 Kings 19:6, 22; Isaiah 37:6, 23; 65:7. The punishment for blasphemy, like that related to every other of the Ten Commandments, was stoning unto death. It is asserted that David's sin caused the enemies of Jehovah to blaspheme (cf. 2 Sam. 12:14).

2. The New Testament Doctrine. A much wider range for the possibilities of evil through blasphemy is presented in the New Testament. A fivefold division may be suggested.

a. BLASPHEMY BY JEWS AGAINST CHRIST, which took place according to Acts 13:45 and 18:6: "But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming"; "And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles." In the light of the penalty by stoning which they risked, it is evident that the hatred for, and resistance of, the truth on the part of the Jews toward Christ was as violent as it could be. The precise form of their blasphemy is not revealed. Probably it was a direct cursing of Christ, whom the Apostle proclaimed as God manifest in the flesh.

b. BLASPHEMY AGAINST IDOLS. In Acts 19:37 intimation is given that it was somewhat common for men unsympathetic to an idol to blaspheme that venerated object.

c. BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE PERSON OF GOD. This is most serious by its very nature. Reference is not to the taking of the name of God in vain; it is rather blasphemy directly addressed to God and against Himself. The passages, already cited above, were Revelation 13:6 and 16:9, 11, 21.

d. CHRIST ACCUSED OF BLASPHEMY. It was claimed by the Jews in their unbelief toward Christ that He blasphemed when saying He had power on earth to forgive sins and when He actually did forgive sin. They said, "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?" (Mark 2:7; cf. Matt. 9:3; Luke 5:21).

e. BLASPHEMY IN RELATION TO THE HOLY SPIRIT. This special form of attack has been termed *the unpardonable sin*. That blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in a certain form of it was said by Christ to be something unpardonable is certain. After the Jews had ascribed to Satan the works which Christ wrought by the Holy Spirit, it is written that Christ said to them, "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (Matt. 12:31–32); "Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost bath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit" (Mark 3:28–30). For want of attention to all that is involved in these and other related Scriptures, there has been a most injurious application on the part of preachers, especially evangelists, of these very Scriptures to the present age. First, it

should be noted that this sin against the Holy Spirit consisted in asserting that Christ's works, which were wrought by the Holy Spirit, were accomplished on the contrary by Satan. Such a setting could not be found now since Christ is not in the world as He was then, nor is He undertaking in the same way to do works by the Holy Spirit. It is therefore impossible for this particular sin to be committed today. To say that attributing works that men may be doing in the power of the Spirit to Satan is the same offense is to go utterly beyond what is written. The possibility of this particular sin being committed ceased with Christ's removal from the earth. But even more emphatically it is to be declared that the so-called unpardonable sin cannot be present where there is a "whosoever will" gospel being preached, else reservations must be made to the effect that a "whosoever will" gospel must except those who have committed an unpardonable sin. Every invitation and promise related to the salvation of lost men would have to carry those same restrictions if there were an unpardonable sin. The promises and invitations would then be addressed to those only who have not so sinned. That no such condition is ever imposed in any grace relationship of the present need not be argued. In attempting to project an unpardonable sin into this age, men have seized upon almost any serious evil as the unpardonable sin, but always without Biblical support. Often Hebrews 6:4–9; 10:26–29; and 1 John 5:16 have been referred to as added Scripture bearing upon supposedly unpardonable sin. These passages, however, though deeply serious in their import, bear no relation to an unpardonable sin. When considering the subject of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it may well be noted that, quite beyond human explanation, men do not swear in the name of the Third Person. From this fact it may be concluded that there is now and ever has been a peculiar sanctity belonging to the Holy Spirit. His very name and title implies this.

3. Blasphemy in General. Such taking of the name of God in vain as is prohibited by Exodus 20:7 consists in using a name of Deity with an oath whether consciously or carelessly done. Usually the thoughts of the one thus profaning the name are not directed to God in any sense at all.

BLINDNESS

In general, the truth respecting blindness is set forth by the Scriptures with reference to that which is physical, that which is judicial, and that which is spiritual. The theme is extensive and vital. These three aspects of blindness though somewhat related should be considered separately.

1. Physical. At a time when physical blindness due to disease met with no control, to be blind physically was a very common experience and, no doubt, that Christ in His day healed so many who were blind is to be explained by the fact that physical blindness and its healing are symbolical of both judicial and spiritual blindness and their healing. The cure of physical blindness was itself an amazing reality; there could be no doubt respecting its actual achievement by Christ. But ever to be kept in mind is the truth that He who wrought such wonders in healing the physically blind by so much proved regarding Himself how He is able to heal other forms of blindness as well. It was the testi mony of one whom He healed, "Whereas I was blind, now I see" (John 9:25). Growing out of this incident, a lengthy discussion between Christ and the Pharisees ensued. The healing of the blind man resulted in his own salvation, for later he said, "Lord, I believe." It is in this context that Christ connected the physical disability with Israel's judicial blindness. For a moment at least, too, the Pharisees seemed to realize the possibility of their being blind themselves. This passage reads: "And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. And some of the Pharisees which were with him heard these words,

and said unto him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth" (John 9:39–41). Here it is made clear that physical blindness and its cure symbolizes judicial blindness and its healing. Even blind Pharisees were able to see this relationship.

2. JUDICIAL. Only the Jews are concerned in this phase of the doctrine of blindness, and a difficult problem arises when it is remembered that this failure of sight comes upon them as a judgment from God. Racial responsibility is in view, otherwise no accounting can be made for the fact that later generations must suffer for the sins of their fathers. Such a situation would be more difficult to understand were it not for Jehovah's revealed purpose to bring that people eventually into everlasting blessing. The principle of racial sin and suffering as well as racial righteousness and blessing is announced in the second commandment, which declares: "I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments" (Ex. 20:5–6). The Jews of this dispensation are suffering, in part, for the sins of their fathers many centuries ago. Still, their sin in its national character will eventually be remembered no more. This hope is declared in the Scripture with great assurance. It is written, "Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The LORD of hosts is his name: if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD" (Jer. 31:35–37). Isaiah predicted blindness as due to fall upon Israel when he wrote the message, "And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed" (Isa. 6:9–10). This prediction assumes vital importance when it is observed that various New Testament passages quote it and as related to the present unforeseen age. Isaiah went on to say that a remnant of Israel which he described as a "tenth" (Isa. 6:13) will be enlightened. This same blindness the Apostle declares to be "in part" (Rom. 11:25), thus allowing again for the remnant of Israel who are to be saved in this age. Christ Himself takes up the Isaiah prediction as recorded in Matthew 13:14–15: "And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them" (cf. Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10; Acts 28:26–27). The rejection of Christ, indeed, was wholly within the counsels of God. When the Jews failed to believe, the Apostle John states, "But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him" (John 12:37–41). The natural branches had to be broken off for a time, to the end that a Gentile day of grace and the outcalling of the Church might be realized (cf. Rom. 11:17–27). Likewise the Apostle states that a veil is lying over the hearts of Israel in the present age. He declares, "But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old

testament; which vail is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away" (2 Cor. 3:14–16). As difficult as the problem may be in itself, the Scriptures assert that for their own national sins Israel is nationally blinded, but not all of them and only for the period of the outcalling of the Church. Of this angle it is written, "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins" (Rom. 11:25–27).

3. SPIRITUAL. The theme of spiritual blindness falls into two general divisions, namely, that of the unsaved and that of the carnal Christian.

a. Following directly upon the reference to a judicial blindness of Israel as declared in 2 Corinthians 3:14–16, is the disclosure regarding Satan's veiling of the minds of the unsaved relative to the gospel by which they may be saved. It is written, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (2 Cor. 4:3–4). Added to this important statement are other Scriptures which set forth truth regarding the fact that the unsaved are under the mighty power of Satan (cf. John 8:44; Eph. 2:1–2; Col. 1:13; 1 John 5:19). Any effort which reaches the unsaved, if it is to deliver them, must be sufficient to lift this veil which Satan has imposed (cf. John 16:7–11).

b. The carnal Christian's blindness and limitation when attempting to understand the Scriptures are described in 1 Corinthians 3:1: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ." The cure, as has been seen, for the blindness of the unsaved is the enlightenment which comes through salvation, while the cure for the blindness of the carnal believer is a more complete yielding to the indwelling Spirit.

BLOOD

In spite of the fact that circulation of the blood as the current through which all vitality moves and waste is eliminated was not established by science until 1615 A.D., the body's blood has in all human history been recognized, though it involved mystery, as the container of life and the symbol of relationships. The shedding of blood has always been accompanied by some degree of fear and daring. Bloodshed spells the taking of life. None who consider the Scriptures can doubt the truth that God relates blood to the life. Early in Genesis (9:4–6) He declared: "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." Blood had to be eliminated from Jewish foods, nor could it be mingled with sacrifice other than in shedding it. The direct statement of Leviticus 17:11 gives a clear and final declaration from God, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." The Biblical doctrine accordingly is subject to a threefold division—(1) sacrificial blood, (2) cleansing blood, and (3) blood as the seal of a covenant.

1. Sacrificial. The all-inclusive declaration on this point which sums up the Old Testament order and the New avers that "without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). It is *shed* blood which has always been required for deliverance, and thus it was in the type and the antitype, Christ in His crucifixion. The mystery of all that enters into the required blood sacrifice for sin cannot be traced through to its end. It traverses more of unknown realms than it does this realm. The truth of God's requiring a blood sacrifice as the righteous ground for the remission of sin was established beyond all dispute in Old Testament times. Though the many offerings sustained no efficacy in themselves to take away sin, they did speak of the immutable necessity of a ransom or redemption by blood as a cure for sin. To challenge this fact is not only to overlook the teaching set forth in the types and the New Testament's direct explanation of Christ's death, but it is to assume that the human valuation of sin may be equivalent to the divine evaluation. What authority, indeed, has a mortal—a mere creature—to arrogate to himself the right to sit in judgment upon God and declare unnecessary the principle which God has established and to which He at infinite cost unto Himself has conformed in all ages? The glorious message is, indeed, that efficacious blood has been shed and that men are invited to receive the value of it, that Christ's blood was shed as a sacrifice which God Himself provided to meet His demands against sin, and that this way of dealing with sin, from Abel's lamb to the day of Christ's death, is the only interpretation which fully and rightly construes all that the Bible presents on this its central theme of salvation.

2. Cleansing. At least two major New Testament passages proclaim the cleansing power of Christ's blood, and these so relate His work of purification to the Old Testament types that they serve both as a revelation respecting the present efficacy of Christ's blood and as clear interpretations of the types, with regard to their meaning and value. The passages are:

Hebrews 9:13–14. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" As the typical signification served for a ground upon which the unclean might be purified, so, and "much more," the blood of Christ purges the conscience (in removing the sense of guilt by the divine witness in the heart that a perfect forgiveness has been accomplished).

Hebrews 9:22–23. "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." In this instance the purging is of things which were ceremonially, or in conformity to the law, being cleansed by the sacrificial blood of beasts. So the blood of Christ as a much better sacrifice serves to purify heavenly things. What such a purification involves and what it accomplished is again within the higher sphere of reality where human knowledge is lacking and where conjecture is useless. "It is not possible," the same writer states in similar vein, "that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (Heb. 10:4); nevertheless, the sacrifice which Christ has completed perfects forever them that in their salvation are set apart unto God (Heb. 10:14) .

Likewise two passages out of very many in the New Testament may be cited which present the doctrine of cleansing through the blood of Christ.

Revelation 7:14. "And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." While the reference is to

tribulation saints, as the passage declares, the truth—equally applicable to all who are saved in this age—is the same in any case; believers are purified perfectly by the cleansing blood of the Lamb.

1 John 1:7. "… the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." In this Scripture the constant cleansing of the believer is in view—that cleansing which is conditioned upon walking "in the light, as he is in the light," which walk means ever the immediate confession of every known sin. In Numbers 19:1–22 this perpetual cleansing, as the antitype, finds its type.

3. Seal of the Covenant. An interesting and illuminating volume was written by Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull on *The Blood Covenant* in which he traces the history of blood covenants among the various peoples of the earth, but of far greater value is the plain declaration that there is now in force a covenant made in Christ's blood (Matt. 26:26–29; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25). God's purposes and His provisions are established in righteousness with surety through the redemption consummated by the shed blood of Christ.

Blood and Water. H. L. E. Luering, writing in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, presents the following which bears on the meaning of John 19:34:

> The physiological aspect of this incident of the crucifixion has been first discussed by Gruner (*Commentatio de morte Jesu Christi vera*, Halle, 1805), who has shown that the blood released by the spear-thrust of the soldier must have been extravasated before the opening of the side took place, for only so could it have been poured forth in the described manner. While a number of commentators have opposed this view as a fanciful explanation, and have preferred to give the statement of the evangelist a symbolical meaning in the sense of the doctrines of baptism and eucharist (so Baur, Strauss, Reuss and others), some modern physiologists are convinced that in this passage a wonderful phenomenon is reported to us, which, inexplicable to the sacred historian, contains for us an almost certain clue to the real cause of the Saviour's death. Dr. Stroud (*On the Physiological Cause of the Death of Christ*, London, 1847) basing his remarks on numerous postmortems, pronounced the opinion that here we had a proof of the death of Christ being due not to the effects of crucifixion but to "laceration or rupture of the heart" as a consequence of supreme mental agony and sorrow. It is well attested that usually the suffering on the cross was very prolonged. It often lasted two or three days, when death would supervene from exhaustion. There were no physical reasons why Christ should not have lived very much longer on the cross than He did. On the other hand, death caused by laceration of the heart in consequence of great mental suffering would be almost instantaneous. In such a case the phrase "of a broken heart," becomes literally true. The life blood flowing through the aperture or laceration into the pericardium or caul of the heart, being extravasated, soon coagulates into the red clot (blood) and the limpid serum (water). This accumulation in the heart-sac was released by the spear-thrust of the soldier (which here takes providentially the place of a postmortem without which it would have been impossible to determine the real cause of death), and from the gaping wound there flow the two component parts of blood distinctly visible" (I, 489, 1915 edition).

BODY

The general Biblical truth regarding the body yields to a threefold division, namely, (1) the human organism, (2) Christ's physical organism, and (3) Christ's mystical Body.

1. The Human Organism. In the New Testament a marked distinction must be made between αῶμα and σάρξ. The former is generally used to indicate physical flesh, while the latter is broader in its import, referring at times to the physical body (cf. Heb. 5:7) and at other times incorporating that which is immaterial and ethical into its meaning, with specific reference to the fallen nature of man. The great Apostle wrote, "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" and in the same context also: "sin [the nature] that dwelleth in me," "sin which is in my members," and "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:15–25). These declarations demonstrate the truth that the Apostle included in the word *flesh* all which constitutes the unregenerate man. The present body is unredeemed as yet even though redemption has been applied to the soul and spirit. This essential truth respecting the believer's body—that it remains unredeemed—is declared in Romans 8:23, where the saved one is said to be waiting for the redemption of his body, which redemption will occur when Christ returns. As for the future of the believer's body, it is said to become, when redeemed and changed, like Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21), and to be conformed to His body instantly at the rapture (cf. 1 Cor. 15:42–44, 51–52). Since the human body is the medium of expression for the immaterial part of man, the flesh is also conceived as being the expression of the "old man," or sin which is in the members of the body. In this connection the Apostle refers to "the body of sin" (Rom. 6:6). In like manner, he compares the flesh with its sin nature to a body of death (Rom. 7:24), or a dead body which he must carry with him wherever he goes. This, again, is the same "body of the sins of the flesh" which Christ judged when He died unto the believer's sin nature (Rom. 8:3; Gal. 5:24; Col. 2:11). Distinguishing between the body and the spiritual life within it that God bestows on faith, the Apostle suggests that the life from Him is a "treasure" which is held in an earthen vessel (2 Cor. 4:7). This body which in its present living state is mortal—subject to death—will, if death does not ensue, put on immortality; and should death ensue, the body which because of death puts on corruption will at the resurrection of saved ones put on incorruption. The body which is to be the believer's forever in glory is adapted to the spirit of man, while that same body in its present estate is adapted to the soul of man (1 Cor. 15:44–46); and whether the Christian goes by death and resurrection and so through corruption into incorruption or by translation into immortality being instantly changed from mortal to immortal, the end is a standardized reality. It will be a body like Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21). There is as much promise for the future of the believer's body as there is for the future of his soul and spirit.

It seems evident to some from 2 Corinthians 5:1–8 that an intermediate body is prepared in heaven for believers who by death are separated from the present organism, which organism will see corruption until the resurrection. The intermediate body would be occupied until Christ comes and the present body is reclaimed in all its resurrection glory. The body referred to in 2 Corinthians 5:1–8 is said to be "our house which is from heaven," one that in character belongs to the sphere of eternal things and serves to avoid even a moment of disembodiment for the believer.

2. Christ's Physical Organism. That which is essential to a true humanity and required if an all-sufficient, bloodshedding sacrifice were to be made, namely, a human body, was acquired by Christ through His physical birth. For that body He gave thanks when about to come into the world, and all in view of the failure of animal sacrifices to deal finally with the problem of sin (Heb. 10:4–7). It is significant that a record has thus been made of Christ's valuation of His physical body and that His primary thought was for this to be made an all-satisfying sacrifice. With reference to His kingship and so likewise to a rejected King's death He said, "For this cause came I into the world" (John 18:37). In vain do artists attempt their imaginary portraits of Christ in His humiliation. That appearance has gone forever (cf. 2 Cor. 5:16). Thus, also, Christ's human body served as a veil to hide His essential glory. Only once did His glory penetrate that veil (2 Pet. 1:16–18). It is probable

that His glory was still somewhat veiled during the fortyday postresurrection ministry and until His final ascension. John, who saw Christ in every situation when He was here on earth, even as Christ appeared after resurrection, fell at His feet as one dead when he saw Christ in glory (Rev. 1:17) . In that body in which He lived and died He arose, and in that same body He is being glorified. Thus glorified, He will in that same body come again.

3. Christ's Mystical Body. The figure most employed to represent the relationship which obtains between Christ and the Church is that of the human body with its many members and its head. The immeasurable reality given the believer as he comes into his new position in Christ by the Spirit's baptism is illustrated by the idea of joining a member to some human body; and, as the functions of the members in such a body differ, so the service of believers varies according to the will of the living Head. Vital union to Christ is the glorious truth which the figure sets forth. No such relationship obtained in the Old Testament order, nor will it appear in the coming kingdom.

BREAD

As the staff of life, the most universal and the most complete article of human food, bread at once becomes the symbol of God's supply for human needs. Thus, and by such a line of reasoning, bread has been considered a sacred element, and is especially so regarded by the Egyptians. In the Jewish economy bread sustained a typical significance while to the Christian it is symbolic. These general divisions of the subject may well be observed more specifically.

1. The Staff of Life. Bread is the term used by the Bible to indicate physical nourishment in general. As early in human history as Genesis 3:19 it is recorded that God said to Adam, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." The word *bread* occurs twenty-five times in Genesis and over a hundred times in the Pentateuch. Manna was termed bread—that which God rained from heaven for Israel (Ex. 16:4). For the most part, it would seem that bread was, in olden times, often the only item of food. Because of these facts nothing could serve better than bread as a symbol of God's care.

2. The Typical Significance. In this feature of the doctrine the more important particular is the wave loaves, which during the Feast of Pentecost were waved before Jehovah (cf. Lev. 23:17–20). The anti-type is the Church as seen by God ever since she began to be on the Day of Pentecost. The feast which immediately preceded Pentecost in Israel's calendar was that of First-Fruits, which anticipated Christ in resurrection. He became indeed the First-Fruits of them that slept (1 Cor. 15:20). It is deeply impressive and suggestive respecting God's perfect order that the Feast of Pentecost was measured off to occur just fifty days after the Feast of First-Fruits. This careful measurement is indicated by the words in Acts 2:1, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come." On this succession of feasts and the meaning of the wave loaves, Dr. C. I. Scofield writes in his notes bearing upon Leviticus 23:16–17: "The feast of Pentecost, vs. 15–22. The anti-type is the descent of the Holy Spirit to form the church. For this reason leaven is present, because there is evil in the church (Matt. 13:33; Acts 5:1, 10; 15:1). Observe, it is now *loaves;* not a sheaf of separate growths loosely bound together, but a real union of particles making one homogeneous *body*. The descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost united the separate disciples into one organism (1 Cor. 10:16, 17; 12:12, 13, 20). The wave-loaves were offered fifty days after the wave-sheaf. This is precisely the period between the resurrection of Christ and the formation of the church at Pentecost by the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:1–4; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13). … With the wave-sheaf no leaven was offered, for there was no evil

in Christ; but the wave loaves, typifying the church, are ‘baken with leaven,’ for in the church there is still evil” (*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 156–57).

3. The Symbolic Meaning. Having declared Himself to be the Bread which came down from heaven (cf. John 6:41), and having asserted that His flesh must be eaten and His blood must be drunk, and that the eating and drinking is needful if eternal life were to be received (John 6:48–58), Christ points out: “The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (John 6:63). Apart from the explanation on Christ’s part that He is referring to spiritual rather than physical realities, there is little left to do other than to join the many who then said, “This is an hard saying; who can hear it?” (John 6:60). However, in the context Christ has as definitely declared that this same gift of eternal life is conditioned with respect to its reception upon believing on Him (John 6:47), and, again, “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent” (John 6:29). Likewise, “Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” (John 6:37). It therefore follows that the demand for His flesh to be eaten and His blood to be drunk is an intensified and realistic figure pointing to the most actual reception of Christ as Savior. This figure of speech or intensification of truth becomes at once a correction of the error so prevalent, namely, that to believe upon Christ means no more than an acknowledgment of the historical fact of Christ including the worthy purpose of His life and death. That such credence is insufficient must ever be urged. It is only as there is Spirit-wrought vision and understanding and as the individual becomes committed to Him as a living Savior that saving faith can be exercised. There comes to be a repose in saving faith; for it is one thing to believe that Christ represents all He claimed to be, but quite another thing to depend upon Him with complete abandonment for a personal salvation. One thus committed to Christ can say with Peter, “Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life” (John 6:68). Such a testimony becomes clear evidence of the kind of confidence which rests in Christ alone. As food and drink are taken into one’s very being and assimilated, in like manner Christ must be received and assimilated.

It is not accounted strange, therefore, when Christ chooses bread for the symbol of His flesh as if something to be eaten and wine—“the blood of grapes”—for the symbol of His blood. It is in Jacob’s prophecy of Judah and his future with its foreshadowing of Christ that this remarkable passage respecting “the blood of grapes” occurs. The passage reads: “Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass’s colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes” (Gen. 49:11). Equally significant is the incident that occurred when Melchizedek met Abraham and “brought forth bread and wine” (Gen. 14:18)—symbols certainly of a completed redemption. What this meant to Abraham is not wholly revealed; however of Abraham Jesus Christ said, “Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad” (John 8:56). Just how much and specifically what Christ included in the words “my day” remains unknown. It is likely, however, in view of the fact of Abraham’s being the sole example of the outworking of grace as this has been set forth in the New Testament, that Abraham, as one “born out of due time,” saw the finished work of Christ and was saved in the same measure in which all are saved who now enter into the value of His finished work. The reception of the elements, bread and wine, not only speaks of redemption but also of a constant appropriation of Christ as the branch draws upon the vine. The breaking of bread furthermore is a testimony directly to Christ respecting this vital dependence upon Him.

BRIDE

At least seven figures with their varied contributions to the truth are needed to set forth the relation which Christ sustains to the Church—the saved ones of this dispensation. He is the Vine and they are the branches; He is the Shepherd and they are the sheep; He is the Chief Cornerstone and they are the stones in the building; He is the High Priest and they are a kingdom of priests; He is the Last Adam, the Head of a new order of beings, and they are that New Creation; He is the Head of the Body and they are the members in particular; He is the Bridegroom and they are the Bride. Under Ecclesiology (Vol. IV) these distinctions have been developed at length. Latent in all these illustrations will be discovered the intimation regarding the whole immeasurable field of relationship which exists between Christ and the Church. Of the first six of this series of figures, it may be pointed out that they represent the present affiliation between Christ and the Church, whereas the seventh—that of the Bridegroom and the Bride—represents that between Christ and the Church which is wholly future. The great company of believers—some on earth and vastly more in heaven—are now the espoused of Christ. But they, like the Lord Him-self, await the day of marriage union. That union, it is revealed, occurs in heaven after Christ has come again to receive them unto Himself. The Scriptures which describe the marriage of the Lamb and the wedding supper in heaven declare, "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God" (Rev. 19:7–9). The wedding "supper" which is celebrated in connection with the marriage in heaven should be distinguished from the marriage "feast" (cf. Matt. 25:10, R.V.), which is celebrated on earth when the King returns with His Bride and begins His beneficent reign. The time and circumstances under which the marriage feast is to be observed are set forth in Matthew 25:1–13. In this context virgins are seen going forth to meet the Bridegroom *and the Bride* (cf. Matt. 25:1 in D and other ancient authorities for the text). The fact that the Bride accompanies the King on His return to earth is taught in various Scriptures—notably Revelation 19:11–16, which portion presents not only the last description of Christ's return to the earth but also the only description of His advent to be given in this final, prophetic book. The order of events in this context is to be observed, whereby the wedding supper and the marriage in heaven immediately precede the return of Christ to the earth with His Bride. Luke 12:35–37 presents a description of the same appeal and warning to Israel in the light of the King's return that is found in Matthew 25:1–13. It reads: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them." Israel alone is addressed and respecting the return of her Messiah with power and great glory. It is that event for which the Jews will be taught to watch after the Church is removed from the earth. The Lord states that when they see these things begin to come to pass they may know that He is near, even at the doors.

Truth respecting the Bride is consummated to some extent in the prophetic picture of Christ's coming kingdom on earth as that is presented in Psalm 45:8–15. In this picture the King appears with the queen upon His right hand in gold of Ophir. She is addressed as *daughter* and as *the king's daughter*. The virgins who attend her are not the queen but are brought to her with joy and gladness. Of them it is said "they shall enter into the king's palace." Thus the virgins of Matthew 25:1–13 are identified in their relation to the bride. Why should not Israel pay tribute of honor to the queen, the

bride of their King? The virgins are the queen's companions and those among them who are ready to enter with her into the "ivory palaces" (vs. 8), which is the King's palace (vs. 15).

No small error has been proposed when it is claimed that Israel is the bride of Christ. It is true that Israel is represented as the apostate and repudiated wife of Jehovah yet to be restored. This, however, is far removed from the "chaste virgin" (cf. 2 Cor. 11:2) which the Church is, still unmarried to Christ. It is Israel that will be reigned over in the coming kingdom. But it is the promise to the Bride that she shall reign with Christ. Such a promise could not be addressed to those over whom Christ will reign. Dr. C. I. Scofield presents the following note under Hosea 2:2: "That Israel is the wife of Jehovah (see vs. 16–23), now disowned but yet to be restored, is the clear teaching of the passages. This relationship is not to be confounded with that of the Church to Christ (John 3:29, *refs.*). In the mystery of the Divine tri-unity both are true. The New Testament speaks of the Church as a virgin espoused to one husband (2 Cor. 11: 1, 2); which could never be said of an adulterous wife, restored in grace. Israel is, then, to be the restored and forgiven wife of Jehovah, the Church the virgin wife of the Lamb (John 3:29; Rev. 19:6–8); Israel Jehovah's earthly wife (Hos. 2:23); the Church the Lamb's heavenly bride (Rev. 19:7)" (*Sco field Reference Bible*, p. 922).

The types of the Old Testament foreshadow many important aspects of truth regarding the Bride. It may be said in respect of the Truth that whenever a man is a type of Christ his wife will be a type of the Church, notable cases being Adam and Eve, Isaac and Rebekah, Joseph and Asenath, Moses and Zipporah, Boaz and Ruth, David and Abigail, Solomon and his true love of the Canticles.

No human imagination can measure the change that will be wrought by the power of God in those who comprise the Bride of the Lamb. He, the infinite One, will be ravished with the adorable loveliness of His Bride, and so for all eternity. She will have been perfected to this immeasurable and infinite degree.

BURIED

Special significance is rightfully attached to the fact that as often as three times, when relating the saving events through which Christ passed, the Scriptures include His burial. It is written: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3–4); "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:2–4); "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh b the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead" (Col. 2:11–12). Speaking of these three passages it may be indicated that the first refers to Christ's death, burial, and resurrection as a ground for the salvation of the lost. This Scripture is the recognized declaration of that which enters into the gospel of God's saving grace. The two remaining passages refer to Christ's death as judgment on the sin nature of those who are saved—that aspect of His death which provides freedom for the Holy Spirit to control the sin nature as that for which Christ has paid the penalty. It is the ground of the believer's experimental sanctification, which aspect of sanctification is made possible

by and is wholly dependent on what Christ has accomplished. The death of Christ is referred to in Colossians 2:11–12 as His circumcision which was a substitution for others, whereas the other passage—Romans 6:2–4—adds crucifixion to that which Christ wrought as substitute for others. Thus the judgments against the believer's sin nature which demanded crucifixion, death, and burial with Christ to the end that he might share in His resurrection life fell upon Christ as substitute. Christ suffered these judgments on behalf of others.

The truth now under contemplation is that Christ's burial has been listed as an important factor in each of these three passages cited above, and as having doctrinal meaning. Regardless of disclosure, too little emphasis has been given this subject by theologians. In the matter of His bearing the sins of the unsaved, the burial of Christ is foreshadowed by the "scapegoat." This type is full and clear. Two goats were required on the Day of Atonement to represent typically that which Christ wrought. One goat was slain and its blood was sprinkled as a purification and cleansing. To the second goat was transmitted the sins of the people and that goat was led away into the wilderness to be seen no more. In His death for the unsaved, accordingly, Christ provided His blood which is efficacious for the cleansing and the judgment of sin, but also He *took away* sin (cf. John 1:29; Heb. 9:26; 10:4, 9, 11). That final disposition of sin is accomplished in His burial. He went into the tomb a sin offering sacrificed unto death. He came out completely unrelated to the burden of sin. Such is the doctrinal significance of the words, "and … was buried." There could be no tracing of the disposition of sin achieved in the tomb as there never was tracing of the further life and existence of the scapegoat after it was released in the wilderness. In that burial which was an aspect of Christ's undertaking in behalf of the believer's sin nature, too, there is also evidently a disposition of those judgments which duly fell upon Him. Into this, again, none can enter with clear understanding. Its immeasurable reality is known only to God.

It should be observed that the Apostle employs at times a technical word in place of the more common word, *to bury*. He declares that the believer's body is *sown* when placed in the grave (cf. 1 Cor. 15:42–44). A thing may be buried to dispose of it or to the end that it may be forgotten, but that which is sown is done with the expectation that something will come up where the seed was placed. The believer's body must be raised, and will at length be raised at the coming of Christ (cf. 1 Thess. 4:13–18).

C

CALLING

In its primary doctrinal meaning the word *call* suggests an invitation from God to men. This meaning is extended to form a ground upon which the ones invited are designated *the called ones*. The efficacious call of God is equivalent to His sovereign choice. Since there are two elect companies now in the world—Israel and the Church—these are alike seen as called of God. However, Israel's call is national while the call of those who comprise the Church is individual. The certainty of Israel's call is declared in the words, "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). Thus Israel's blessing, which reaches into eternity to come, is guaranteed. The word *call* is closely related in meaning to the word *draw*. Christ said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:44). The declaration which this passage advances is decisive. Not only is it asserted that none can come to God apart from this drawing, but that all thus drawn will certainly respond, for Christ said "I will raise him up at the last day." The words *draw* and *call* indicate the divine method of choice, though the latter may be used with specific reference to the estate of those thus blessed. They therefore are *the called ones*. At this point it may be observed that the name *believer* is in contrast to the term *the called ones*. The former indicates a human responsibility, while the latter indicates a divine responsibility.

As there is a drawing which is general through the preaching of the gospel, so there is a general call. Christ said once: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (John 12:32). Likewise, as there is a divine drawing which is not resisted (cf. John 6:44), so there is a calling by the Spirit which is not resisted and rightly styled *an efficacious call*. It is wholly within the bounds of this type of call that believers are termed *the called ones*. They are thus differentiated from the mass who, though subject to a general call and drawing, are not efficaciously called. A truth to be observed is that God indicates and separates His elect ones who comprise the Church not by any general effort, such as the death of Christ for the whole world or the proclamation of the gospel through which that death is presented as a ground of salvation to those who are lost, but He selects them rather by a potent influence upon each elect person, which influence assures the reception of Christ as Savior. So definite and certain proves the call that it is equivalent to the realization of divine election itself. The Apostle accordingly writes of an "effectual working" of God's power which determined his ministry (Eph. 3:7). It is an upward or high calling (Phil. 3:14); it is a heavenly calling (Heb. 3:1). It demands a holy walk (Eph. 4:1, R.V.; 2 Thess. 1:11); it engenders hope (Eph. 4:4); and by outward demonstration the believer is appointed to certify, to give proof of, his calling by the life he lives (2 Pet. 1:10).

There is a peculiar use of the word *calling* when by it reference is made to the estate of those who are called and at the time they are called. To this the Apostle testifies when he writes: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches. Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made

free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God" (1 Cor. 7:17–24).

The divine and efficacious call is one of the five mighty workings of God in behalf of each elect person under grace. Having referred to them as "the called according to his purpose," the Apostle goes from Romans 8:28 onward to declare that those whom God foreknew, He predestinated; those whom He predestinated, He called; those whom He called, He justified; and those whom He justified, He glorified (Rom. 8:29–30). In this connection, the word *foreknow* does not mean a mere prescience or knowledge of that which is to be; it here indicates the active exercise of eternal love for the individuals comprising the company who are the elect of God in this age. For these He also predetermined their destiny. Observe the functioning of predestination. It includes precisely the same company numerically and to the last individual whom He calls with an efficacious calling; and it is the same elect company who, without loss of even one, He both justifies and glorifies. In this sequence of five divine achievements, four represent the sovereign action of God. It is *calling* alone which incorporates some human responsibility in its outworking, and yet without the slightest infringement upon that infinite certainty that all who are called will be both justified and glorified. A call suggests some cooperation in the form of a human response to the call. In this respect, the divine call is wholly different from the other four sovereign undertakings—foreknowledge, predestination, justification, and glorification—which admit of no human action or responsibility whatever. The question at once arises whether, when one link in this chain is restricted up to the point that it depends at all upon human concurrence, the whole vast undertaking described by these five words is not jeopardized relative to its certainty of fruition. Should God coerce the individual's will the essential character of a call would be wholly obliterated, and the action of the human choice which is so evident in the Biblical declaration of the way of salvation be invalidated. Thus the question becomes one of whether God is able so to persuade, to induce, to prevail upon the human understanding and will respecting the choice of Christ as Savior and all that the choice secures that the called one will, without a possible exception, respond by exercise of saving faith in Christ—even the faith itself being imparted (cf. Eph. 2:8). The assurance is that God can and does so influence men by the enlightenment which the Spirit accomplishes that they, with a certainty that permits of no possibility that even one should fail to respond to the divine call, will every one be justified and redeemed in answer to personal and saving faith in Christ. This is what constitutes an efficacious call. Of great importance in this whole program of salvation is the fact that, when the called one is enlightened and persuaded by the Spirit rather than being coerced, his own will acts in unhindered and unimpaired volition. It has remained true that "whosoever will may come." However, in the counsels of God, which counsels may properly be disclosed alone to those who are saved but which constitute no message to the unsaved, it remains also true that no human will acts in the acceptance of Christ by faith who has not been brought to understand what Satan-blinded minds never do understand, namely, that all divine grace is their portion and infinite blessing theirs in Christ Jesus for the receiving on the basis of faith.

Calling, then, is that choice on the part of God of an individual through an efficacious working in the mind and heart by the Holy Spirit, to the end that the will of the one who is called may be moved by its own vision and determination in the exercise of saving faith. By so much two great necessities are preserved and equally satisfied, namely, only those are called whom God has predetermined to be justified and glorified, and those who are thus called elect from their own hearts and enlightened minds to receive Christ as Savior.

CARNALITY

Together with two other doctrines—that of the *natural man* and that of the *spiritual man*—the doctrine of the *carnal man* completes the threefold division of the human family in their relation to, or attitude toward, the Word of God. The designations in the original text are: ψυχικός, which indicates the unchanged, unregenerate man; πνευματικός, which designates the spiritual man or one who is characterized by the presence and manifest power of the Holy Spirit; and σαρκικός, which denotes the carnal or fleshly believer (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14–3:4).

Carnality is caused not by the unspiritual things which one may do, but fundamentally by a lack of yieldedness to the mind and will of God. The carnal Christian does unspiritual things because he is carnal or fleshly. The passage which directly declares who are fleshly and why is found in 1 Corinthians 3:1–4: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" In this context it is revealed that the carnal person is a true believer and therefore saved. Such are addressed as *brethren*—a salutation which never includes unregenerate persons, and they are said to be *babes in Christ*. While, because of carnality, they are termed *babes in Christ*, nothing could give greater assurance of their security for time and eternity than the fact that they are "in Christ." This revealing passage not only indicates the limitations of the carnal believer but reveals the state of affairs which, in the case of the Corinthians, came about because of their carnality. Being unyielded to God, they could not receive the "strong meat" of the Word of God; they could only receive the "milk." By so much their spiritual limitations are revealed. Their carnality was manifest in the divisions among them, with the tendency to follow human leaders. Such conduct signified a violent disregard for the unity of the Spirit—the one Body of believers—which unity the Apostle declares must be kept (Eph. 4:3). Since this sin of sectarian divisions is first on the list of evils for which the Apostle condemns the Corinthian believers—there is even mention of it before he points out their immoralities—its exceeding sinfulness in the sight of God becomes plain; yet like divisions are evident whenever sectarianism and denominational loyalty are stressed above the doctrine of the one Body of believers.

The term *carnal* is a translation of the word σαρκικός, which term means that one is influenced by the σάρξ—not a reference now to the physical body, but to the fallen nature which every believer retains as long as he is in his unredeemed body. The flesh is ever opposed to the Spirit of God (Gal. 5:17) and is never removed in this life, but may be held in subjection by the Spirit when and as the believer is depending in yieldedness upon Him. The Apostle testifies that "in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18), and that when exercising his own strength he experienced nothing but failure in his conflict with the flesh. It was by the power of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus that he became free from the power of sin and death—that spiritual death which manifests itself through the flesh (Rom. 8:2). He also forgets not to indicate that his victory by the Spirit depends, on the divine side, upon that aspect of Christ's death in which He brought the sin nature into judgment (Rom. 8:3). The result is such that the believer may experience all the will of God wrought in and through him—but this will never be wrought *by* him (Rom. 8:4). The Christian's responsibility is to "walk after the Spirit." This does not suggest living after some code or rule of life, but rather a subjection to the guidance and purpose of the Spirit who indwells him. When thus

yielded, it becomes the Spirit's task to "work in" the believer "both to will and to do" of God's good pleasure (Phil. 2:13).

Though much is disclosed by the Apostle respecting carnality and the flesh, his more important teaching on the subject is found in 1 Corinthians 3:1–4, already considered, Galatians 5:16–21, and Romans, chapters 7 and 8. Having declared in Romans 8:4 that the believer's responsibility is to walk by means of the Spirit, the Apostle writes freely of the distinction between being in the flesh, which is the estate of the unregenerate person, and having the flesh within, which is the condition that characterizes all who are saved. Those believers who are dominated by the flesh respond to the flesh and those that are dominated by the Spirit respond to the Spirit (Rom. 8:5). In any case the carnal or fleshly mind functions in the realm of spiritual death and the spiritual mind in the realm of life and peace (Rom. 8:6). The reason for the carnal mind facing in the way of spiritual death is that it means enmity against God, not being subject to God's will, nor can it be (Rom. 8:7; cf. Gal. 5:17). The unsaved, being in the flesh, cannot please God (Rom. 8:8). However, the believer is not in the flesh as his estate though the flesh is in him. If someone is regenerated he will bear evidence of the presence of the indwelling Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:9). Too much emphasis can hardly be given to the fact that the Christian may function in his life within either the realm of spiritual death—separation from God—or the realm of things related to the Holy Spirit, He who is the Originator and Director of the spiritual life. Therefore, the Apostle declares: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die [or, be in the realm of spiritual death—separation from God]: but if ye through [by means of, or, depending on] the Spirit do mortify [reckon to be dead in Christ's death] the deeds of the body, ye shall live [i.e., in the realm of the spiritual life]" (Rom. 8:13–14). Carnality means, then, a manifestation of the flesh which in turn is a demonstration of that which belongs to spiritual death. There is no implication in this extended declaration respecting the flesh and carnality that the believer may turn about or become unsaved. This presentation by the Apostle, however, is wholly within the sphere of the believer's walk as that which may be energized either by the flesh or by the Spirit. The Christian is saved and safe in Christ, yet in his manner of life he may prove σαρκικός or πνευματικός.

CHASTISEMENT

Chastisement and scourging—here to be distinguished from the larger theme of suffering—because the Father's correction of His own offspring (Heb. 12:6) are in character far removed from condemnation. It is written that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1) and "he that believeth on him is not condemned" (John 3:18), and of such as believe it is also said that he "cometh not into judgment" (John 5:24, R.V.). One who stands in the imputed merit of Christ, as every saved person does, could not come into condemnation; nevertheless, for sin in which a Christian willfully persists there may be chastisement from the Father, who is Himself a perfect disciplinarian. The course ever to be followed by a child of God who has sinned and when he sins is outlined in 1 Corinthians 11:31–32, which reads: "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world." This order is clear. First, the believer who has sinned may and should make full confession to God, which confession is self-judgment and is an expression outwardly of an inward repentance of heart. If self-judgment is achieved, that divine forgiveness which restores the believer to fellowship with God is granted and right relations to God are restored again. On the other hand, if the believer, having sinned, refuses to confess it in genuine repentance or goes on justifying his sin, he must in God's time and way be brought under the

correction of the Father. This judgment or correction by the Father assumes the form of chastisement and to the end that the child of God need not be condemned with the world.

The whole theme of suffering—a theme yet to be considered—extends far beyond but still includes the doctrine of the believer's chastisement. It embraces that which Christ suffered from the Father in which none may share, that which Christ suffered from men in which believers may share, that which the believer suffers as a chastisement from God the Father in which Christ does not share, that which believers suffer from men in which Christ does also share, and that which constitutes Christ's burden for a lost world in which Christians may share.

Chastisement, or discipline as such, may be contemplated under four general divisions, namely:

1. PREVENTATIVE. Only one example of preventative chastisement has been recorded in the Sacred Text, but such could easily be the experience of any child of God should circumstances demand. Having been caught up into the third heaven, the Apostle Paul was enjoined that he should not tell here on the earth what he had seen and heard, and accordingly, lest he should so transgress, a thorn was given him in the flesh. Though thrice he besought the Lord for its removal, the situation (2 Cor. 12:7–9) was not relieved. This became a preventative chastisement.

2. CORRECTIVE. Chastisement which is corrective in motive has been outlined at the beginning of this discussion. It is the Father's correction of His erring child. Both chastisement and scourging are indicated in Hebrews 12:6: "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." The universality of both chastisement and scourging may be explained on the ground of the Father's unwillingness to allow any exceptions among those who deserve to be disciplined. It is certain that the Father does not chasten or scourge believers whether they so require or not. Such an interpretation not only contradicts 1 Corinthians 11:31, which declares that "if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged," but must needs disrupt the whole purpose of chastisement. A difference is evidently to be found between chastisement and scourging. The former is that manner of correction which might be repeated; the latter represents the conquering of the human will which, once achieved, needs hardly to be done again. No anarchy or rebellion can be tolerated in the Father's household. The surrender of one's life to God is both reasonable and required (Rom. 12:1–2). Yielding to God may be accomplished easily if all resistance is avoided, or be made difficult and painful when a long conflict is maintained.

3. ENLARGING. The object of chastisement is said to be "unto holiness." So, also, the "fruit of righteousness" becomes the portion of those who are exercised thereby. Christ's word recorded in John 15:2 indicates how discipline may be applied from God to the end that the believer may be more fruitful. He declares of God: "Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." This does not suggest the correction of willful evil; it is all done that more fruit may be borne to the glory of God. It is designed so that a good man may become a better man.

4. VINDICATIVE. Again, but one illustration is found in the Bible of this specific form of chastisement. To Job it was given to demonstrate against the challenge of Satan that he loved God apart from all personal benefits or advantages which He had bestowed. No evil had been recorded against Job till then. In truth, Jehovah three times describes Job as "a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil" (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3). But Satan in converse with Jehovah declared that Job served Jehovah only for selfish motives and that Jehovah was not really loved for His own worthiness. Though Job knew nothing of the issue which had arisen in heaven over him, he nevertheless vindicated Jehovah in three successive tests. The first was in the loss of property and

family. His reply under this test was worded: “Naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither: the LORD gave, and the LORD hath taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD. In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly” (1:21–22). The second test involved the loss of health and wifely comfort. At this point he said: “What? shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil? In all this did not Job sin with his lips” (2:10). Similarly Job stood the third test involving faith when, as recorded, he asserted concerning God: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him” (13:15).

CHRISTIAN

As a title which belongs to those who are saved, though itself now more employed than any other, *Christian* appears in the Sacred Text but three times: “And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch” (Acts 11:26); “Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian” (Acts 26:28); “If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed” (1 Pet. 4:16). The term *Christian* is evidently a Gentile designation for believers, since the word *Christ* upon which this title was constructed suggests recognition of the anointed Messiah and no unbelieving Jew was prepared to acknowledge the Messianic claims of Christ. This acknowledgment, indeed, became the very crux of the problem of a Jew’s relation to the new faith. It is significant that Saul of Tarsus, when saved, “straightway … preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God” (Acts 9:20). Messianism was ever the theme of those who preached to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ. All might be able to identify the person who had been known as *Jesus of Nazareth*, but it was the determining test that He be acknowledged as the Christ or the Messiah, and thus the Son of God. The Jews spoke of believers as *Nazarenes*. This had no complimentary implication. Very early in the days of Christ’s ministry on earth, however, Nathaniel voiced the accepted idea when he inquired, “Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?” Also, the orator Tertullus when arguing before Felix thought it well to condemn Paul as “a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes” (Acts 24:5). It will thus be observed that believers did not assign the name *Christian* to themselves, though Peter employed it in reference to that which had become a recognized practice (1 Pet. 4:16). It seems probable that this custom of designating believers was not the expression of a conviction that Jesus is the Messiah; it was rather based upon Christ’s familiar name as a religious leader. The designations *brethren*, used about 200 times in the New Testament, *saints*, used about 60 times, *disciples* (beginning with its appearance in the Acts) used about 30 times, and *believers* meaning those who believe, used about 80 times, thus hold a preference according to the Acts and Epistles of the New Testament.

Beyond the problem of what may be an appropriate title is the fact itself of being identified one way or another. What, according to the New Testament and thus upon the authority of God, makes one a believer or Christian? Answers to this question are varied, sometimes falling so low that the title *Christian* is assigned to one who merely holds citizenship in a so-called Christian country. Over against this, the reality which the saved one represents reaches out beyond all human comprehension. Under Soteriology (Vol. III) thirty-three simultaneous and instantaneous divine undertakings and transformations which together constitute the salvation of a soul have been named. All of these are wrought at the moment saving faith in Christ is exercised. Three of these great realities alone may be cited here, namely:

1. A NEW PURIFICATION. That divine forgiveness which has been achieved as a part of salvation is complete and extends to all sins—past, present, and future—so far as condemnation is concerned.

Romans 8:1 therefore declares: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.” It still remains true that the believer’s sin may, as seen elsewhere, lead to chastisement. Forgiveness nevertheless is unto purification and wrought through the blood of Christ. It proves so complete that not one shadow or stain will be seen upon the saved one—even by the eyes of infinite holiness—throughout eternity. Divine forgiveness is not based on the leniency of God, but rather on the fact that the condemning power of every sin has spent itself upon the divinely provided Substitute. God’s forgiveness is a legal recognition of the truth that Another has borne the judgment for the one who is forgiven. The purification is thus as complete and perfect as the ground upon which it is wrought.

2. A New Creation. An actual and wholly legitimate sonship relation to God is divinely engendered when a soul has been saved. The one who is saved becomes the offspring of God. He becomes therefore an *heir of God* and a *joint heir* with Christ. The Apostle John testifies of Christ that to “as many as received him, to them gave he” sonship standing (John 1:12)—not a mere option or choice in the direction of regeneration, for He causes them to become in the most absolute sense the sons of God. As such they are fitted and destined to take the honored place in the Father’s family and household in heaven. God is now “bringing many sons unto glory” (Heb. 2:10).

3. A New Standing. Because of the perfect identity and union of the believer with Christ which is wrought by the Holy Spirit, it may be said of the one saved that he has been “made … accepted” (Eph. 1:6). This standing is not a fiction or fancy, but such that by it the believer becomes at once not only clothed in the righteousness of God, but himself the very righteousness of God. This immeasurable reality depends wholly on the one fact that the child of God being blessed is in Christ. Such a limitless position before God is made legally possible through the sweet savor aspect of Christ’s death when as Substitute He “offered himself without spot to God” (Heb. 9:14), thus releasing all that He is in Himself to be the portion of those whom He saves. This provision through His death is actualized and sealed unto eternal reality by a vital union with Christ.

A Christian, then, is not one who does certain things for God, but instead one for whom God has done certain things; he is not so much one who conforms to a certain manner of life as he is one who has received the gift of eternal life; he is not one who depends upon a hopelessly imperfect state, but rather one who has reached a perfect standing before God as being in Christ.

CHRISTIANITY

That body of truth which is now known as *Christianity* was identified by the early church as *The Faith* and *This Way* (Acts 9:2). According to Acts 6:7 a great company of the priests were “obedient to the faith,” and Jude (1:3) contended for the faith once-for-all delivered. Not until Ignatius of Antioch (d. 107?) was the term *Christianity* introduced. It, like the word *Christian*, has come into general use today as a representation of that which the apostles revealed in the New Testament, and was itself brought into existence by virtue of Christ’s death, resurrection, and present ministry in heaven, as well as by the advent of the Holy Spirit into the world. Of all the religious systems which have been fostered in the world, but two have the distinction of being designed, originated, and (eventually, though not as yet) consummated according to the specific purpose of God. These are Judaism and Christianity. Though Covenant Theology, with its extended doctrinal influence, has either confused or ignored the distinctions which obtain between the two divinely fostered systems, a recognition of the difference between them is the essential foundation of any beginning or progress in

the right understanding of the Scriptures. To demonstrate the truthfulness of this statement, it should be added that, while both of these systems incorporate instructions for daily life here on earth, it can be ascertained by reason of evidence which any unprejudiced person may trace that Judaism is a system belonging to one nation—Israel, that it is earthly in its scope, purpose, and the destiny which it provides, while Christianity is heavenly in its scope, purpose, and the destiny which it provides. It will be seen, as well, though including much that is common to both that they are alike the outworking of opposite principles, and that they are not and could not be in force at the same time. Judaism alone was in action from the call of Abraham to the death and resurrection of Christ and will again be the outworking of the divine purpose in the earth after the Church has been removed, but Christianity is the only divine objective in the present age, which age is bounded by the two advents of Christ. Too often it is assumed that Judaism has been terminated or merged into Christianity. A favorite expression of this notion is to the effect that Judaism was the bud and Christianity the blossom. Over against this misconception is the truth that both Judaism and Christianity run their prescribed courses unimpaired and unconfused from their beginnings into eternity to come. By far the larger portion of Bible prophecy concerns Israel with their land, that is, the nation, the Davidic throne, the Messiah-King, and His kingdom. This and much more together form the eschatology of Judaism. Here it can be seen again that it is exceedingly inaccurate to speak of Systematic Theology as Christian Theology, since the former incorporates vast ranges of truth which are wholly foreign in their primary application to that which belongs to Christianity. Because much theological teaching is confused in these fields of truth, it is essential that particular emphasis be added here.

Though it was given to the Apostle Paul to formulate and record the realities which together constitute Christianity, he did not himself make its initial announcement. Christ in the Upper Room Discourse (John 13:1–17:26) declared the new and vital features of Christianity. This occurred at the very end of His earthly ministry and was set forth as an anticipation of that which was about to be inaugurated. The earthly ministry of Christ was restricted, in the main, to Israel and carried on wholly within the scope of their covenants of promise. In the Upper Room Discourse are found the important factors of relationship to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit which are peculiar to Christianity. However, as divinely planned, the great Apostle was raised up to receive and formulate the new system, based as it is on the death and resurrection of Christ and the values gained at Pentecost.

At this point certain terms with reference to their shades of meaning may well be introduced:

1. NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY, which embraces that which is distinctively Christian in the New Testament. New chapters are added to Judaism in connection with the unfolding of that which constitutes Christianity.

2. PAULINE THEOLOGY, which is doctrine restricted to the writings of Paul but which nevertheless unfolds much regarding Judaism, especially in its contrasts with Christianity (cf. the larger portion of the Epistle to the Hebrews).

3. MY GOSPEL (Rom. 2:16), which designation is used by the Apostle when referring to all the revelation that was given him, namely, the gospel of saving grace revealed to him in Arabia (cf. Gal. 1:11–12) and also the revelation respecting the Church as the one Body of Christ composed, as it is, of believing Jews and Gentiles. To all this should be added the range of truth which sets forth the Christian's peculiar responsibility in daily life, with the new and incomparable provisions for holy living through the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit. The Apostle's designation, "my gospel," is

equivalent to Christianity when a direct, constructive, and unrelated (to Judaism, etc.) consideration of Christianity is in view.

As a summarization, it may be restated that Christianity incorporates the gospel of divine grace which is based on the death and resurrection of Christ, the fact of the one Body with all its relationships and destiny, and the new and vital way of life through the Holy Spirit's enablement.

CHRISTOLOGY

Recognizing that an entire volume of this work has been assigned to Christology (Vol. V), the subject may be again approached in what is intended to be a highly condensed review. The theme (has been and) is well divided into the seven positions in which Christ has been set forth by the Bible, namely:

1. The Preincarnate Son of God. The fact of His preincarnate existence is established not only by direct statements of Scripture but by every implication. Some of these lines of proof are:

a. CHRIST IS GOD. It follows that if Christ is God then He has existed from all eternity. Evidence that He is God may be seen in His titles—Logos, Only Begotten, Express Image, First Begotten, Elohim, and Jehovah; in His divine attributes—eternity (Mic. 5:2), immutability (Heb. 1:11–12; 13:8), omnipotence (1 Cor. 15:28; Phil. 3:21), omniscience, and omnipresence; in His mighty works—creation, preservation, forgiveness of sin, raising the dead, and execution of all judgment.

b. CHRIST IS CREATOR. In this regard the Scriptures are explicit (Rom. 11:36; Col. 1:15–19; Heb. 1:2–12). If He is Creator, He has existed before creation.

c. CHRIST IS NAMED AS ONE EQUAL TO OTHER IN THE TRINITY. In all references to the Persons of the Godhead, Christ the Son shares equally. In all purposes of God, as far as revealed, He assumes those parts which only God can assume. He is thus before all things.

d. THE MESSIAH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IS GOD. Since Christ is the Messiah of the Old Testament, He is necessarily God and from all eternity.

e. THE ANGEL OF JEHOVAH IS CHRIST. This is clearly proved in earlier pages of the present theological work and is unfailing evidence of Christ's pre-existence, indeed.

f. THE DIRECT BIBLICAL ASSERTIONS IMPLY THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST. Such assertions are numerous and conclusive.

g. THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE IS THAT CHRIST HAS EXISTED FOREVER (e.g., John 1:1–2; Phil. 2:5–11; Heb. 1:1–3).

2. The Incarnate Son of God. The theme respecting the incarnate Christ occupies about two-fifths of the New Testament. The general outline of this aspect of Christology may be stated under seven divisions:

a. OLD TESTAMENT ANTICIPATIONS. These are both typical and prophetic in character.

b. BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD. Very much that is fundamental in doctrine is properly based on the birth of Christ. Here is to be introduced His various sonships—the title Son of God suggesting the divine; Son of man, the racial; Son of Mary, the human; Son of David, the Messianic and Jewish; Son

of Abraham, the redemptive. Here also will be unfolded the entire theme of His hypostatic union of two natures; the mediatorial aspect of Christ's Person and His death; His earthly ministry to Israel as Messiah, Immanuel, and King; His ministry to the Gentiles as Savior, Judge, and Ruler; His ministry to the Church as Head, Lord, and Bridegroom. Here too is learned the twofold object of His earthly ministry, first to Israel respecting her covenanted kingdom and later to Jews and Gentiles respecting the Church which is His Body. Again, yet more of major import is brought forward, namely, Christ's three offices—that of Prophet, which incorporates all His teaching ministry; of Priest, which incorporates the sacrifice of Himself for the world; and of King, which incorporates the whole Davidic covenant together with the predictions and their fulfillment in His future reign.

c. BAPTISM. The baptism of Christ was a major event in His earthly life and of far-reaching significance since by it He was consecrated to the office of Priest, which office, like that of King, endures forever.

d. TEMPTATION. Judging from the extended description given this crisis, the temptation is possessed evidently of great importance. It became the crucial attack of Satan against the humanity of Christ, the issue being whether or not He would abide in His Father's perfect will. That He would was assured by His very nature as God and was determined from all eternity; yet the test was allowed so that finite minds might be satisfied about the impeccability of the Savior.

e. TRANSFIGURATION. The transfiguration, it is declared, was a setting forth of the power and coming of Christ in His kingdom (Matt. 16:28; Mark 9:1; Luke 9:27), that is, the event pictures the glory of the coming kingdom. When transfigured, Christ was about to turn from the kingdom ministry which had engaged John, the disciples, and Himself over to the new heavenly purpose concerned with a people qualified for glory through His death and resurrection. It was therefore essential that the kingdom not only be promised but displayed, that its future certainty might not be lost from view with the crushing disappointment which His death as a rejected king engendered.

f. TEACHING. Probably no clearer evidence respecting the scope and purpose of Christ's first advent can be discovered than is indicated in His teaching, especially that of the major discourses. His ministry to Israel and to the Church are therein distinguished completely—to those not blinded by theological prejudice.

g. MIGHTY WORKS. When Christ said, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father" (John 15:24), He disclosed to some extent the reason why He wrought miracles. His mighty works attested His claim to be the Messiah and so His rejection was without excuse because of that evidence.

3. The Efficacious Sufferings, Death, and Burial of the Son of God. Considering these three events separately:

a. HIS SUFFERINGS. The evidence presented in John 19:28 intimates that the actual bearing of the judgments of sin fell upon Christ in the hours of His suffering which terminated in death. It was just before He said "It is finished" that John declares of Him, "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst." What was actually experienced by Christ in those six hours upon the cross cannot be known in this world by any man; yet the value of it is received by those who believe.

b. HIS DEATH. It was required of any efficacious sacrifice that it should be delivered unto death and the shedding of blood. The death of Christ is the antitype of every typical sacrifice and

determined the nature of that particular type. Typical sacrificial deaths through bloodshedding were such as God required because of the truth that Christ would thus be sacrificed. The range of Biblical testimony respecting Christ's death may be examined in seven divisions, namely: (1) types, (2) prophecies, (3) historical declarations of the Synoptic Gospels, (4) declarations of the Apostle John in his Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation, (5) declarations of the Apostle Paul, (6) of the Apostle Peter, and (7) of the Letter to the Hebrews.

If it be inquired, as constantly it is, Who put Christ to death? it may be pointed out that He was offered by the Father (Ps. 22:15; John 3:16; Rom. 3:25), of His own free will (John 10:17; Heb. 7:27; 9:14; 10:12), by the Spirit (Heb. 9:14), and by men—Herod, Pilate, the Gentiles, and Israel (Acts 2:23; 4:27). To this may be added that part in His death which was contributed by Satan (cf. Gen. 3:15).

The death of Christ achieved a vast array of objectives. At least fourteen of these are indicated in this work under Soteriology (Vol. III).

c. HIS BURIAL. As the scapegoat type anticipated, Christ carried away the burden of sin into oblivion. He went into the grave a sin-bearer and He came out the Lord of glory.

4. The Resurrection of the Son of God. Again, the Old Testament witness to that which concerns Christ is seen in types and prophecies. In the New Testament this theme is declared (1) by the predictions of Christ and (2) by the historical fact that He rose from the dead —an event more fully proved than perhaps any other of history. Christ was raised by the Father (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27, 31–32; Rom. 6:4; Eph. 1:19–20), by the Son Himself (John 2:19; 10:17–18), and by the Spirit (1 Pet. 3:18).

In disclosing the factors which enter into Christianity, the Apostle to whom this revelation was given places the resurrection of Christ in a central and all-important position. The death of Christ provides, but the resurrection constructs. Through Christ's death demerit is cancelled and the merit of Christ is made available, but by the resurrection of Christ the new Headship over a perfected New Creation is established forever. The importance of His resurrection may be seen from the following facts which in turn declare the reasons for the rising. Christ arose (a) because of what He is (Acts 2:24). That is, it is impossible that He the Son of God should be held in the place of death. (b) He arose because of who He is (Rom. 1:3–4). The resurrection served to prove His position as "Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness." (c) He arose to be Head over all things to the Church (Eph. 1:22–23). (d) He arose to bestow resurrection life upon all who believe (John 12:24). (e) He arose to be the source of resurrection power in the lives of His own who are in the world (Matt. 28:18; Rom. 6:4; Eph. 1:19–20). (f) He arose because His work which provided the ground for justification was completed (Rom. 4:25). (g) He arose as the pattern or first-fruits of all who are saved (1 Cor. 15:20–23; Phil. 3:20–21; 1 Tim. 6:16). (h) He arose to sit on David's throne and thus to fulfill all covenant promises to Israel (Acts 2:30).

In the sight and estimation of God, the resurrection of Christ is of sufficient import to be celebrated once every week and so the first day of the week on which it is celebrated supplants, in the present age, the Sabbath of the old order.

5. The Ascension and Session of the Son of God.

a. HIS ASCENSION. The departure of Christ for heaven has been already onsidered under the doctrine of ascension in this volume. It is mentioned again here only to complete the structure of

doctrine belonging to Christology. Two ascensions have been indicated—one immediately after the resurrection when the return of Christ into heaven as First-Fruits and as Priest presenting His blood occurred. The second ascension was that of final departure from the earth when He took up His present ministry in heaven.

b. HIS SESSION. The whole of Christ's present ministry in heaven has been practically ignored by theologians and especially by Arminians, to whom this ministry is repulsive since it guarantees the eternal security of all who are saved. Seven aspects of His present ministry are to be recognized, namely: (1) exercise of universal authority. He said of Himself, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18); (2) Headship over all things to the Church (Eph. 1:22–23); (3) bestowment and direction of the exercise of gifts (Rom. 12:3–8; 1 Cor. 12:4–31; Eph. 4:7–11); (4) intercession, in which ministry Christ contemplates the weakness and immaturity of His own who are in the world (Ps. 23:1; Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:25); (5) advocacy, by which ministry He appears in defense of His own before the Father's throne when they sin (Rom. 8:34; Heb. 9:24; 1 John 2:1); (6) building of the place He has gone to prepare (John 14:1–3); and (7) "expecting" or waiting until the moment when by the Father's decree the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of the Messiah—not by human agencies but by the resistless, crushing power of the returning King (Heb. 10:13).

6. The Second Coming and Kingdom of the Son of God.

a. THE SECOND COMING. The stupendous event of the second advent of Christ with all its world-transforming results is to be distinguished from His coming into the air to gather the Church to Himself both by resurrection and translation. His second advent concerns the Jews, the Gentiles, and angelic hosts including Satan and his angels, and is related to the Church only as she is seen returning with Him and reigning with Him.

b. THE KINGDOM. Though the long-promised, earthly, Davidic kingdom of Christ was offered to Israel at His first advent, it was forthwith rejected and postponed in the counsels of God until He comes again. One of the basic theological misconceptions is the attempt to relate Christ's kingdom on earth simply to His first advent. Since no earthly kingdom came into view even then, it is claimed by theologians that His kingdom must be spiritual and that all expectation based on covenants and promises of the Old Testament was misunderstood by the apostles and prophets in so far as that may have been construed literally. Nevertheless, according to every word of Scripture, a scope which extends to the greatest of all prophetic expectations, Messiah will come again and will do literally what it has been predicted He will do for the kingdom.

7. The Conclusion of Mediation and the Eternal Reign of the Son of God. Following the conclusion of the millennial kingdom, which is itself the last form of Christ's mediation, certain immeasurable events occur with all their transforming results, namely: (a) Satan is released from the abyss (Rev. 20:3); (b) armies are formed and a revolt against God occurs again (Rev. 20:7–9); (c) the passing of the old heaven and the old earth (Rev. 20:11); (d) the great white throne judgment (Rev. 20:12–15); (e) the creation of the new heaven and the new earth (2 Pet. 3:10–14; Rev. 21:1); (f) the descent of the bridal city out of heaven (Rev. 3:12; 21:2, 9–10); (g) the actual surrender of mediation, but not of the Davidic throne. From the reading of 1 Corinthians 15:25–28 translated according to the Authorized Version, a belief has been engendered that Christ surrenders His reign at the end of the kingdom age. Having declared that Christ receives the kingdom and its authority from the Father (1 Cor. 15:27), however, the passage really goes on to say that, after the mediatorial reign of a thousand years, Christ will go on reigning forever by the same authority of the Father. It is the testimony of the

Davidic covenant that He shall reign on David's throne forever and ever (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:20–37; Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:31–33; Rev. 11:15).

CHURCH

(See ECCLESIOLOGY)

CLEANSING

The possibility of the believer's cleansing from spiritual defilement and in a manner wholly satisfying to God is comforting and assuring beyond measure. Since sin is the experience of all in this world, a provision whereby defilement may be cleansed is of surpassing import to all.

The doctrine of divine cleansing of human defilement is subject to a threefold division, namely:

1. In the Old Testament. Various cleansings were prescribed and provided in the Old Testament order, but none of them was in itself efficacious. These were accepted of God for what they typified and hence, as far as the divine achievement in cleansing is concerned, all was complete; but still the ground upon which the cleansing had been wrought was an anticipation of that which Christ would do regarding that defilement when He went to the cross. The ground of cleansing could only be accounted perfect in that the anticipated death of Christ was as certain in the reckoning of God as it is at this time, since the death has been historically achieved. Water was usually the typical cleansing agent, applied by sprinkling or bathing, and in the case of the solution formed with ashes of the red heifer had to be mixed with the symbol of sacrifice. Though typical cleansing was extensive in the Old Testament, it was no more so nor more vitally imperative than the cleansing which the New Testament provides.

2. Of the Unsaved. A once-for-all cleansing is a part of the saving grace of God toward the lost when they believe unto salvation. The efficacy of Christ's sacrifice provides, as divinely applied in the reckoning of God, a washing in the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7:14). That this does not indicate a literal, physical washing is obvious; nevertheless, the results with all their supreme value are the same.

3. Of the Believer. Sin is always sin and defilement always defilement whether related to the saved or to the unsaved, and as such can be cleansed in no other way than by the blood of Christ. For the child of God, such cleansing is set forth in 1 John 1:7, 9, which Scripture declares: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. … If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." In verse 7 the assurance is given that as the believer walks in the light, which means a constant and full adjustment to all the revealed will of God for him, the blood of Christ goes on cleansing him from all sin. The same condition, stated in other words, is present in verse 9, when it is said that "if we [Christians, only] confess our sins"—that is, make the required adjustments—God is both faithful and just (faithful to His promise and purpose, and just in what He does for the believer in view of the fact that Christ has borne the sin) to forgive and to cleanse from all unrighteousness. Nothing could be more effective or advantageous for the believer than that he maintain unbroken fellowship with the Father and with the Son (1 John 1:3, 7).

Union with Christ is established forever by the exercise of saving faith, but communion with the Father and the Son may be, and too often is, broken. This, however, may be restored by confession when the sin is forgiven and its stain washed away. Such cleansing was typified by the sprinkling with water in which was mixed the ashes of a red heifer (Num. 19:2–9).

COMMANDMENTS

The term *commandments* is found in and represents an integral part of both the Mosaic and Christian systems, but with widely different significance. In fact, the variance between the two systems is clearly represented by these different uses of the word. Of the three major classifications of humanity commandments are addressed in the Scriptures to the Jew and the Christian, but not to the Gentile, or for that matter anyone unsaved—either Jew or Gentile—in this age, the reason being that divine commandments serve only to direct the daily life of those who are in right relation to God. For the Jew in the old order this affiliation was wrought by a physical birth which brought him into covenant relation to God, and for the Christian this is achieved by a spiritual birth which brings him into sonship relation to God. Of the Gentiles, however, it must be said: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12), and as for a lost estate there is now "no difference" even between Jew and Gentile (Rom. 3:9; 10:12). It follows, then, that no commandments are now addressed to Jews. In the present age the first issue between God and an unsaved person—Jew or Gentile-—is not one of correction or direction of daily life, but of personal salvation through faith in Christ. Therefore, directions for daily life are not addressed to the unsaved in this age.

1. In the Old Testament. The divine counsels for Israel which came by Moses and which remained in effect until the death and resurrection of Christ fall into three major divisions, namely, the commandments (Ex. 20:1–17) which directed Israel's moral actions, the judgments (Ex. 21:1–24:11) which governed Israel's social activities, and the statutes or ordinances (Ex. 24:12–31:18) which guided Israel's religious activities. These three forms of divine requirement were interrelated and interdependent; one could not function fully apart from the other two. The modern notion that the Mosaic commandments are still in force, but that the judgments and ordinances have been abolished, can be entertained only when inattention exists respecting the form and nature of the Mosaic commandments. Great grace from God to the Jews of old is observable in the fact that apart from any merit of their own they were by sovereign election—each one of them—born physically into covenant relationship with God. Similarly, great grace was upon them which, when they sinned, provided restoration into right relations with God through blood sacrifice. Such restoration was granted to every Israelite. The whole nation was restored to a right relationship with God on the Day of Atonement. There was, however, always a remnant of all those in the nation who manifested a particular renewal or spiritual reality. Some of these are listed in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, and many more are recorded throughout the Old Testament and in the early portions of the New Testament.

Upon examination (Num. 15:32–36), it will be discovered that the penalty of death was divinely imposed for the breaking of the ten commandments. Concerning this severity in the penalty for infraction of the Mosaic Law, it is written: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses" (Heb. 10:28). That the Mosaic system is not now in force is evident from the

fact that not all its conditions are applicable. The Sabbath enjoined by the Mosaic Law is superseded for the present age by the Lord's Day, and the promise of long life upon the promised land which God had bestowed has no relation to the Church. To her there was no land given, for she is definitely said to be a people who are "strangers and pilgrims." In like manner, a long life here contradicts the truth that the Christian is waiting for the return of Christ to receive him into glory (1 Thess. 1:9–10). The commandments of Moses are declared directly by the Scriptures to be abolished and done away for the present age (cf. John 1:17; Rom. 6:14; 7:1, 3–4; 2 Cor. 3:6–11; Gal. 3:23–25). 2 Corinthians 3:7 determines the fact that it is the Ten Commandments of Moses as well as the judgments and ordinances which were done away. If it be feared that the disannulling of the commandments of Moses as such involves the loss of their great principles of righteousness, it may be observed that every truth contained in the Mosaic system of morals—excepting that related to the Sabbath day—has been restated under grace, but is there adapted to grace and not to law. The first of the Ten Commandments of Moses appears nearly fifty times in and adapted to the new relationships under grace. The commandments of Moses partake of the nature of elementary instructions adapted to minors who are "under tutors and governors," but to those who were in such relation to God by covenant nevertheless as to be according to His will and purpose for them. This relationship which the nation Israel sustained to Jehovah should not be confused with the high and holy relationship which Christians now sustain toward God by reason of being in Christ. It is because of the fact that Israel was in covenant relation to God that the manner of life set forth in the Mosaic system could be addressed to them. Observing to do all that Moses required did not bring them into the Jewish covenants; they were enjoined to keep the law because God in grace, apart from all merit of their own, had placed them in covenant relation to Himself. Students who recognize and teach these most fundamental facts are sometimes accused by Covenant theologians of holding that people of the old order were saved and constituted what they were by keeping the Law of Moses, all of which is a misconception. The godly Jew was subject to blessing for his faithfulness in that which Jehovah required of him. But the Mosaic Law only holds the distinction of being Jehovah's rule of life for His people in the age that is past. These are the commandments which they "brake" (Jer. 31:32) and which are yet to be incorporated into (Deut. 30:8), although as a covenant to be superseded by, the new covenant which has still to come (Jer. 31:31–34; Heb. 8:8–13).

2. From Christ. The second use of the word *commandments*, when reference is made by it to a system or to principles governing human action, occurs when it signifies the commandments of Christ. When setting forth the principles which are to obtain in the coming kingdom age (Matt. 5:1–7:29), Christ drew certain contrasts between that which enters into the Mosaic system and that which will obtain in the kingdom (Matt. 5:17–48). The oft-repeated formula is, "Ye have heard that it was said [by Moses] … but I say unto you." In none of these contrasts, however, did Christ use the term *my commandments*. This designation was not used until He came to the upper room the night before He was crucified, at which time He introduced the body of truth especially belonging to the Church in the present age of grace. There is nothing accidental here. This phrase on the lips of Christ designates, and by it He distinguishes, the range of truth which belongs to the present age. Thus at the end of His ministry on earth and after the forty days of instruction following His resurrection, He directed His disciples to teach all things that He had commanded them (Matt. 28:20), but did not include the Mosaic system. It is to be noted that Christ's first injunction was "a new commandment" (John 13:34), and that love is enjoined here as the evidence required to indicate that marvelous unity which all believers form (cf. John 17:21–23)—a unity wrought by the Holy Spirit and to be kept or manifested by love one for another. No such unity ever existed before. That which is included under the words "my commandments" was taken up and expanded by the Apostle Paul in his epistles.

References to Christ's commandments are many—John 13:34–35; 14:15, 21; 15:10; 1 John 2:3; 3:22–24; 4:21; 5:2–3; 2 John 1:4–5. Cf. Matthew 28:20; Luke 24:46–48; Acts 1:3; 1 Corinthians 14:37; Galatians 6:2; 1 Thessalonians 4:2.

CONFESSION

Confession is an outward expression of an inward conviction. It assumes three distinct forms in the Bible.

1. Of Christ. The individual's confession of Christ is to be seen in two particulars:

a. AS SAVIOR. Of this particular confession of Christ the Scriptures declare: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:9–10); "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. … Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God" (1 John 4:2–3, 15); "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist" (2 John 1:7). Too often these texts—especially Romans 10:9–10—have been thought to refer to a confession of Christ which an individual might make in public. Earnest men have taken this Scripture to mean that an individual must make a public confession of Christ as a prerequisite to salvation, little recognizing the fact that the majority of those who are believers were saved under circumstances in which no public confession of Christ was possible. The confession here enjoined is directed to God and not to men. It is the response of the heart to God by which acceptance of Christ as Savior is sealed. When confronted with Jehovah's promise respecting a son, Abraham believed—literally, amened—God (Gen. 15:6). Thus every soul born of God turns to Him with a heartfelt acknowledgment of Christ as Savior. It is the response of the soul and spirit saying in the innermost being, "Abba, Father." It should also be noted that, since in upwards of 150 New Testament passages salvation has been conditioned upon faith or believing alone, it cannot be true that any other requirement is laid upon the unsaved for salvation, else these many and central passages are incomplete and to that extent misleading. All who hear the call of God do respond in their hearts to that call, if they are saved at all.

b. IN THE KINGDOM. According to Matthew 10:32–33, Christ's confession of His own in the future kingdom will depend upon their confession of Him on earth. This will evidently be a most vital consideration in the kingdom age. The passage declares: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

2. Of Sin. The second aspect of this doctrine divides, likewise, into two main divisions, which are:

a. THE OLD TESTAMENT REQUIREMENT. Since any covenant person or persons may be restored to the experimental blessings of their relation to God by confession—though in no instance is an unconditional covenant itself or the position before God which it secures in danger of being sacrificed—the people of Israel were thus restored, and this provision became a vital feature of Old

Testament doctrine (cf. Lev. 5:5; 16:21; 26:40; Num. 5:7; 1 Kings 8:33, 35; 2 Chron. 6:24, 26; 30:22; Ezra 10:11; Neh. 1:6; Ps. 32:5; 51:1–19; Prov. 28:13; Dan. 9:4). As with the case of the Christian in the present age and as stated above, the covenant position and standing of Israel could not be lost, but fellowship with God if lost because of sin could be restored by confession. Two specific instances of individual confession within the old order should be observed with attention. David's notable sin, even if involving immeasurable evil and the sacrifice of his personal blessings, did not destroy his salvation, for he said, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation." He also recognized that his sin, though an injury to many, was primarily against God. This he indicated with the words: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:4). Likewise the prodigal of Luke 15:11–21, who also belonged to the old order, did not sacrifice his sonship by reason of sin, but was restored to communion with his father through confession, in which confession he said, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son" (Luke 15:21). It is to be observed how both of these confessions recognize that sin is primarily against God. Since there is here as elsewhere a progress of doctrine, the general theme of confession will be more clearly presented in connection with relationships which obtain on this side of the death of Christ.

b. THE NEW TESTAMENT REQUIREMENT. Confession, being the outward expression of an inward conviction, is closely related to repentance. The problem before the believer who has sinned is not restoration to the saved estate, which estate depends wholly upon the immutable Person and merit of Christ and therefore continues what it is so long as the basis abides upon which it rests; it becomes rather a matter of fellowship with the Father and with the Son. Two cannot walk together except they be agreed and God cannot have communion with evil; however, when the sinning Christian turns to God in full acknowledgment of the sin, accepting God's estimation of it, agreement is established again and restoration to fellowship is at once experienced. On the divine side, there is both cleansing and forgiveness required and also provided, and these are wrought in the faithfulness of God to His promise and purpose, and in justice since Christ has borne the sin in question (1 John 1:9). Naturally, such provisions are intended only for those who are actually sons of God and thus enter into a union with God which cannot be broken. Confession should always be unto God and to no one else unless, perchance, some other person has been injured by the sin. It should be recognized also that true confession is a complete admission of the evil wrought. Asking God to forgive is wholly beside the issue. He has said that He will forgive and cleanse the saved one who *confesses* his sin. This promise should be taken exactly as given, and faith should reckon that when sincere confession has been made the promise is kept, regardless of emotions respecting the sin which may continue. Two important passages bear on the Christian's confession of sin: "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:31–32); "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. … If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:7, 9; cf. James 5:16).

3. Of Men. As noted above, it is a major feature of the future kingdom relationships that Christ will confess before the Father and the angels those who confess Him before men. The passage reads, "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 10:32–33). This Scripture is wholly within the kingdom revelation and therefore could not apply to the Christian in the present age. A similar feature for the Church is seen, however, in Revelation 3:5.

CONSCIENCE

As a native faculty of every human being, conscience is most difficult of understanding and has too often been wholly neglected in works on Anthropology and psychology. When Immanuel Kant presented what has come to be the time-honored threefold division of the immaterial part of man as intellect, sensibility, and will, he failed to include conscience, vital feature of human existence though it is. The subject at best is shrouded in mystery. Personality seems to express its full scope and inclusiveness when it wills and executes its purpose guided by the intellect and the sensibilities; nevertheless, over and above this manifestation of personality, conscience sits in judgment whether the action be good or bad. The assumption of conscience as not having part in that which otherwise engages the entire being and yet being intuitively aware of each action to the extent of rendering judgment upon the deed suggests the peculiar and elusive character of this faculty. A wide range of opinion exists respecting the conscience. At the one extreme lies the contention that conscience is an acquired attitude of mind, a mere habit formed by the discipline of early training, which training accentuated the values of good and evil. The acid test of this opinion is somewhat brought to light by uncivilized people who have had no moral ideals held before them. Since conscience is capable of being weakened and seared, it could be expected that, whatever may have been its native strength in the early childhood of heathen peoples, it would be all but destroyed as one's years advance. At the other extreme lies a conviction that conscience is the voice of God speaking directly in the human soul. A test for this theory to pass would be the evident fact that conscience is capable of being weakened and wholly defeated—tendencies which are not easily associated with the actual voice of God. The Bible assumes the presence of conscience in man as a native factor of his being and predicates such limitations of it as to make it a fallible human characteristic. Though subject to weakening through abuse, conscience is presented in the Scriptures as a monitor over human actions. It seems to be something inborn and universal rather than an acquired faculty, and to be a voice of human origin rather than the voice of God. When an induction is made of all Scripture bearing on the conscience, the dependable facts representing this human competency will be revealed. The word occurs thirty times in the New Testament.

The following general divisions of the subject are suggested: (1) The conscience acts judicially, accusing or excusing (Rom. 2:15). (2) The conscience acts punitively, inflicting remorse and self-punishment. (3) The conscience anticipates future judgments and then acts by way of prediction. (4) The conscience acts socially in judging others (Rom. 14:4; 1 Cor. 8:13).

The truth respecting the human conscience is even more complex in the case of a believer. Being indwelt by the Holy Spirit and therefore subject to the mind and voice of the Spirit, the question may be raised whether a Christian really lives at all by the restricted impressions which an unaided conscience engenders. The Holy Spirit becomes the new Monitor, and the child of God either grieves or does not grieve the Holy Spirit. It is therefore written: "And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30). It is possible that the Holy Spirit works in and through the human conscience when registering His reactions to the believer's thought and conduct. The Apostle thus testified of himself, "My conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 9:1).

CONVERSION

Conversion, which appears forty times in the original (ἐπιστρέφω), means no more than a turning about, and calls for a twofold treatment, namely:

1. Physical Implications. In this the first use of the terminology *convert* or *conversion* the meaning to be conveyed is no more than the turning about of a physical body. At various times it is declared of Christ that He "turned" or "turned about" (cf. Matt. 16:23, στρέφω), which intimates simply that He turned His body about. He was thus "converted." Christ warned the disciples against casting pearls before swine lest the swine turn and rend them, or "be converted" and rend them (cf. Matt. 7:6, στρέφω).

2. Spiritual Implications. As a moral or spiritual act also, the individual may turn about. The Apostle writes: "For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess. 1:9–10). However, being only the human action of mind and will, conversion in the moral or spiritual sense is not equivalent to salvation, which in all its mighty transformations is ever and only a work of God for the individual who exercises saving faith in Christ. This the second and more important aspect of the term *conversion* may indicate no more than reformation. It is the foremost counterfeit of true salvation. When doing the work of an evangelist, it is possible to secure conversions which are self-wrought, moral changes quite apart from genuine salvation with its forgiveness, new birth, and imputed righteousness. The student would do well to avoid the use of the word *conversion* when salvation is in view. Men are not saved except they be spiritually converted. They will then turn from all other confidences respecting their salvation to Christ alone (cf. 1 Thess. 1:9). Israel too might be said to turn about (cf. Ps. 19:7; Isa. 6:10; Matt. 13:15; 18:3; Mark 4:12; Luke 22:32; John 12:40; Acts 3:19; 15:3; 28:27; James 5:19).

CONVICTION

The original Greek word ἐλέγχω which may be translated either *convict* or *convince*—used seventeen times in the New Testament—represents in general the process whereby one is caused to reach certain conclusions or impressions in his mind. Too often it is assumed that this approach is through the emotions and that conviction consists in a spiritual depression and sorrow for sin. It is rather to be observed that the emotion which may arise in the heart is itself due to conviction, a convinced state of mind, and is not the convinced state of mind itself. Under a misapprehension it is supposed that sufficient sorrow for sin will soften the heart of God to the end that He may forgive, or that the sorrow for sin will result in a complete abandonment of its practice. In neither of these suppositions is the truth to be found. God's attitude toward the individual's sin has been thoroughly changed and this because of the fact that Christ has borne his sin. Through the death of Christ for sin, God is now propitious. There remains no occasion for Him to be appeased or propitiated either by human tears or sorrow. Likewise, to reach a point in conviction where some reforms are secured is far removed from the salvation of the individual. If through the enlightenment which conviction imparts, however, the individual is led to be cast completely upon God for His saving grace, the desired result of a spiritual transformation will be gained.

With this more specific meaning of *conviction* in mind, attention may be given to the central passage bearing on this theme, namely, John 16:7–11, which reads, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but

if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." This threefold ministry of the Spirit to the unsaved by which they are enlightened or convicted, which enlightenment evidently overcomes the blindness which Satan has imposed respecting the gospel, is most essential if any intelligent acceptance of Christ is to be achieved. This satanic blindness is described by the Apostle, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (2 Cor. 4:3–4). None other than the Holy Spirit can lift this veil. The Spirit does so by causing the individual to comprehend three cardinal, indivisible truths. They are cardinal since they comprise the very structure of the gospel of God's grace. They are indivisible since no portion of them is ever wrought apart from the whole. As the three themes are being taken up separately, it is of great importance to recognize that these subjects are mentioned in the text as constituting the substance of the Spirit's unfolding or revelation to the unsaved. The same complete unveiling of these truths is as definitely required in each unregenerate person as the universality of their blindness requires. Of itself and apart from Satan's blinding, the gospel is not difficult to understand and looks most attractive to those unto whom it comes through the enlightenment of the Spirit. Apart from an understanding of the gospel and the Spirit-wrought willingness to receive it, none are saved. Hebrews 6:4–9 implies that much enlightenment may come to the unsaved which they have power to resist and that, so long as they continue to resist the grace of God, the only hope for their salvation is by themselves set aside. The passage, however, does not teach that Christians may be lost. Verse 9 determines the fact that the unsaved are referred to in that which was said in verses 4–8. Returning now to the central passage:

1. Of Sin. Reference here is to the one sin that "they believe not on me." Too often it is assumed that it is the Spirit's work to make people conscious of and sorry for their sins; rather, He reveals to the unsaved simply the one sin of rejecting Christ. This emphasis of the Spirit is reasonable in the light of the truth that Christ has borne all sin in His death. There remains but the one issue—that of believing or receiving what Christ has done and Himself as the glorified Savior.

2. Of Righteousness. Thus, again, the Spirit unveils what it is impossible for the unenlightened, unregenerate person to comprehend, namely, that in the invisible Christ now at the right hand of God has been provided every merit and quality which one could ever need for time or eternity. Though the unsaved cannot enter deeply into the complex doctrine of imputed righteousness, it is essential that they know how salvation depends on their turning from all confidence in self or any other hope and on placing expectation wholly and only in Christ. This certainly proves an important feature of the Spirit's work if an intelligent acceptance of Christ as personal Savior is ever to be secured.

3. Of Judgment. In the use of the word *judgment* at this point allusion is made to the cross of Christ by which Satan, "the prince of this world," was judged (cf. Col. 2:14–15). The entire fact has to do with Satan's hold upon humanity on the ground that they are unlike God through sin. By bearing the sin of the world efficaciously (John 1:29), the Son of God wrought a judgment against Satan which should be acknowledged as the greatest of all judgments. The unsaved are expected to recognize that they, like criminals, have been apprehended, brought into judgment, found guilty, and led out to be executed, only to have Another, by His own choice, intervene and suffer execution in the sinner's stead. Thus it comes to pass that the sinner is placed as a judged criminal beyond his own execution. Certainly this is not a thing to be undertaken by the sinner, then, but is something to *believe*.

When the whole field of truth which the Spirit reveals to the unsaved, by whatever agency He may elect, is revealed, it becomes evident that the issue before the unsaved as God presents it is one of believing what has now been accomplished by Christ and of resting with confidence in the Saviorhood of Christ. It is plain that he who attempts to preach the divine message should do so with all this truth in mind. In other words, the gospel which the Holy Spirit can indite is what has been set forth by the three phrases: “of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.”

COVENANTS

Since the days of Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) who, more than any other, introduced a one-covenant-of-grace idea, many theologians have promoted the notion that God is undertaking but one objective throughout human history. Scripture must be ignored or greatly misinterpreted to the end that such idealism may be advanced. The onecovenant idea could not avoid being a means with which to close the Scriptures from human understanding. It does not necessarily follow—as some contend—that because there is but one righteous ground upon which God can deal graciously with sinners, namely, by the blood of Christ shed for them, there must be but one covenant relationship between God and man. That God has earthly as well as heavenly purposes and in addition transforming blessings adapted to each group and the sphere to which they belong will be seen by any unprejudiced student of the Sacred Text. In relation to His earthly people, Israel, and their blessings God has made various covenants. Some of these are conditional and some unconditional, which terms suggest that in some covenants God has them to depend upon human faithfulness, while in others He merely declares what He will do wholly apart from the question of human worthiness or faithfulness.

Without much Scripture upon which to base it, Covenant theologians have supposed the existence of a covenant between the Persons of the Godhead in relation to the part each would assume in the whole divine program of the ages, especially in redemption. The most that can be said for this contention is that it is reasonable; yet, all the same, difficulties are engendered. For this assumes that there was a beginning in the plan and purpose of God and that separate Persons of the Godhead sustained individual interests.

God has nevertheless entered into nine covenants with man on the earth. With these nine agreements all Scripture is related. Attention therefore to their provisions will be most essential. It is true that the earlier relationships between God and man included here are not termed covenants, but still they partake of the nature of covenants. The first three covenants—Edenic, Adamic, and Noahic—defined human life at its beginning. The Edenic Covenant conditioned unfallen man’s life in Eden and is in seven parts. The Adamic Covenant governed fallen man in his estate outside of Eden and falls into seven parts. The Noahic Covenant provided for man after the flood and is likewise in seven parts. These along with all the remaining covenants have a more complete treatment earlier, under Bibliology (Vol. I). The fourth covenant in order is the Abrahamic, which also falls into seven divisions—(1) “I will make of thee a great nation,” (2) “And I will bless thee,” (3) “And make thy name great,” (4) “And thou shalt be a blessing,” (5) “And I will bless them that bless thee,” (6) “And curse him that curseth thee,” (7) “And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed” (Gen. 12:1–3).

In the fifth covenant, which has been named the Mosaic (Ex. 19:5), is a covenant made with Israel as a nation alone and that in the conditional manner. An unconditional covenant cannot be

broken by man since it places no dependence upon him. A conditional covenant may be disrupted, and the Mosaic Covenant indeed, which is more familiarly known as the law, was broken. God declares so much in Jeremiah 31:32 (cf. Heb. 8:9). This covenant had governed Israel's conduct as a redeemed people. It was given to them, however, not as a means of redemption or attainment unto a covenant relation to God, but because they were in right relation to God as a redeemed nation under God's covenant with that people descended from Abraham. It should take no effort to recognize that the Mosaic Covenant was never addressed to Christians; yet certain divisions of the professing church have failed to see why the saints of God of the present age cannot be under the law (John 1:17; Rom. 6:14; 7:4, 6; 2 Cor. 3:6–13; Gal. 3:23–25).

The sixth covenant, which is the Palestinian (cf. Deut. 30:1–10), presents the conditions upon which Israel entered their promised land. It, too, is expressed in seven parts, which are clearly set forth in the one passage bearing upon it. The land will be for them an everlasting possession and to it they will yet return, for Jehovah's covenants with Israel cannot be broken. The seventh covenant is the Davidic, which was made with David (cf. 2 Sam. 7:14–15) and comes in five parts. David's posterity fails not; his throne is established forever; a kingdom or sphere of rule continues forever; and Jehovah reserved the right to chasten David's sons, but the covenant cannot be broken. It is unconditional (cf. 2 Sam. 7:12–16; Ps. 89:1–37). David therefore must never lack for a son to sit upon his throne (Jer. 33:17); and as the eternal Son of God, who in His humanity is a son of David, will sit on that throne forever (Luke 1:31–33), there has not lacked one in all generations before Christ was born of David's line, or since, to sit upon the throne (cf. Ps. 2:6–9; Matt. 25:31). The eighth covenant is with Israel and conditions their life in the kingdom (cf. Jer. 31:31–34). It replaces and yet includes the Mosaic commandments (cf. Deut. 30:8), though in heightened form. It, too, is unconditional and falls into four parts.

There remains to be recognized a heavenly covenant for the heavenly people, which is also styled like the preceding one for Israel a "new covenant." It is made in the blood of Christ (cf. Mark 14:24) and continues in effect throughout this age, whereas the new covenant made with Israel happens to be future in its application. To suppose that these two covenants—one for Israel and one for the Church—are the same is to assume that there is a latitude of common interest between God's purpose for Israel and His purpose for the Church. Israel's covenant, however, is new only because it replaces the Mosaic, but the Church's covenant is new because it introduces that which is God's mysterious and unrelated purpose. Israel's new covenant rests specifically on the sovereign "I will" of Jehovah, while the new covenant for the Church is made in Christ's blood. Everything that Israel will yet have, to supply another contrast, is the present possession of the Church—and infinitely more.

CREATION

(See EVOLUTION)

The power of reason which belongs in some degree to every rational human being asserts itself by inquiring about the origin of all things. Consciousness of self and of all surrounding one identifies realities which engender the twofold conviction that, regardless of the remoteness of the time, what appears must have had a beginning and—since all creation is so marvelously designed and arranged—that there must have been a mind of infinite competency and omnipotent power to create or cause all things to exist. Merely to drive the idea of origin back into oblivion, as the evolutionist does,

serves only to confuse the mind and enlarge the sphere of uncertainties; for the central problem will remain—the problem of a first cause is no nearer solution. Regardless of a supposed process of development, the germ out of which it might be claimed that creation with its unnumbered supernatural features has developed in accord with natural or accidental methods, there is still call for explanation of the astounding necessity that said germ enfolded the universe in itself. There arise, therefore, but two basic ideas respecting origin: (1) that of natural development and (2) that of divine creation. Lying in between these two wholly irreconcilable propositions are various shades of theistic evolution—an attempt on the part of men to account for the undeveloped form of life and matter with which the universe is supposed to have begun by ascribing them both to Deity. The crass unbelief and rejection of God and His Word which in reality characterizes every form of evolution is mitigated not at all by such excursions into the realms of fiction as the theistic evolutionist takes to bring God into the picture, for he not only rejects the divine revelation in its literal form but minimizes in every respect the divine elements that may have become incorporated into his scheme of interpretation. The general doctrine of creation may, then, be divided into (1) that which accepts the divine revelation and (2) that which rejects the revelation.

1. Accepting Revelation. The creation of a universe out of nothing is an achievement so beyond the range of human understanding that it can be received as truth only through a sufficient confidence in, and recognition of, the One who creates. It is written, “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear” (Heb. 11:3). Faith is the basic requirement; but to the unregenerate man Almighty God is not sufficiently real to serve as a cause for anything. The Apostle declares, “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (1 Cor. 2:14). Therefore, to say to the unsaved man that God has done, is doing, or will do anything provides no satisfactory explanation for the manner in which it is done. Without a sufficient recognition of God, which only regenerate persons can possess, the unregenerate are shut up to natural forces when attempting to discover the origin of life and matter. Godless scientists boast, of course, that they accept nothing which is not demonstrated by proved facts; but when approaching the problem of origins they either advance the most unproved, grotesque, and absurd speculations or else withdraw into the awkward silence to which reasonable men flee when they realize that they do not know. Science may assert that the Christian does not know how creation was accomplished, and that is true to the extent that he does not know God’s method; but he does know God as his Creator. The Christian’s satisfaction respecting the origin of things is not due to mere unenlightened, fantastic credulity; rather, he has found One who can do all He says that He has done or ever will do, and thus ends his quest for a sufficient Cause.

It should be noted at this point again that the unsaved cannot recognize God. They are equally incapable of understanding the ground of faith upon which the enlightened, regenerate person stands. Argument avails nothing. The two schools of thought on the subject are not only widely separated in viewpoint, but remain hopelessly apart until the unregenerate come to know God. The divine-creation revelation does not contend, as falsely charged, that nothing has produced nothing. This assertion made by the spiritually unenlightened only demonstrates anew their inability to recognize God. To them He, by reason of being nothing in their concept, could produce nothing. On the other hand, to say that God the infinite One produced something out of nothing may defy human comprehension, but it does not exhaust the resources of infinity. The revelation regarding divine creation, incidentally, is not restricted to the early chapters of Genesis, at the beginning of Scripture. The entire Bible is constructed on the divine-creation truth. The Sacred Text not only asserts divine

creation at its beginning, but upholds it and proceeds on its sure foundation in every succeeding step where there is unfolding of truth.

2. Disregarding Revelation. Exceedingly damaging indictments must be brought against every form of evolutionary belief. It contradicts what God says. The effect of this sin is far-reaching. So far as can be done by man, it dismisses God from His universe. By divine arrangement, God's character and immediate presence is the norm as well as reason for every moral standard in the universe. A man who does not recognize God is, apart from feeble social ideals which reflect some knowledge of God, a law unto himself; the moral wreckage in the world of education is thus directly traceable to "scientific" theories embraced by educational leaders who repudiate God. There is but one cure for the utter failure of the race, and that is for the individual to be born spiritually from above, to come thus to know God, to know His power, His character, and His faithfulness.

CREEDS

Primarily the knowledge of Bible doctrine is an individual attainment. In this field great works on theology have been produced, accordingly; but for general unification men have formulated creeds and upon these they choose to find a common agreement. Creeds are closely related in their character to works on Systematic Theology. Both alike, however, and for the same reason, are rejected by modern religious leaders. Since the New Testament sets forth so much more doctrine than the Old Testament, creeds are usually based on New Testament revelation. Doubtless, Deuteronomy 6:4 is the most theological passage in the Old Testament. Creeds have special value as reflectors of the theology of their times. None are inspired, of course, and none infallible. Vast ranges of essential truth have been advanced by expositors and theologians indeed since the great majority of creeds were formed. A grave danger exists of failing to recognize the larger field of truth whenever or wherever these creeds are adopted and defended as a sufficient expression of that which the Word of God presents. Similarly, personal subscription to some creed may be a means by which one may be classified as orthodox, and yet that one may be destitute of a firsthand study of the Scriptures. Any such device which allows men to pass as trained ministers but which tends to make arduous and continuous study of the Sacred Text nonessential should be exposed and faithfully avoided. At the present time, many greatly restricted doctrinal statements are being drawn by the ever increasing number of independent forms of Christian work which, being unrelated to other bodies of believers and having no doctrinal standards consequently upon which to rest, must thereby declare their belief to the public.

The major creeds of the past fall into two general groups: (1) those formulated before the Reformation and (2) those formulated after the era of the Reformation.

1. Prereformation Creeds.

a. THE APOSTLE'S CREED, sometimes called the *Roman Creed*, is best known and more generally used than others. Being highly condensed, it is suited to public recitation. As with all creeds, the aim of the writers was to declare what they believed to be cardinal truth; but this creed, like all others, is characterized by that which has been omitted as well as by that which has been presented. Few people, however, are ever aware of that which is omitted in creeds or theological writings.

b. THE NICENE CREED, or creed of 318—so-named because of the number of bishops who collaborated in its formation—was adopted at Nice, A.D. 325, and was reaffirmed at Constantinople in 381. Its primary aim was to contradict Arianism, in its own defense of Trinitarianism.

c. THE ATHANASIAN CREED was the statement of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, the chief combatant of Arius.

2. POSTREFORMATION CREEDS.

a. THE SCHWABACH ARTICLES, dated 1529.

b. THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, 1530.

c. THE SCHMALKALD ARTICLES, 1537.

d. THE FORMULA OF CONCORD, 1577.

e. CONSENSUS GENEVENSIS, 1551, with its twenty-six articles.

f. THE HEIDELBERG, 1562.

g. THE CANONS OF THE SYNOD OF DORT, 1618–1619.

h. THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES of the Church of England, 1563.

i. THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH, formed by Reformed church leaders, 1648.

CRITICISM

According to its broad usage the word *criticism* indicates more than an unsympathetic attack upon what is written in the Scriptures; it reaches out to incorporate analysis and evidence in general, and proves as advantageous in establishing that which is true as it does in detecting error where human error exists. Carelessness obtains in the use of terms which classify criticism. The student is enjoined to give heed to suitable definitions and to conform to the distinctions set forth.

Dr. James Orr has written illuminatingly on this theme in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. The following is a quotation from his statement:

> So much has been said and written in recent years on “Criticism” that it is desirable that the reader should have an exact idea of what criticism is, of the methods it employs, and of the results it reaches, or believes itself to have reached, in its application to Scripture. Such a survey will show the legitimacy and indispensableness of a truly scientific criticism, at the same time that it warns against the hasty acceptance of speculative and hypothetical constructions. Criticism is more than a description of phenomena; it implies a process of sifting, testing, proving, sometimes with the result of establishing, often with that of modifying or reversing, traditional opinions. Criticism goes wrong when used recklessly, or under the influence of some dominant theory or prepossession. A chief cause of error in its application to the record of a supernatural revelation is the assumption that nothing supernatural can happen. This is the vitiating element in much of the newer criticism, both of the Old Testament and of the New Testament.
>
> Criticism of Scripture (“Biblical criticism”) is usually divided into what is called “lower or textual criticism” and “higher criticism”—the latter a phrase round which many

misleading associations gather. “Lower criticism” deals strictly with the *text* of Scripture, endeavoring to ascertain what the real text of each book was as it came from the hands of its author; “higher criticism” concerns itself with the resultant problems of age, authorship, sources, simple or composite character, historical worth, relation to period of origin, etc. The former—“textual criticism”—has a well-defined field in which it is possible to apply exact canons of judgment: the latter—“higher criticism”—while invaluable as an aid in the domain of Biblical introduction (date, authorship, genuineness, contents, destination, etc.), manifestly tends to widen out illimitably into regions where exact science cannot follow it, where, often, the critic’s imagination is his only law.

It was only gradually that these two branches of criticism became differentiated. “Textual criticism” for long took the lead, in association with a sober form of Biblical “introduction.” The relations now tend to be reversed. “Higher criticism,” having largely absorbed “introduction” into itself, extends its operations into the textual field, endeavoring to get behind the text of the existing sources, and to show how this “grew” from simpler beginnings to what it now is. Here, also, there is wide opening for arbitrariness. It would be wrong, however, to deny the legitimate place of “higher criticism,” or belittle the great services it is capable of rendering, because of the abuses to which it is frequently liable.—II, 749

To be added to this consideration is the terminology *destructive criticism*, which refers to the effort made by unsympathetic men who aim at a breaking down of the testimony of the Sacred Text. Too often all Biblical “criticism” is thought to be of this type, destructive rather than constructive. It may, however, be either one or the other.

CROSS

In its more important use in the New Testament, the term *cross* refers to the framework of wood upon which Christ was crucified. It becomes at once not only a symbol of His death by crucifixion but a synonym of the words *sacrifice*, *suffering*, and *death*. The unique manner in which the inanimate timber on which Christ was crucified is linked with the very Person of the One slain there is to be seen in Galatians 6:14, where the terminology *cross* becomes, through use of the words “by whom,” identified with that which Christ became in His death. The passage reads, “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

In its doctrinal significance, the word *cross* is subject to a twofold usage, namely, (1) that which relates to Christ’s sufferings and death and (2) that which relates to the believer’s suffering and sacrifice.

1. Christ’s Sufferings and Death. One passage may be cited under this heading, namely, 1 Corinthians 1:18, which reads: “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.” Here the whole value of Christ’s sufferings and death is in view. To the unsaved, apart from the enlightenment of the Spirit, the message of redemption is “foolishness.” Thus the Apostle declares in 1 Corinthians 2:14 also, “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Likewise he states, “But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are

called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:23–24). In this revealing body of Scripture the attitude of the unsaved, here termed *foolishness*, is not to be considered an intimation that they are making light of the cross by ridicule; it is rather that the best explanation of Christ's death which they are able to conceive falls so far below the truth that it proves to be foolishness, that is, it would have been folly for Christ to die if actuated only by the objectives these unregenerate people assign to His death. The historic fact of Christ's death, unique event as that was (the only holy man that ever walked on earth was forsaken of God and crucified as a malefactor), does require an explanation on the part of every thoughtful person. To claim, as some have done, that Christ's death was to the end that divine sympathy might be shown for those who are lost fails of the truth completely. Though He might display the sympathy of God, in so doing there would be no relief provided the one for whom Christ suffered either in respect to the cause of his woe or to the woe itself. To declare that Christ's death is of value to the extent that it reveals the evil character of sin and with the intent that sinners might turn from sin, once that is exposed, is to miss the essential truth again; for if all people could be persuaded to abandon sinful practices and even were they enabled to sin no more, there would still not be one person saved by such an achievement. Efforts to reform the lost apart from regeneration—the true objective in Christ's death—are well termed the folly of the ages. To suppose that Christ died as a martyr, the unwilling victim of a mob, and that to die for one's convictions must be glorious is likewise to be misled about the real meaning of His death. For Christ was not an unwilling victim, for He said of Himself that He laid down His life that He might take it again (John 10:17). In the second place the death of a hero, no matter how glorious, provides no reconciliation between God and man respecting sin. There is but one answer to the question of why Christ died. This has been stated in the Old Testament thus, "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:5–6), and in the New Testament by the words, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). To each individual the death of Christ should mean what it did to the great Apostle when he said: "The Son of God, … loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20).

2. THE BELIEVER'S SUFFERING AND SACRIFICE. Here all thought of making satisfaction for sin, as in the death of Christ, is excluded. It is only as the cross of Christ represents His personal sacrifice and suffering that it becomes, too, the symbol of the believer's sacrifice and suffering. The denial of self that the life may be lived for God is in view. Christ said, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Matt. 16:24). A true definition of the believer's cross-bearing has been given in 2 Corinthians 4:10–11, where it is said: "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." By self-adjustment to the will of God, being ready even for a martyr's death, the attitude of Christ Himself was reproduced in the Apostle who was ministering to the Corinthian believers (cf. Rom. 9:1–3; 12:1–2; Phil. 2:5–8; 3:7–9; Heb. 10:4–7).

D

DARKNESS

The fact that darkness means an absence of light is used by the Scriptures to illustrate truth in five different aspects. No physical reality is more impressive—unless it be life and death—than the phenomenon of darkness and light. The various uses of the term *darkness* in the Bible are connected with:

1. Opposition to the Character of God. Writing of the holiness of God, the Apostle John has said, "And in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). Similarly, James has said, "With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of [cast by, R.V.] turning" (James 1:17). Light thus becomes a vivid illustration of the transparent purity of God. His glory is radiant with Shekinah light. Some of Christ's intrinsic glory was manifested in His transfiguration. Perfect holiness can be indicated only by celestial light.

2. Moral Estate of the Unsaved World. When Christ came into the world, it was said of Him that He appeared as Light which shineth in a dark place, and yet the darkness comprehended it not (John 1:5). The perfect Light which God is cannot be comprehended by the darkness of this world. Darkness first came into this world when sin entered. Its reality is faithfully described by God in His Word, but men do not heed or understand the divine testimony. They "loved darkness rather than light" (John 3:19). In the beginning there was light enough, but men turned from the light. The Apostle states: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened" (Rom. 1:21). The experience of the blind man is symbolical, "Whereas I was blind, now I see" (John 9:25). To the lost world about Him Christ declared, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness" (Luke 22:53). When one is saved he is translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God's love (Col. 1:13). Truth is itself as light and the lack of it as darkness. Of the believer it is recorded that he has been "called out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2:5).

3. The Carnal Christian. Having declared that "God is light," the Apostle John asserts further: "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth" (1 John 1:6). Fellowship or communion depends upon agreement, and where sin is practiced and defended by a believer there can be no perfect fellowship with God. To walk in the light is to be subject to the light, that is to say, when God reveals to one whatever in the life runs contrary to the Light which God is, there should be adjustments to that new revelation. To walk in the light is not to be sinlessly perfect; it is to be adjusted to all that God discloses unto the heart concerning His will for one's individual life. For one to say as a pretense or supposition that he is walking in the light when evil has been tolerated, is to assert that which is not and could not be true. If, however, the believer walks in the light of God by being adjusted to His will, fellowship with God is maintained without effort and the stain of all sin is removed by the blood of Christ, for this blessed provision goes on cleansing (1 John 1:5–7). The darkness in which the believer may walk must be distinguished from the darkness of the lost estate; his darkness is due to carnality, and its limitations are seen in the fact that his sin has not disturbed personal union with God, but only his communion with Him. There are

various drastic costs which the believer pays when he walks in darkness; loss of fellowship with God is one of them.

4. The Tribulation. It is specifically revealed that when Christ returns to the earth He will come to a universal condition of "gross darkness" which shall cover the people (Isa. 60:2). The tribulation period which is ended by Christ's advent with power and great glory will be a time "of darkness and of gloominess" (Joel 2:2). According to all major references concerned with it, the tribulation is the hour of supreme darkness and distress over all the world.

5. Final Estate of the Lost. There is a place called "outer darkness" (Matt. 25:30) which becomes the last and unending abode of those who go there. That such a place has existed from the time of the fall of the angels is evident since some of the angels are in "chains of darkness" due to that early departure from God, awaiting a day of judgment (2 Pet. 2:4). They are not merely in physical darkness, but a place and condition utterly void of that Light which God is.

DAYS

A considerable number of specific days is mentioned in the Bible and these are for the most part themes of prophecy. All of them may well be considered separately.

1. Creation. Genesis clearly declares that there were six successive days in which God created the heavens and the earth of today. The best of scholars have disagreed on whether these are literal twenty-four hour periods or vast periods of time. From the standpoint of the ability of God, there is no question to be raised since He must be able to create all things in the briefest time. A literal twenty-four hour period seems to be implied when each is measured by words like, "And the evening and the morning were the first day," etc. On the other hand, it is reflected in nature that much time has passed since the forming of material things, and the Bible does use the word *day* symbolically when referring to a period of time. The coming kingdom of a thousand years is styled *The Day of the Jehovah*. Any point of time throughout the present age is known as *the day of salvation*. Peter declares: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Pet. 3:8). So, also, Christ represented the present age as the hour that was coming "and now is" (cf. John 5:25–28).

2. Sabbath. It pleased God, after six creative days having Himself rested on the seventh, to require of Israel as an integral part of their law that they cease from labor and activity on each seventh day. Other extra sabbaths were sometimes added and each seventh year was to be a sabbatic period when it would be required that the land rest throughout the year. The seventh-day Sabbath, being a feature of the Mosaic system, continued as long as the Mosaic law was in force. According to Hosea 2:11, a time should eventually come when Sabbath observance would cease and when God's judgments would fall upon Israel. The same Sabbath will, however, be resumed in the tribulation and likewise in the kingdom that is to follow. It is not accidental that the Sabbath has been mentioned in connection with the tribulation in Matthew 24:20.

3. Lord's Day. "The first day of the week" (cf. Matt. 28:1; John 20:1) is called in this age of the Church the Lord's day, and on the ground of the fact that on this day Christ arose from the tomb and became Head over the New Creation of God. Such observance of the New Creation day was anticipated in Psalm 118:22–24 (cf. Acts 4:10–11). The Authorized Version declares that John "was

in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10), but this is not necessarily a reference to the first day of the week. The original text reads literally, *Lordish day*, or "day which is characterized by Lord." It can mean, therefore, either Lord's day or Day of the Lord. Since John's vision as set forth in all of Revelation was of the extended period designated as the Day of the Lord, it seems evident that it must be this day of which John speaks. The Lord's day is only designed for the Church and so it ceases when that body of people is removed from the earth. With its cessation Israel is restored to her place of earthly favor and her Sabbath re-established.

4. Day of the Lord. The greatest expectation of the Old Testament was that of the Day of the Lord, yet it had not come when the Old Testament record closed and it has not come to the present time. It is still future (cf. 1 Thess. 5:1–2). It is related to Christ's second advent and not to His first advent. This period extends from Christ's coming "as a thief in the night" (Matt. 24:43; Luke 12:39–40; 1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Pet. 3:10; Rev. 16:15) to the passing of the heavens and the earth that now are and the melting of the elements with fervent heat. It seems highly significant that, in the same context and under the same theme in which those outmost boundaries of the Day of the Lord are given (2 Pet. 3:8–12), it is declared that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. It is essential that every student make a complete induction of all in the Bible which pertains to the Day of the Lord and thus gain for himself firsthand knowledge of all that has been divinely determined for this extended period. It may then be seen that this day includes the judgments of God upon the nations and upon Israel and that these judgments occur at Christ's return. It includes both Christ's return and the kingdom of a thousand years which follows. It extends indeed to the final dissolution with which the kingdom ends (2 Pet. 3:8–13; Rev. 20:1–15).

5. Day of Christ. By this term—so far as it relates to the earth—reference is made to a distinctive moment of time in which the dead in Christ will be raised and living saints will be translated, which moment is rightly extended into other scenes where vast changes are to be wrought that are the portion of the saints in glory. The Apostle John as seer or forerunner traces these glories for the Church in heaven and as well the agonies on the earth which belong to the tribulation and occur at the same time. The Day of Christ is the termination of the Church's pilgrim journey on the earth (cf. 1 Cor. 1:8; 5:5; 2 Cor. 1:14; 5:10; Phil. 1:6, 10; 2:16), and includes the event when saints are judged before the judgment seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10) and the marriage of the Lamb (Rev. 19:7–8). A notable correction in the Authorized Version is called for in 2 Thessalonians 2:2 where the term *Day of Christ* occurs, for *the Day of the Lord* is referred to in the original Greek according to textual criticism (see R.V.). Nothing is predicted as having to take place before the Day of Christ, but, as in the 2 Thessalonians context, there are stupendous events which must precede the Day of the Lord.

6. Last Day. Since it is the time in which Christ will raise those who are saved (cf. John 6:40, 44, 54), the terminology *the last day* is evidently a reference to the last day of the Church on earth and must therefore be a major feature of the Day of Christ.

7. Last Days for Israel. One passage out of many will serve to declare the distinctive character of Israel's last days on earth—the days of her kingdom glory: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation

shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the LORD" (Isa. 2:2–5).

8. LAST DAYS FOR THE CHURCH. A very unusual amount of New Testament Scripture, including all second Epistles excepting 2 Corinthians as well as other New Testament portions, bears on this important period. In contrast to Israel's last days, the last days for the Church are evil in character. One passage, again, may be quoted: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away" (2 Tim. 3:1–5; cf. 1 Tim. 4:1–5; James 5:3; 2 Pet. 3:3; 1 John 4:17). An exceptional use of this term is to be found in Hebrews 1:2 wherein the church age is seen to be part of the "last days" in God's dealing with men.

9. DAY OF JUDGMENT. By the phrases, "Day of judgment or Judgment Day," reference is evidently made to the final trial of the wicked who are raised to stand before the great white throne following the kingdom age and preceding the eternal state (Rev. 20:5, 11–15). Additional Scriptures to be considered are Matthew 10:15; John 12:48; 2 Peter 2:9; 3:7; Jude 1:6.

10. MAN'S DAY. This theme, obscured at times by translators, is referred to but once in the New Testament, namely, 1 Corinthians 4:3, which reads, "But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self." In this passage the phrase *man's judgment* is really a reference to human opinion current in this age, which might properly (and literally) be translated *man's day*.

11. DAY OF SALVATION. The Apostle declares that *now* is the day of salvation (2 Cor. 6:2), and is thereby referring to any moment within the church age as a time when Christ may be received as Savior. His statement is based on Old Testament prophecy.

12. DAY OF GOD. The one reference to the Day of God (2 Pet. 3:12) is evidently an identification of the eternity yet future when the new heavens and the new earth will have been created.

DEATH

Being, as it is, a penalty for sin, death in its varied forms is foreign to the original creation as it came from the hand of God. Being a penalty, such portion of it as may be removed will be dismissed forever; other portions of it, being eternal, cannot be removed. The entire theme may be divided into three aspects of death—the physical, the spiritual, and "the second." Physical death is separation of soul and spirit from the body, spiritual death is the separation of soul and spirit from God, and second death is the final and permanent form of spiritual death if the individual has not been saved from that. To Adam God had said as a threatened penalty for the sin of disobedience, *Dying thou shalt die* (Gen. 2:17, Hebrew). This judgment, which later fell upon Adam, would have included all the forms of death, even second death—had he not been saved from it by divine grace. As God had warned, Adam died spiritually the day that he partook of the forbidden fruit, and thus became subject to the second death. On that day, also, he began to die physically, and, though many hundreds of years may have intervened, he finally perished physically.

While this is true of Adam personally, it must be observed that Adam's position as a natural head of the race was such that the whole human family are directly affected by his sin, and thus "death passed upon all men" (Rom. 5:12). The initial, single sin of Adam is the cause, or occasion, for the penalty of death in all its forms falling universally upon all the members of the human race. The fact that death in its varied forms descends upon the race calls for a separate consideration of the relation each form of death sustains to mankind as originating in Adam's one initial sin.

1. PHYSICAL. That great feature of human experience—physical death—is described in respect to its cause in Romans 5:12–14: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." In this passage it will be seen that sin did not originate with Adam in Eden, but as a tragic thing which had already become the occasion for the fall of Satan and many angels it found entrance into the world through the one man, Adam, and from Adam to the race in his loins. In the instance of physical death all men partake of the penalty, because of the fact that in the divine reckoning all men shared as participants in Adam's first sin by being, as they were, represented in his natural headship. The phrase, *for that all have sinned*, has too often been supposed to refer to the personal sins of all men within their lifetime. In the passage quoted above, however, it may be seen that the Apostle makes special effort to resist the idea that this form of death is due to personal sins. Physical death, he points out, is not due to the breaking of the law, for men died before the law was given; nor is it due to willful disobedience such as characterized Adam's sin, since those—infants and unaccountable persons—die who do not sin willfully as Adam did. It only remains, therefore, that physical death is due to participation in Adam's sin. The truth respecting seminal headship being so little understood, it is not easily considered or accepted by uninstructed minds. As a limitless forest of oak trees may be embraced in one acorn, so a race was contained in Adam. The Biblical principle which proceeds on the basis that unborn generations do act in their fathers, or share in that responsibility which their fathers bear, is declared in Hebrews 7:9–10. Here Levi, who lived by tithes being paid to him and who was a great grandson of Abraham, paid tithes, although being then only in the loins of his great grandfather, Abraham. The passage reads: "And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." So far as Scripture reveals, there can be but one cause of physical death; it is due to the individual's personal participation in Adam's one initial sin. The participation was universal, hence the penalty—physical death—is universal. It is physical death which will later be destroyed (cf. 1 Cor. 15:26; Rev. 21:4). This "the last enemy" will be cancelled by a reversing of it; that is, all that have died will be raised to die no more (cf. John 5:25–28; 1 Cor. 15:22). The divine cure for physical death is resurrection.

2. SPIRITUAL. Though spiritual death began with the same initial sin of Adam, it becomes effective on humanity in a different manner than does physical death. The first sin of Adam caused him to be transformed downward into a different kind of being from that which God had created. He, furthermore, could propagate only after his kind, and thus the race was born in spiritual death received by heredity from the first man, Adam. Each person of the race is born spiritually dead—separated from God—and receives that fallen kind of nature directly from one's parents. Thus spiritual death comes *mediately* through an unbroken line of posterity. Over against this, physical death is received from Adam *immediately*, as each person dies in body because of his own personal

share in Adam's first sin. The cure for spiritual death is regeneration or the passing from inward death unto life.

3. Second. As there is no cessation of consciousness in either physical or spiritual perishing, there can evidently be no cessation of consciousness in the second death. It rather is the eternal perpetuation of spiritual death—unending separation of soul and spirit from God. The Apostle John writes of the second death and asserts that it is linked with "the lake of fire." The meaning seems to be that those who enter the second death also enter "the lake of fire" (Rev. 20:12–15). A most important feature of this depressing doctrine is the teaching of Revelation 20:6 which states: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

On the general theme of this second death Dr. C. I. Scofield makes the following comment: "'The second death" and the 'lake of fire' are identical terms (Rev. 20:14) and are used of the eternal state of the wicked. It is 'second' relatively to the preceding physical death of the wicked in unbelief and rejection of God; their eternal state is one of eternal 'death' (i.e. separation from God) in sins (John 8:21, 24). That the second death is not annihilation is shown by a comparison of Rev. 19:20 with Rev. 20:10. After one thousand years in the lake of fire the Beast and False Prophet are still there, undestroyed. The words 'forever and forever' ('to the ages of the ages') are used in Heb. 1:8 for the duration of the throne of God, eternal in the sense of unending" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, pp. 1351–52).

The death of Christ becomes an exception to all aspects of human death. While He died physically, it was not, as with others, a penalty for a share that He ever had in Adam's sin; for with that He, being unfallen in His humanity, had had no part. In respect to spiritual death, there is no clear declaration of how far Christ entered that realm. He of course did say, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46). Where God is silent the devout mind should hesitate to intrude.

DEITY

(See GOD)

DEMONOLOGY

In considering demons and the service which they render Satan, it is important to distinguish between demon possession or control and demon influence. In the one case the body is entered and a dominating control gained, while in the other case a warfare from without is carried on by suggestion, temptation, and influence. Investigation of the Scriptures in regard to demon possession reveals:

First, that this host is made up of bodiless spirits only. The following Scriptures verify such a statement: "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that

man is worse than the first" (Matt. 12:43–45); "And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them" (Mark 5:12).

Second, that they are, moreover, not only seeking to enter the bodies of either mortals or beasts, for their power seems to be in some measure dependent upon such embodiment, but they are constantly seen to be embodied thus, according to the New Testament. A few of these passages are given here:

> "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick" (Matt. 8:16); "As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil. And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake" (Matt. 9:32–33); "And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes. And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion: for we are many. And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea" (Mark 5:1–13); "And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed" (Acts 8:6–7); "And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying" (Acts 16:16).

Third, that they are wicked, unclean, and vicious. Many passages might be quoted in proof of this observation:

> "And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way" (Matt. 8:28); "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease" (Matt. 10:1); "There met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones" (Mark 5:2–5); "And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed

foaming" (Mark 9:20). It might be added that there seem to be degrees of wickedness represented by these spirits, for it is stated in Matthew 12:43–45 that the demon, returning to his house, "taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself."

The question is often raised whether demon possession obtains at the present time. Although the Biblical records of such control are almost wholly limited to the three years of the public ministry of Jesus, it is incredible that demon possession did not exist before that time or has not existed since. In this connection it should be remembered that these beings are not only intelligent themselves, but directly governed and ordered by Satan, whose wisdom and cunning have been so clearly set forth in the Scriptures. It is reasonable to conclude that they, like their monarch, are adapting the manner of their activity to the enlightenment of the age and locality attacked. It seems evident that they are not now less inclined than before to enter and dominate a body. Demon possession in the present time is probably often unsuspected because of the generally unrecognized fact that such spirits are capable of inspiring a moral and exemplary life as well as of appearing as the dominating spirit of a spiritist medium or as the power behind the grosser manifestations that are recorded by missionaries concerning conditions which they observe in heathen lands. These demons, too, like their king, can appear either as "angels of light" or "roaring lions" when by the former impersonation they may more perfectly further the stupendous undertakings of Satan in his warfare against the work of God. Demon influence, like the activity of Satan, is prompted by two motives: one to hinder the purpose of God for humanity and one to extend the authority of Satan himself. They, therefore, at the command of their king, willingly cooperate in all his God-dishonoring undertakings. Their influence is exercised both to mislead the unsaved and to wage an unceasing battle against the believer (Eph. 6:12). Their motive is suggested in what has been revealed by their knowledge of the authority and Deity of Christ, and as well by what they know of their eternal doom. The following passages are important in this connection: "And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8:29); "And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him" (Mark 1:23–25); "And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" (Acts 19:15); "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble" (James 2:19).

Satan, though proposing to supersede the Almighty, is not omnipotent; but still his power and the extent of his activity are immeasurably increased by the cooperation of a host of demons. Satan is not omniscient, yet his knowledge is greatly extended by the combined wisdom and observation of many sympathetic subjects. Satan is not omnipresent, but he is able to keep up an unceasing activity in every locality by the loyal obedience of the satanic host.

DEPRAVITY

Depravity is a theological rather than Biblical word, which distinction indicates that the term, though not found in the Sacred Text, by so much like the words *Deity* and *Trinity*, represents a truth that is clearly taught in the Scriptures. This doctrine, furthermore, is misunderstood and often resented because of the fact that the Scripture has not been heeded or because the term *depravity* actually refers to that which God sees when He looks at fallen man and not to what man sees when he

looks at himself or his fellow men. These two grounds of misunderstanding unite in one general declaration when it is stated that depravity is what God declares that He sees, and precisely what He sees, when He looks at fallen man. The student would therefore do well to give unprejudiced and exhaustive consideration to all that is recorded in the Bible on this theme. Theologians employ also the phrase *total depravity*, which does not mean that there is nothing good in any unregenerate person as seen by himself or by other people; it means that there is nothing in fallen man which God can find pleasure in or accept.

The picture looks dark, and would be much darker still were it not for the divinely provided remedy which announces full and free salvation. This picture of mankind does not stand alone. A large portion of the angels "kept not their first estate," and for them no hope is offered whatever; they are unrevokably doomed to the lake of fire prepared for them (Matt. 25:41). Likewise, the Gentiles who lived between Adam and Christ are described in Ephesians 2:12 as doomed souls: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." The estate of man after the fall and before the flood is declared in Genesis 6:5: "And GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." David testified of himself, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51:5; cf. Job 14:4; Ps. 58:3). Similarly, three major passages may be cited from the New Testament which cover all men of this and other ages, namely:

> "There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes" (Rom. 3:10–18); "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:19–21); "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Eph. 2:1–3; cf. John 3:6; Rom. 5:12).

Distinction should be made between depravity as such, which is universal throughout all human history from Adam's fall onward, and the estate today of men "under sin," which estate is the result of a divine mandate declared to the end that God's grace may have its perfect exercise and manifestation (John 3:18; Rom. 3:9; 11:32; Gal. 3:22), and is evidently a condition which obtains only in the present age of grace when it can be said that there exists no difference between Jew and Gentile.

DISCIPLES

In this doctrine concerned with disciples, as in all other instances, the student would do well to employ Bible terms precisely as they are employed by the Scriptures. The word *disciple* means no more than a pupil, a learner, or a follower, and is not equivalent to the terminology *believer* or *Christian*. Observe that when Paul came to Ephesus, according to Acts 19:1, he found "certain disciples," but these proved to be only disciples of John the Baptist and not Christians at all. They had no knowledge of the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom. 8:9), and so, learning of Christ, they were rebaptized by the Apostle in the name of Jesus Christ.

While this term *disciple* is used interchangeably at times with the title *apostle* when referring to the twelve whom Christ chose to be with Him, the terms are not to be considered equivalent. An apostle is a hand-picked, qualified witness. None, therefore, became apostles who were not directly chosen of God, and it was required for membership with the Twelve that they have had association with Christ on earth. Strange assumption derived no doubt from Rome obtains on the part of those who claim for themselves an unbroken apostolic succession from the first apostles on. This claim must rest on something outside the Word of God, when no provision is made therein for continuation of the apostolic office, nor has it even been intimated as a possibility. It is pure assumption to claim that some ordination imposed by men constitutes one in line with the apostles of old. If such an order existed, it would be well for it to depend on apostolic success rather than on a supposed apostolic succession.

All believers are disciples in the sense that they are being taught of God through the indwelling Spirit and whatever instrumentality the Spirit may employ. The important fact is that the truth of Scripture reaches the believer's understanding and heart as a revelation from God (cf. John 16:12–15; 1 Cor. 2:9–12). The term *disciple* implies no more of a relation to God than that of learner. One revelation may come by means of the Spirit even to the unsaved, and that the way of salvation being revealed through the gospel. None other than those called of God, however, receive the gospel.

DISPENSATIONS

Two words often used as synonyms when treating dispensationalism are nevertheless quite different in their specific meaning. These should be considered separately.

1. Age. (αἰών). This term, which is translated *world* thirty-one times in the Authorized Version of the New Testament, means a block or period of time. It hardly need be said that there is no observable relation between the English noun *world* and a period of time. By reason of this confusion in terms, the whole revelation respecting successive ages was soon lost to view because of the translation. A clear illustration of how the translators worked is set forth in Hebrews. 1:1–2, which in the popular Authorized Version reads: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." Here the translation *worlds* has come from αἰών and by this term it is here declared that Christ arranged or programmed the successive ages of time. The disclosure is not the same as in verse 10 of the same chapter which states that Christ created all material things. No estimate could ever be made of the misunderstandings which have followed this error in translation. The same is true of the thirty-one instances where the rendering *world* is used in place of *age*. A notable passage on this point is Matthew 13:38–40: "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the

end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world" (cf. Matt. 13:49; 24:3; 28:20; Mark 4:19; 10:30; Rom. 12:2; 1 Cor. 2:6; 2 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 2:2; 2 Tim. 4:10; Heb. 11:3). Here in the first instance the field is said to be the *cosmos* world, while in the second and third instances the harvest is the consummation of the age, and not the end of the material world as the Authorized Version translation implies. In another notable passage—Matthew 24:3—reference is not made to the present age, but to the Jewish age which has yet seven years to run after this one has been completed. The disciples knew little of this present unforeseen age at the time that Christ was speaking. The sign of the end for the Jewish age, however, is declared in Matthew 24:15 and in answer to the question respecting this age as seen in verse 3. The evil one referred to by Christ as the sign is described in 2 Thessalonians 2:3–10 and there it has been said that he will not appear until the removal of the Church. The Mosaic age, which extended from the giving of the law to the law's end in the death of Christ, was interrupted by the intercalary age known as "the times of the Gentiles," which intercalation period began with the captivities and ends with the glorious reappearing of Christ. Accounting for a portion of this Gentile era God did measure out 490 years relative to Israel, which time along with "Gentile times" was nevertheless broken into by the present unforeseen intercalary age of the Church. The final tribulation period is measured in time by definitely predicted years for Israel, while the character of that period is delineated by the feet and toes of the colossal image which record the end of Gentile times.

2. DISPENSATION. Translated from the word οἰκονομία, meaning primarily *stewardship,* a dispensation is a specific, divine economy, a commitment from God to man of a responsibility to discharge that which God has appointed him. The Apostle declares of himself: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward" (Eph. 3:1–2). A stewardship was committed to the Apostle for him to receive, formulate, and proclaim the sacred secret respecting the hitherto unrevealed fact and provisions of saving grace as they are demonstrated in the Church. In uncounted instances Covenant Theology is disturbed by the recognition of dispensational distinctions; even the new manifestation of divine grace becomes one of those disturbing features of truth. If there be, as Covenant theologians contend, but one covenant of grace and that covenant operating uniformly in every age, to what, indeed, must the Apostle be referring when he asserts that a dispensation respecting a hitherto unrevealed economy of divine grace is committed unto him? Regardless of an unproved and unscriptural notion which may be embraced by a great number of men who have done no more than to receive without investigation what is taught in their schools, in the present age God is making a distinct and peculiar demonstration of His grace through the Church, which is Christ's Body. "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:8–10). Thus it comes about by means of this company of redeemed Jews and Gentiles (Eph. 3:6), which company has not existed as such in any other age, that the mystery or sacred secret, hidden from past ages, is made known and that revelation reaches to angelic hosts. Because past, present, and future ages (cf. Eph. 1:10; 3:1–6) are so clearly defined in the Scriptures, Covenant theologians acknowledge different ages or time-periods, but then they treat them as merely different ways of administering one and the same divine purpose. Regardless of every feature known to earlier ages, it will be seen that the Word of God builds all its doctrinal structure on an age past, a present age, and a future age. To deny these varied divisions,

however, gathered as they are about the different revealed purposes of God, is to cease to be influenced duly by the precise Scripture which God has spoken.

DISPERSIONS OF ISRAEL

In the light of her unchangeable covenants, one of which is possession of the land of promise (cf. Deut. 30:1–8), it is essential that Israel's dispossessions of the land be recognized. These dispossessions, then, involve regatherings also. There was clear prediction of three dispersions and three regatherings. Three dispersions have occurred as predicted, and two regatherings. Israel is now scattered in her third and final dispersion, awaiting more or less consciously the last regathering. One of the most common impressions respecting Israel is that they always have been and always will be scattered among the nations, as they are at this time. Attention to the Word of God will correct such a misleading error. It should be observed that, unless Israel remains a separate people under the specific purpose and covenant of God, and in no way related to, or any part of, the Church, there would be no meaning to Israel's dispersions or regatherings. The three dispersions and regatherings may well be considered separately. As an introduction to this consideration, it may be observed that, since in the Scripture Israel is the key to all earthly prospects and blessings, nothing will ever be normal in the earth when this nation is out of her land. All peace and tranquility for the earth await the final placing of Israel on their own promised land.

1. Dispersion into Egypt. The history of Israel in Egyptian bondage, the manner of their going thither, and the miracle of their deliverance are all known to readers of the Bible, but it is not so generally known that the Egyptian bondage was predicted centuries before. When a deep sleep fell upon Abraham and Jehovah ratified His unconditional covenant with him respecting the everlasting title to the land, God said to him: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not their's, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" (Gen. 15:13–16). The return of the nation to the land under the leadership of Moses and Joshua marks the end of the first dispersion. It began, continued, and ended as Jehovah predicted it would to Abraham.

2. The Captivities. Because of their sins, both the northern and southern kingdoms were allowed to go into bondage. The bondage ended seventy years after the southern kingdom was taken captive, but still not all that were taken abroad returned. The important fact is that a representation of the whole nation was reassembled in the land. A period of captivity for the southern kingdom was predicted by Jeremiah. He wrote: "And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations" (Jer. 25:11–12). Daniel learned from this specific passage when the time of bondage would be fulfilled. Of this experience Daniel records: "In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; in the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem" (Dan. 9:1–2).

3. Present Dispersion. The present dispersion exceeds the other two in point of duration and in the manner in which Israel is now scattered among all the nations of the earth. Beginning with the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D., the final scattering continues to the present hour and is a major characteristic of the present age, which characteristic must continue until the Church be removed from the world. It is then that Israel will at once come under renewed blessing and guidance of Jehovah and return to her own land. However, the return is accompanied also by other mighty events, all of which are unprecedented and directly or indirectly related to Israel's restoration. In this aspect of prophetic truth very much Scripture is involved.

The final return to their land is one of the major themes of Old Testament prophecy concerning the Jew. Concerning the present captivity Moses wrote:

> And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the LORD thy God. And it shall come to pass, that as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the LORD shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the LORD shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. And the LORD shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you.—Deut. 28:62–68

That which was to serve to accomplish this dispersion is described at length: "Remember, I beseech thee, the word that thou commandedst thy servant Moses, saying, If ye transgress, I will scatter you abroad among the nations" (Neh. 1:8); "I will scatter them also among the heathen, whom neither they nor their fathers have known: and I will send a sword after them, till I have consumed them" (Jer. 9:16); "Because my people have forgotten me, they have burned incense to vanity, and they have caused them to stumble in their ways from the ancient paths, to walk in paths, in a way not cast up; to make their land desolate, and a perpetual hissing; every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished, and wag his head. I will scatter them as with an east wind before the enemy: I will shew them the back, and not the face, in the day of their calamity" (Jer. 18:15–17); "And I will scatter toward every wind all that are about him to help him, and all his bands; and I will draw out the sword after them. And they shall know that I am the LORD, when I shall scatter them among the nations, and disperse them in the countries" (Ezek. 12:14–15); "I lifted up mine hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries" (Ezek. 20:23); "And I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the countries, and will consume thy filthiness out of thee" (Ezek. 22:15). James must therefore address his Epistle "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." That Israel will yet return to her land and experience great national blessing is one of the Bible's most positive predictions—a forecast which yields to no fanciful notions for its interpretation. It must either be accepted in its literal form or ignored completely. Too often the latter is done. Men of course must ignore these Scriptures who deny any

real distinction between Israel and the Church, for, as before declared, dispersion and regathering is utterly foreign to the Church. Upwards of fifty assertive passages declare that Israel will be regathered into their own land from this the third and final dispersion. Two of these passages may be cited:

> "And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the LORD thy God, and shall obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; that then the LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee" (Deut. 30:1–3); "And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore" (Ezek. 37:21–28).

E

ECCLESIOLOGY

The term ἐκκλησία, translated *church* or *assembly*, means a calledout company. Its counterpart in the Old Testament is the congregation; but Israel's congregation was never the true Church of the New Testament. Israel constituted nevertheless an assembly in the wilderness (Acts 7:38) as did the mob of Ephesus in the theater likewise (Acts 19:32, 41). The deeper spiritual use of the word *church* refers to a company of saved people who are by their salvation called out from the world into living, organic union with Christ to form His mystical Body over which He is the Head. That outward form of church which is a mere assembly of people must be restricted to those of one generation, indeed of one locality, and may include the unsaved as well as the saved. Over against this, the Church which is Christ's Body and Bride is composed of people of all generations since the Church began to be, is not confined to one locality, and includes only those who are actually saved. The spiritual meaning is thus seen to be far removed from mere recognition of a building which may be called a church, a congregation however organized, or any form of sectarian constituency.

The Pauline doctrine of the true or spiritual Church is second only in importance to the doctrine of salvation by grace. That salvation of which he wrote leads to and provides the supernatural material out of which the true Church is being formed. The two taken together constitute what the Apostle termed "my gospel." Both of the doctrines which composed his gospel were a revelation to the Apostle directly from God (Gal. 1:11–12; Eph. 3:1–6). Each revelation concerned hitherto unannounced and, up to the Day of Pentecost, nonexisting conceptions. Exception to this general statement may be found in the doctrinal patterns set forth by certain Old Testament types which foreshadow phases of truth belonging to the Church alone, and as well by the first twelve chapters of John's Gospel in which Christ is held up as a Savior of the lost, though in anticipation of that qualification as Savior which was afterwards gained through His actual death and resurrection. That the true Church was only an anticipation during the earthly ministry of Christ may be demonstrated in various ways. Christ Himself declared it to be yet future (Matt. 16:18), a crucified and risen Savior had not yet become the Object of saving faith (Gal. 3:23–25), and no one could believe in or preach the present grace-salvation at a time when he did not believe that Christ would die or be raised from the dead (Luke 18:31–34). There could be no Church until it was purchased with His precious blood (Eph. 5:25–27), until He arose to give it resurrection life (Col. 3:1–3), until He ascended to be the Head over all things to the Church (Eph. 1:20–23), or until the Spirit came on Pentecost through whom the Church might be formed into one Body and through whom the Church might be co-ordinated by His indwelling presence.

God has four classes of intelligent creatures in His universe—angels, Gentiles, Jews, and Christians—and there is more difference to be observed between Christians and either Jews or Gentiles than between angels and Jews or Gentiles. Should this statement seem extreme, it must be because the true and exalted character of the Christian is not comprehended. No angel is a son of God by actual generating birth from above, nor is any angel made to stand before God in the πλήρωμα—i.e., fullness—of Christ (John 1:16), which fullness is the πλήρωμα of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9–10).

Human history on earth has extended at least six thousand years. This long time may be divided into three periods of approximately two thousand years each: from Adam to Abraham two thousand years, with but one stock or kind of people in the world; from Abraham to Christ another two thousand years, with two kinds of people in the world—Gentiles and Jews, and from Christ's first advent to the present and indeed to His second advent, with three kinds of people in the world—Gentiles, Jews, and Christians.

No Scripture is addressed to angels and very little to Gentiles. About three-fourths of the Bible concerns Israel directly and about one-fourth concerns the Church. Failure to discern between Judaism and Christianity, as the case is with many theologians, proves misleading and wholly without excuse. No attitude of men toward God's truth is more revelatory respecting their habitual neglect of a personal, unprejudiced study of the Bible than the implications and suppositions which some advance concerning God's purpose in the world. That He has been doing but one thing and following but one purpose on earth is a farreaching error.

There is abundant Scripture to indicate that the present divine purpose must be the outcalling of the Church from both Gentiles and Jews.

Seven figures are employed in the New Testament to set forth the relation which exists between Christ and the Church. All seven are needed to the end that the whole revelation respecting this relationship may be disclosed. In connection with each figure and as its parallel there is a similar truth to be observed regarding Israel. (1) Christ is the Shepherd and Christians are the sheep. Israel, too, was the flock of God and the sheep of His pasture. This language brings out Christ's shepherd care and the helplessness of His sheep. (2) Christ is the Vine and believers of today are the branches. Israel was Jehovah's vineyard. This comparison speaks of Christ's strength and life being imparted, without which nothing could be done to enhance His glory. (3) Christ is the chief Cornerstone and Christians are the building. Israel had a temple, but the Church is a living temple for the habitation of God through the Spirit. Here the figure conveys the thought of interdependence and indwelling. (4) Christ is the High Priest and New Testament believers are a kingdom of priests. Israel had a priesthood; the Church in its entirety is a priesthood. This figurative speech introduces truth respecting worship and service. (5) Christ is the Head of the Church which is the Body. Israel was a commonwealth, an organized nation; the Church is an organism very much alive by reason of partaking of one life and being related to its living Head. This comparison speaks of vital relationship and of gifts for service. (6) Christ is the Head of a New Creation and Christians are with Him in that Creation as its vital members. Israel was of the old creation and attached to the earth; the Church is of the New Creation and related to heaven. This figure dwells upon the believer's marvels of position and standing, since he is in Christ. (7) Christ is the Bridegroom and the Church is the Bride. Israel was the repudiated (yet to be restored) wife of Jehovah; the Church is the espoused virgin Bride of Christ. This relationship for Christians, foreseen in various types, is all of another sphere and future. It sets forth the glory of Christ in which the Church as His Bride will share above. What marvelous things are wrought in this company of believers that they should become suitable as a bride for the Second Person of the Godhead and such a one as will ravish His heart throughout all eternity!

Pauline Ecclesiology is divided into three major divisions of doctrine: (1) the Church which is Christ's Body, His Bride, His fullness (John 1:16; Col. 2:9–10), and He is made full in them (Eph. 1:22–23); (2) the local church, which is an assembly composed of those who in any locality profess to be followers of Christ; and (3) the high calling for a daily life in conformity with the position which the believer sustains, being in Christ. Along with this is the doctrine of the empowering, indwelling Spirit by whom alone the high calling can be realized. It is evident from the Bible that

God had a rule of life for Israel which was the Law of Moses, and that He will yet have a legal requirement for them in the future kingdom. It is equally evident that He has indicated the manner of life which belongs to the Christian, and that it rests not on a merit basis, but calls for a life to be lived on the exalted standards of heaven itself. Let no student imagine that he has progressed far in sound doctrine if he does not comprehend the consistent teaching of the New Testament which declares that the Christian is not under the Law of Moses or any other form of obligation which has for aim the securing of merit.

It is never taught in the Scriptures that Israel as a nation will appear in heaven, though this destiny is open at present to individual believers from among the Jews. The destiny of the nation is earthly, extending on forever into the new earth which is yet to be. The destiny of the Church is heavenly. As His Bride and Body, the Church will be with the Bridegroom and Head wherever He goes.

ELDERS

Since elders (or bishops) are the divinely ordered rulers in the local, visible church, the general doctrine of the local church as regards its government may rightfully be introduced under this heading. The term *elder* is common to both Testaments and in general contemplates those of maturity and authority. No mere novice was to be made an elder (cf. 1 Tim. 3:6). The first reference to elders in the Old Testament seems to take recognition of their advanced years. Old men by reason of their experience are naturally valued for counsel (cf. 1 Kings 12:8; Ezek. 7:26). Later in Biblical history the designation *elder* gained the added idea of authority.

The word *elder* has three meanings in the New Testament. (1) A reference to age or maturity (cf. Luke 15:25; 1 Tim. 5:2). (2) A continuation of the Old Testament office of elders over Israel (cf. Matt. 16:21; 26:47, 57; Acts 4:5, 23). (3) A name for one officer of the local church to whom is assigned authority especially in the direction of spiritual matters pertaining to the church which he serves. It is now generally recognized that the title *elder* (πρεσβύτερος) relates to the same person as does the title *bishop* (ἔπίσκοπος). It seems probable that the word *elder* is recognition of the person chosen to bear the name, while the word *bishop* is descriptive of the office or position which that person occupies. The term *elder* contemplates what the man is in himself, then, while the term *bishop* contemplates what he has been appointed to do.

Among modern churches there are three general forms of government. (1) There are those who employ the word *episcopal* for their manner of government, which indicates leadership more or less absolute in the hands of men known as bishops. (2) There is a congregational form of organization which theoretically brings every matter to the whole membership for decision. (3) There lies, between these two extremes, a representative form of government in which the membership or congregation by its vote commits governmental responsibility to selected men—elders and deacons. To the elder is given in general the care over spiritual things and to the deacon the care over temporal things. This form of church management, after which the United States government with its Senate and House of Representatives was patterned, remains fundamentally a congregational government since these officers serve at the appointment of that local body. Elders or deacons are not supposed to be rulers who impose their will upon the congregation, as is too often the case. They are elected by the congregation rather as a committee might be and upon them is imposed the responsibilities which are assigned to governing men. The churches which have been organized under this representative

form of administration should never lose sight of the fact that they are, first and last, congregational in their type of government. This truth is not lessened because of the commitment of responsibility to representative elders and deacons. Such men should discharge all of that, but no more than that, which is committed unto them. These chosen officers should seek to know what is the wish of the whole membership and to enact that alone. Never should they impose any personal convictions upon the congregation contrary to the mind of the membership. For mere convenience some elders are classed as *teaching elders*, who are the clergy, and others as *ruling elders*, who are the church officers. Here the terminology *ruling elder* implies no more than that he rules as the membership's representative. Elders may be elected to rule for their lifetime or for a restricted period. The latter has more in its favor.

ELECTION

Having recognized the sovereign right of God over His creation and having assigned to Him a rational purpose in all His plan, the truth contained in the doctrine of election follows in natural sequence as the necessary function of one who is divine. When there arises unbelief and resistance in the human mind against the tenet of divine election, it is engendered only because this larger conception of divine necessity has not been considered. It is hard, indeed, for men who have adopted the idea that they are independent of God and therefore in no way related to Him—the view of all who are unsaved—to receive any truth relative to the sovereign rights of a Creator over His creatures.

The principle underlying divine election seems to be evident in all God's creation, but is not resented usually when it operates outside the limited field of a destiny for human beings. A principle of selection is everywhere to be seen, which principle cannot be attributed to mere accident, chance, or blind fate. That any man is born at all when he might have been forever nonexistent must be an act of selection on the part of divine sovereignty. That a man is born in one age of privilege rather than another of less privilege can be no matter of mere chance. That one has been born of godly parents rather than in pagan darkness is a divine determination. That one inherits wealth, culture, or position in place of painful limitations, that one has mental gifts and competency must not be a human arrangement; yet these very conditions, being wrought of God, all partake of the nature of divine selection. The great covenants of God are divine promises of selective benefits to favored groups of people. This again is of the nature of divine election. Record is made of "elect angels" (1 Tim. 5:21). Such, indeed, would be God's right to do with His creatures as He may choose. It is both true and reasonable that God has not caused anything or any being to exist without having a worthy purpose to realize through that creation. That some of His creation serve one purpose and some another is itself a matter of divine choice. Human resentment arises only when it is indicated that some are more favored than others respecting destiny. Were God thought to be an ungoverned tyrant, it could be allowed that He might do as He pleases with His own, whether this prove right or wrong; but when it has been disclosed that He is infinitely righteous and holy and that He is actuated by infinite love, difficulty will arise in the natural mind over how God can have elect people for whom He achieves more than He does for others or how some can be blessed while others are not.

There is no doubt whatever about the Bible teaching that God has chosen an elect people; but the contemplation of all that is involved in this truth reaches out into realms of existence that can be known only to God, far removed as they are from the human sphere of understanding. Being thus limited, it ill becomes the earth dweller to sit in judgment on God respecting divine election. God's essential character has been disclosed and He can be trusted where men cannot possibly understand.

He is infinitely wise, infinitely holy, and infinitely just and good. When exercising His sovereign right in election, He does not transgress His character or deny Himself. Since He does elect some for special glories and destinies and since He proves infinitely right in all He does, it follows that His eternal elective purpose must be as righteous as He is righteous.

There are two major elections of God.

1. Israel. Throughout the Olivet Discourse Christ refers to Israel *as the elect*. The most casual contemplation of this discourse (Matt. 24:1–25:46) will disclose the truth that only Israel is in view as the elect of God. Similarly, a revealing Scripture from Paul (Romans 9:1–10:4) sets forth the truth respecting Israel's election. Too often this portion of Scripture has been applied to believers today who comprise the Church. The salient facts in the case which make it impossible, however, are that in Israel's election there is a national objective and that an individual Jew, though belonging to the elect nation, did not have any personal election assured him. God is thus sovereign in His dealings with Israel. He disregards the enmity and hatred of the nations as they resent the fact of Israel's election. The election is made a public matter, indeed, for Jehovah selects, preserves, and defends this one people out of all the nations of the earth. They are His "chosen people" above all the nations and chosen specifically for His glory. In relation to Israel's election, then, God acts in sovereign authority. All other nations must eventually take a subordinate place. During Israel's kingdom on earth, accordingly, the nation or peoples that will not serve Israel shall perish (Isa. 14:1–2; 60:12). No true interpretation of the Old Testament is possible if the fact of Israel's national, sacred, eternal election be rejected.

2. The Church. As certainly as Israel's election has been public and national, so certainly the Church's election is private—hence for them alone to appreciate—and individual. So wide a difference must obtain between the issues involved in a public, national election and a private, individual election that little in common exists between them. Respecting the private character of the individual's election, it may be indicated that there is no more dangerous or injurious practice in the application of God's Word than that of displaying the truth of personal election before the unsaved. It neither belongs to them nor does it allude to them. Its presentation to them can only create resentment, as it does, and blind their minds respecting the one and only truth which God now addresses to them, namely, personal salvation by grace alone through Christ Jesus. The message to the unsaved, regardless of the deep theological issues which are latent in it, is simply, "Whosoever will may come." When any do come and are saved, they may then glory in the revelation that their lives were chosen in Him from before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4). Every preacher of God's Word should be awake to this immeasurable danger of introducing the theme of personal, individual election before unregenerate persons.

In this age of grace there is an election which includes all who are saved. This company constitutes the Church, the Body and Bride of Christ, and together with the resurrected Christ constitutes the New Creation with all its purpose and destiny in heaven. The New Testament gives abundant testimony to the fact of the divine purpose and character of this heavenly people. It also discloses that each member of this select company is chosen personally and individually by God before all ages of time. In the New Testament the same term *the elect* is used both for Israel (Matt. 24:22) and the Church (Rom. 8:33).

When addressing the Father in His great High Priestly prayer (John 17) and when thus referring to the believers in this age of the Church, Christ employed but one cognomen which He used seven times. The title which Christ used exclusively when speaking to the Father of believers is most

significant. It must be the supreme title in the vocabulary used in conversation between the Father and the Son. The designation—"those whom thou hast given me"—itself asserts the most absolute elective purpose on the part of the Father and the Son. Human imagination would not have gone far astray if it should picture a situation in eternity past when the Father presented individual believers separately unto the Son, each representing a particular import and value not approached by another. Like a chest of jewels, collected one by one and wholly diverse, these love-gifts may have appeared before the eyes of the Son of God. Should one be missing, He, the Son, would be rendered inexpressibly poor by so much. Immeasurable and unknowable riches of grace then are in the wonderful words: *those whom thou hast given me*.

That all humanity has not been included in this election is most certain. It includes only those particular ones given to Christ. According to Psalm 2:7–9 the Father will yet give to the Son the nations for His subduing judgments to rest upon them, that they may be His possession; but this has no relation to a bestowal of individuals in eternity past. Theirs is of a truth unto a sublime exaltation in glory.

Romans 8:28. In this passage reference is made to ones called "according to his purpose." In the context which follows the most absolute doctrine of predestination, preservation, and presentation for this elect, or called, people has been set forth. Not all humanity are called; but those who have been called are justified and glorified.

Ephesians 1:4. Of each believer it is said that he was chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world and for the heavenly purpose that he may be in glory before Him. Thus, again, it becomes clear that not all of humanity are chosen. Christ declared: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6:44), implying a selection. There nevertheless is also a universal call or drawing (cf. John 12:32), but that is far removed from the personal drawing of the elect whom the Father hath given to the Son.

3. Supposed Partiality. To contend as some have that God, to be impartial, must bestow His greatest riches of blessing upon all alike is to sit in judgment upon the Creator, which judgment ill becomes the creature, to deny God's sovereign right to order His creation as He will, and to deprive God of the freedom to introduce variety into His universe. Must every creature be an archangel? Has not God as much right to display His measureless variety in matters pertaining to man's relation toward Him as in matters connected with man's relation to his fellow man on earth? This is an issue quite apart from the vexing problem of sin. However, it must be recognized also that sin has been permitted to enter the universe with its ruin of a part of the angels and with the total ruin of the human race. All of this, indeed, was in the eternal counsels of God, for He determined before the foundation of the world that His efficacious Lamb would be slain (Rev. 13:8). As a starting point, then, for a right understanding and evaluation of problems related to divine election, it is essential to receive the Biblical testimony that all men are ruined spiritually, being born into a fallen race. The gathering out of an elect company to appear in heaven perfected forever involves not only redemption, which answers the claims of God's holiness, but dealing with the willful rejection of God, which rejection is as universal as the fall because a fruit of that fall. God alone could provide such a redemption, and there can be no salvation apart from that redemption. It is equally true that God alone can deal with the human will in this regard.

4. Human Will. In the first instance, it is well to observe that God did not create the human will as an instrument to defeat Himself; it was created rather as a means by which He might realize His

own worthy purposes. Though as Sovereign He could do so, God does not coerce the human will; He rather works within the individual both to will and to do of His good pleasure (cf. Phil. 2:13). An efficacious call to salvation, then, is a call which none ever finally resists (cf. Rom. 8:30). Everyone whom God predestinates He calls, and everyone whom He calls He justifies and glorifies. There could not be failure in one instance among the millions who are called. The vision which He creates in the heart and the limitless persuasion He exercises induce a favorable reaction on the part of all thus called, which reaction is rendered infinitely certain. The important truth to be observed in all of this is that, though divine persuasion be limitless, it still remains persuasion, and so when a decision is secured for Christ in the individual he exercises his own will apart from even a shadow of constraint. The divine invitation still is true that "whosoever will may come." However, it also is true that none will ever come apart from this divine call, and that the call is extended only to His elect. What God's righteous relation is to those whom He does not call is another doctrine quite removed from the teaching of election.

5. Practical Outworkings. As in the great covenants God has made, so in every outworking of His will the principle of divine selection is exhibited. The following classifications will demonstrate this:

a. FIVE ELECTIVE DECREES. Theologians may be classed according to the order in which they place the five elective decrees of God. The following tabulation of these decrees is in an order which may be defended from the Scriptures:

(1) Decree to create.

(2) Decree to permit the fall.

(3) Decree to elect some to salvation.

(4) Decree to provide a Savior.

(5) Decree to save the elect.

As an illustration of the importance of this order, it may be seen that to place the decree to elect some to be saved before the decree to create would place God in the position of creating a portion of humanity with a view to their being reprobated forever. A complete treatment of the five elective decrees has been undertaken in Volume III devoted to Soteriology.

b. FIVE POINTS OF CALVINISM. Because of the Calvinistic attitude toward divine election, its generally recognized five points are here named:

(1) Total inability of the fallen man.

(2) Unconditional election.

(3) A limited redemption.

(4) Efficacious divine grace.

(5) The perseverance of the saints.

c. FIVE POINTS OF ARMINIANISM: (1) Conditional election according to God's foreknowledge of supposed human worthiness.

(2) A universal redemption, but only those who believe to be saved.

(3) Salvation by grace through faith. (Because of a supposed enabling grace divinely bestowed upon all at birth, all may cooperate in their salvation if they will to do so.)

(4) Grace not irresistible.

(5) Falling from grace possible.

d. FIVE OINTS OF JUDAISM. As an outworking of God's elective purpose for Israel, five points of Judaism may be indicated:

(1) An everlasting nation.

(2) An everlasting possession of their land.

(3) An everlasting throne.

(4) An everlasting king.

(5) An everlasting kingdom.

ESCHATOLOGY

The doctrine of things to come is extensive indeed. It may be safe to estimate that as much lies ahead yet to be experienced as has transpired in the past. Biblical prophecy is virtually history prewritten. Apparently God delights to disclose that which He will do. To do so is an achievement which humanity can neither approach nor understand. In this competency God demonstrates the truth that He is superior to all others. The advantage to the human family of being informed respecting the future when ability to discern it for themselves has been denied them is exceedingly great; yet to the vast majority of people, including even Christians, God's revealed disclosures respecting the future are as though they had never been written. Those who habitually neglect the study of prophecy must of necessity go uninformed about the meaning of the past, the present, and the future. What God chooses to do is a sublime unity in itself. When the consummation of that unity is not envisaged, there can be no ground left for a right appreciation of the direction, value, and meaning of either the past or the present. God has not provided men with the material set forth by His predictions in vain. He expects that what He has said shall be welcomed just as all other portions of the Bible are received, and furthermore He has not left men to their helplessness in the understanding of His unfolding of future things. Among the things which the Holy Spirit has been appointed to accomplish for those in whom He dwells is to show the "things to come" (John 16:13). In the light of this provision and its practical outworking only wonder can be entertained concerning the real relation to the Holy Spirit of those who, professing to be saved, are not interested in God's proclamation of "things to come." Since the knowledge of the future so determines the right understanding of past and present, no man is prepared to "preach the word" who habitually ignores divine prediction. The claim that the prophetic Scriptures cannot be understood is never made by those who give due attention to them. No more difficulty has been encountered in interpreting the Scripture bearing on Eschatology than the Scripture bearing upon Soteriology. The supposed trouble respecting the interpretation of Eschatology originates in the fact that many theologians have from the first given themselves to the study of Soteriology almost exclusively, to the all-but-complete neglect of

Eschatology. Since Eschatology bulks so largely in the text of the Bible—sixteen Old Testament books being universally classed as prophetic and from one-fourth to one-fifth of the whole Sacred Text appearing as prediction when written—Bible expositors who are free to move outside the bounds of static theological dicta have discovered vast fields of revelation in the prophetic Scriptures, which doctrine of necessity determines the direction of right Biblical interpretation. Because of this discovery, there is an evergrowing school of premillennial interpretation and a fast-ripening division between otherwise orthodox men.

The primary division in all prophecy lies between that which is now fulfilled and that which is unfulfilled. This division has never been stabilized, of course. The time word *now* is ever changing. Things that were future yesterday may be fulfilled by tomorrow. No Eschatology is complete which concerns itself only with that which is future at a given time. Since all prediction was future at the time it came to be written, a complete Eschatology should account for all that is fulfilled and unfulfilled.

Naturally enough, prophecy may be divided again between that which is found in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. At this point, however, it is essential to observe the doctrinal rather than the structural division between the Testaments. This doctrinal cleavage occurs between the Gospels of Luke and John. In other words, the Synoptic Gospels continue and consummate the unfulfilled portions of the Old Testament. Malachi had ended with expectation of Israel's King and His kingdom. The Synoptics relate the coming of the King and the offer of His kingdom to that nation, which kingdom was, according even to divine purpose, rejected by the nation and its realization assigned to the second advent. A far-reaching error of theologians generally is to relate the promised kingdom—in so far as they apprehend it at all—to the first advent, whereas it is always linked to the second advent except as it was offered and rejected in the days of the first coming. The development of any earthly kingdom in this age and by virtue of forces released at the first advent is a theological fiction.

It becomes imperative, if any right understanding of Scripture is to be gained, to trace the distinctive order of events as set forth in Judaism to their divinely appointed completion. This the Synoptic Gospels do. Beginning with John and continuing to the end of Revelation, a new people composed of both Jews and Gentiles, a new divine purpose in a hitherto unrevealed age, with new predictions bearing upon a heavenly glory, are introduced, though—usually by way of contrast—much is added respecting the divine purpose for Israel.

Under Eschatology in its larger treatment as presented in Volume IV, the major prophetic themes of the Old Testament and of the New Testament are outlined. It may be restated here that, in general, prophecy can be classified as pertaining to Israel, Gentiles, and the Church. To this large threefold division may be added predictions respecting angels, heaven, and the new earth. Israel from her beginning in Abraham continues as a divinely preserved people through this age of the Church on into her kingdom, and finally appears with her eternal glory in the new earth that is to be. That nation never loses its identity and in fulfillment of everlasting covenants and predictions is blessed on the earth. That nation, as such, is never seen in heaven. The Gentiles from Adam on, continuing through Israel's Old Testament history, through "the times of the Gentiles," through the present age of Gentile privilege in the outcalling of the Church, even through the coming Messianic kingdom age as sharers in that kingdom, are finally seen in relation to the new earth and the city which comes down from God out of heaven (cf. Rev. 21:24, 26). Very extensive portions of Scripture carry prediction regarding the Gentiles. Reference is made here only to Gentiles as a continuing body of people quite apart from those individuals among their number who are saved in the present age. The Gentiles as

such remain Gentiles into eternity to come. Finally, the Church from her beginning at Pentecost is seen as a pilgrim people on the earth, and later as partakers of the heavenly glory.

ETERNITY

Under this general theme consideration is properly given to eternity itself, eternity in relation to God, to time, and to "the gift of God [which] is eternal life."

1. Definition. No thought ever confronts the finite mind which is less intelligible than that of eternity, and it is probable the idea that eternity will never end is more comprehensible than that it never had a beginning. In fact, the human mind cannot grasp the extent of that which is eternal. Philosophers and theologians alike have met with defeat when attempting to portray eternity. A slight increase of apprehension may be secured when it is contemplated in its relation to the eternal God.

2. In Relation to God. Little will be gained in attempting to contemplate eternity as a mere negative idea, the absence of time. It is best considered as the mode of existence of the eternal God. Abundant testimony has been given in the Scriptures respecting the eternal character of God. He is never presented in the Bible as circumscribed by time. He may conform to time with its character of successions, but His own mode of existence is from everlasting to everlasting. He is Sovereign Designer and Ruler over all ages of time. Referring to Christ as very God and Creator of all things, Hebrews 1:2 declares that He *programmed the ages*. There is no reference here to Christ as Creator of material things, as later in verse 10, but rather to the fact that He originated and ordered the progression of all time-periods. The mode of existence which belongs to God is fundamental and basal, compared to which any other manner of existence such as that related to time may be considered something unusual or exceptional. To the finite creature, however, who is homed in time there is no other fashion of life than his own which is comprehensible to him. Such natural limitations should not blind the mind to divine revelation or to those conclusions which may be reached at least by the help of reason. It should be recognized that there are other modes of existence than that which is related to time, even though these cannot be comprehended in their essential features. An eternal existence belongs to the Creator; hence to that mode of life alone belongs ascendancy and supremacy. Thus the occurrence of a period of time with its finite creatures and its successions is properly to be rated as exceptional or inferior.

3. In Relation to Time. The prevalent notion that time represents an intercalation which has interrupted the flow of eternity, that it is "a narrow neck of land between two shoreless seas of eternity," seems much at fault. Such a conception involves the absurdity that eternity too may have an ending and a beginning. Whatever time may be and whatever its relation is to eternity, it must be maintained that no cessation of eternity has occurred or will. God's mode of existence remains unchanged. Time might be thought of as something superimposed upon eternity were it not that there is ground for question whether eternity consists of a succession of events, as is true of time. The consciousness of God is best conceived as being an all-inclusive comprehension at once, covering all that has been or will be. The attempt to bring time with its successions into a parallel with eternity or to give time the character of a segment in the course of eternity is to misconceive the most essential characteristic of eternal things.

4. Eternal Life. A sharp distinction must be made between human existence which by its nature continues forever and the gift of God which is eternal life. In the last analysis, humanity is not wholly

conformed to time. Every human being will be living on forever, even after it has been decreed that time shall be no more. Thus humanity intrudes into eternity and must, in the end, conform to the eternal mode of existence. Each human being has a beginning. In this he is unlike God. Each human being, however, has no end of his existence. In this respect he is to some extent like God. That human beings have no end is a solemn thought; but on those who receive God's gift of eternal life the very life of God is bestowed. That life is a partaking of the divine nature. It is no less than "Christ in you, the hope of glory." Thus by regeneration all who believe become possessors of that which in God is itself eternal. In 1 Corinthians 13:12 it is declared, accordingly, that the believer one day will know even as now he is known of God, that is, the finite mind will be superseded by the mind of God. Even now it is said that he has the mind of Christ (1 Cor. 2:16). Little, indeed, may be anticipated respecting the coming transcendent experience of those who now possess eternal life when they shall enter into the experience of eternal life in full.

EVANGELISM

Evangelism and evangelists are peculiar to the New Testament. They belong to God's great plan for calling out the elect who are His heavenly people. Israel had her prophets who were patriots and reformers, but no one of their number undertook a ministry comparable to the New Testament evangelist. At the same time, there was no gospel message whatsoever sent from God to the Gentiles (cf. Eph. 2:12).

1. Definition. Evangelism is the act of presenting to the unsaved the evangel or good news of the gospel of God's saving grace through Christ Jesus. It may be a dealing with individuals or with groups and congregations. In any case, the one ideal prevails. Probably the most arresting fact related to this ministry is that it has been committed to every individual who may be saved. The Apostle writes that "God … hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation … and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:18–20). This commission rests on all believers alike. In agreement with this universal commission is the revelation presented by Ephesians 4:12. Following upon enumeration of the ministry or leadership gifts—apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers—the truth has been asserted that the responsibility of the pastor and teacher is to perfect the saints in their own work of the ministry, along with edifying of the Body of Christ. Thus is restated the thought that to every believer has been committed the evangelizing ministry. Each believer is, upon being saved, constituted a witness to the unsaved; but all believers are in need of such instruction, counsel, and direction as a God-appointed and well-trained pastor and teacher may impart. It is presupposed that the pastor and teacher has himself been fully trained for this leadership service. Courses which anticipate such a ministry are wanting in theological seminaries generally and therefore graduates who assume pastorates are not promoting evangelism through the God-intended agency of the whole company of believers. By so much the New Testament ideal of evangelism is failing. Instruction, nevertheless, should include discipline in the plan of salvation, the terms of the gospel, the use of the Scriptures, and the manner and method of effective work. Here Christians may well study to show themselves "approved unto God," workmen that need "not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15). It can thus be demonstrated that personal evangelism on the part of all who are saved is the New Testament plan of evangelism.

This New Testament purpose in which it is anticipated that each believer shall, after due instruction, have the high privilege of leading souls to Christ happens to be closely related to the believer's spiritual life; and since no effective service for God can ever be rendered apart from a right adjustment of the life to the holy will of God, extended instruction respecting a spiritual life must be incorporated as a part of the teaching undertaken in the training of believers. Soul-winning work, like all Christian service, depends upon the imparted power and direction of the Holy Spirit. The very desire for the salvation of the lost is not a human trait but the manifestation of divine love working through the believer. It is the love of God shed abroad in the heart out from the Holy Spirit, whom every believer has received. The believer must be guided in respect to those unto whom he speaks and directed in the manner of his approach to the unsaved.

Especial care must be exercised by preachers who are called upon to preach the gospel to groups and congregations. The gospel must be presented in its purity and no requirement laid upon the unsaved respecting works they might perform. Public methods often imply that there is saving value in something the unsaved are asked to do. God not only calls out His elect people through gospel preaching, but He ever cares for those whom He saves. If evangelizing methods do not contradict these great truths, there will be less unhappy results.

Two widely different programs for soul-winning have been pursued in the last century, namely, those adjusted to Arminian beliefs and those agreeable to Calvinistic views. The Arminian practices, being aggressive and conspicuous, may be unfortunately deemed more faithful and zealous in character. It should be recognized, however, that there are extremes both in the direction of zeal and of overcaution. The issue here being considered relates to practices followed by sincere and earnest men who deplore every extreme method. The Arminian theology forms the basis for one method of evangelism; so likewise the Calvinistic theology forms the basis for another. Arminian theologians declare that although men are born in depravity an enabling ability is given to them at birth whereby they may cooperate in their salvation if they will. This notion, unsupported by Scripture, lends encouragement to the evangelist to press people for decisions and assumes that all individuals could accept Christ if they but will to do so. It follows that, if pressed hard enough, any unregenerate person might be saved. That most mass evangelism has conformed to some degree to this Arminian theory is evident. Over against this, Calvinistic theologians contend on the authority of the Scriptures that all men are born depraved and that they remain so, being incapable of accepting Christ apart from the enlightening, drawing, calling work of the Holy Spirit. The following Scriptures, among many, sustain this conception:

"No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. … And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father" (John 6:44, 65); "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14); "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (2 Cor. 4:3–4); "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8).

Language cannot be more explicit; and in truth were it not for the enlightening work of the Spirit by which He convicts of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment (John 16:7–11), no unregenerate person would ever turn to Christ for salvation. The point at issue is that, when the Spirit undertakes His work of bringing men to Christ, there will be little need of persuasive methods. The Holy Spirit uses the Word of God on the lips of a devoted servant of God or on a printed page, and men hearing

the truth and believing are saved. From that time forth all who are saved occupy the Christian's position and have a definite responsibility to witness, not to the end they may thereby be saved but because they are saved.

2. Evangelists. Of three times in which the word *evangelist* occurs within the New Testament, its place in Ephesians 4:11 is the most significant. The use of the term in this passage is with reference to the pioneer missionary who takes the message of salvation to regions beyond, where it has never gone. The revivalist laboring among churches and evangelized fields which are more or less spiritually dormant has no recognition as such in the Bible, though there is no Scripture against that type of ministry. A peculiar unreality must be seen in any spasmodic reviving when it is certain that the church thus stimulated will, for want of right direction and discipline thereafter, return at once to its unspiritual state. The evangelist's message by its very nature should be addressed to the unsaved and restricted to the theme of salvation. Should themes related to Christian living be introduced, the attention of the unsaved is at once removed from the one and only issue which concerns them to another and wholly irrelevant proposition, namely, whether they will adopt some manner of life which they, by reason of being unsaved, are utterly disqualified to consider. No minister needs more to possess the full knowledge of God's truth than does the evangelist or the one who attempts to preach the gospel of saving grace.

EVOLUTION

Evolution is a humanly devised theory which has no truly scientific basis or evidence upon which to rest, but is all the same believed by college and university professors and in general the intellectual class. No thoughtful person can avoid the problem of the origin of all things, and the evolutionary theory is perhaps the best theory that unregenerate man can conceive. The unsaved cannot take God and His revelation into their thoughts. He certainly is not in all their thoughts (Ps. 10:4). The divine seeming so unreal to them, the concept of deity has not provided a reasonable enough basis for their minds when it is declared that God did anything. Therefore, being unable to believe the Genesis account of creation and not having any ability to believe that there is a God who created all things, they have devised the best theory that they can, but still with great inconsistency. As avowedly scientific men, they must refuse to accept anything which is unproved; yet in this theory of evolution they accept every word of testimony regardless of a lack of proof, and of course no effectual line of proof has been constructed or discovered. Such men in their unregenerate limitation are to be pitied. No Spirit-taught person will have trouble with the Genesis account of creation. Having nothing to put in its place, however, the evolutionist must devise the best theory that he can with which to satisfy the mind on the vexing problem of origins. Further discussion of this particular problem will be found in former volumes of this work, especially Volume II. See the index.

F

FAITH

According to the simplest conception of it, faith is a personal confidence in God. This implies that the individual has come to know God to some degree of real experience. Not all men have faith, so the Apostle declares (2 Thess. 3:2). Thus lying back of faith is this determining factor, namely, *knowing God*. Regarding the personal knowledge of God, Christ said: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. 11:27). This statement is decisive. No one knows the Father except the Son and those only to whom the Son may reveal Him. However, with that divinely wrought knowledge of God in view, the invitation is immediately extended by this context for all the world-weary to come unto Him and there, and only there, find rest for the soul. Since God is not fully discerned by the human senses, it is easy for the natural man in a day of grace to treat the Person of God and all His claims as though they did not exist, or, at best, as if a mere harmless fiction. Faith accordingly is declared, in one aspect of it, to be "the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). Utter want of faith is the condition of unregenerate men (1 Cor. 2:14) until God be revealed to them by the Son through the Spirit. The following quotation from the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* states the simple facts about that faith which is confidence in God (Handley Dunelm, *s.v.*, "Faith"):

> It is important to notice that Hebrews 11:1 is no exception to the rule that "faith" normally means "reliance," "trust." There "Faith *is* the substance [or possibly, in the light of recent inquiries into the type of Greek used by New Testament writers, 'the guaranty'] of things hoped for, the evidence [or 'convincing proof'] of things not seen." This is sometimes interpreted as if faith, in the writer's view, were, so to speak, a faculty of second sight, a mysterious intuition into the spiritual world. But the chapter amply shows that the faith illustrated, e.g. by Abraham, Moses, Rahab, was simply *reliance* upon a God known to be trustworthy. Such reliance enabled the believer to treat the future as present and the invisible as seen. In short, the phrase here, "faith *is* the evidence," etc., is parallel in form to our familiar saying, "Knowledge *is* power." A few detached remarks may be added: (*a*) The history of the use of the Greek *pistis* is instructive. In the LXX it normally, if not always, bears the "passive" sense, "fidelity," "good faith," while in classical Greek it not rarely bears the active sense, "trust." In the *koinē*, the type of Greek universally common at the Christian era, it seems to have adopted the active meaning as the ruling one *only just in time*, so to speak, to provide it for the utterance of Him whose supreme message was "reliance," and who passed that message on to His apostles. Through their lips and pens "faith," in that sense, became the supreme watchword of Christianity. … In conclusion, without trespassing on the ground of other articles, we call the reader's attention, for his Scriptural studies, to the *central place of faith in Christianity*, and its significance. As being, in its true idea, a reliance as simple as possible upon the word, power, love, of Another, it is precisely that which, on man's side, *adjusts him* to the living and merciful presence and action of a trusted God. In its nature, not by any mere arbitrary arrangement, it is his one possible receptive attitude, that in which he brings nothing, so that he may receive all. Thus "faith" is our side of union with

> Christ. And thus it is our means of possessing all His benefits, pardon, justification, purification, life, peace, glory.—II, 1088

In its larger usage, the word *faith* represents at least four varied ideas: (1) As above, it can be personal confidence in God. This the most common aspect of faith may be subdivided into three features: (a) Saving faith, which is the inwrought confidence in God's promises and provisions respecting the Savior that leads one to elect to repose upon and trust in the One who alone can save. (b) Serving faith, which contemplates as true the fact of divinely bestowed gifts and all details respecting divine appointments for service. This faith is always a personal matter, and so one believer should not become a pattern for another. That such faith with its personal characteristic may be kept inviolate, the Apostle writes: "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God" (Rom. 14:22). Great injury may be wrought if one Christian imitates another in matters of appointment for service. (c) Sanctifying or sustaining faith, which lays hold of the power of God for one's daily life. It is the life lived in dependence upon God, working upon a new life-principle (Rom. 6:4). The justified one, having become what he is by faith, must go ahead living on the same principle of utter dependence upon God. (2) It can also be a creedal or doctrinal announcement which is sometimes distinguished as *the faith*. Christ propounded this question: "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18:8; cf. Rom. 1:5; 1 Cor. 16:13; 2 Cor. 13:5; Col. 1:23; 2:7; Titus 1:13; Jude 1:3). (3) It may signify faithfulness, which implies that the believer is faithful toward God. Here is an inwrought divine characteristic, for it appears as one of the nine graces which together comprise the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22–23). (4) It may prove a title belonging to Christ, as in Galatians 3:23, 25 where Christ is seen to be the object of faith.

While faith, basically considered, must be divinely inwrought, it is ever increasing as the knowledge of God and experience in His fellowship advances. It is natural for God not to be pleased with those who distrust Him (Heb. 11:6). Faith, indeed, vindicates the character of God and frees His arm to act in behalf of those who trust Him. Thus because of the heaven-high riches which reliance secures, it is termed by Peter once, "precious faith" (2 Pet. 1:1).

FALL

A lapsarian is one who believes that man fell from his first estate of innocence by sinning. This position adheres to the record which the Bible presents. If men do not receive that record it is because they fear not to reject the testimony of God. When the natural man, who has no confidence in the Word of God, would attempt to account for the origin of things in the universe, as his reason impels him to do, he turns to the best solution of the problem that his imagination can devise, namely, the evolutionary theory. He should well know that there is no worthy basis of fact upon which this theory may rest. He rejects the Genesis account on which all subsequent Scripture will depend only because an unregenerate man cannot know God and his mind cannot recognize that God if such there be is able to do anything. Not only should evolutionary theory be called into question because of the utter lack of foundation on which it might rest, but the condition in which humanity is finding itself in the world demonstrates that the divine record is true. Writing on the theme of man's fall in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Herman Bavinck states it thus:

> Indirectly, however, a very powerful witness for the fall of man is furnished by the whole empirical condition of the world and humanity. For a world, such as we know it, full of

> unrighteousness and sorrow, cannot be explained without the acceptance of such a fact. He who holds fast to the witness of Scripture and conscience to sin as sin (as ἀνομία, *anomía*) cannot deduce it from creation, but must accept the conclusion that it began with a transgression of God's command and thus with a deed of the will. Pythagoras, Plato, Kant, Schelling, Baader have all understood and acknowledged this with more or less clearness. He who denies the Fall must explain sin as a necessity which has its origin in the Creation, in the nature of things, and therefore in God Himself; he justifies man but accuses God, misrepresents the character of sin and makes it everlasting and indefeasible. For if there has not been a fall into sin, there is no redemption of sin possible; sin then loses its merely ethical significance, becomes a trait of the nature of man, and is inexterminable. … From the standpoint of evolution, there is not only no reason to hold to the "of one blood" of Acts 17:26, A.V., but there has never even been a first man; the transition from animal to man was so slow and successive, that the essential distinction fails to be seen. And with the effacing of this boundary, the unity of the moral ideal, of religion, of the laws of thought and of truth, fails also; the theory of evolution expels the absolute everywhere and leads necessarily to psychologisin, relativism, pragmatism and even to pluralism, which is literally polytheism in a religious sense. The unity of the human race, on the other hand, as it is taught in holy Scripture, is not an indifferent physical question, but an important intellectual, moral and religious one; it is a "postulate" of the whole history of civilization, and expressly or silently accepted by nearly all historians. And conscience bears witness to it, in so far as all men show the work of the moral law written in their hearts, and their thoughts accuse or excuse one another (Rom. 2:15); it shows back to the Fall as an "Urthatsache der Geschichte."—II, 1093

The message of the Bible is one of redemption from that estate in sin which, according to the Sacred Text, must be due to the fall. Thus the whole Biblical revelation comes to be without reason or reality when the fall of man is denied. The record of the fall which the Scriptures present is one of great simplicity. A man and woman are brought into being as innocent and as upright as the creation of a holy God could make them. They know God's mind since they commune with Him. An arbitrary command is given that they abstain from eating the fruit of one certain tree. To disobey God is to repudiate Him and to adopt a course of independent action which must be wholly foreign to the proper relation which should exist between a creature and Creator. The warning had been duly given that, as a result of disobedience or independent action, "dying they would die." The reference is to perishing, both physical and spiritual, with its consummation in the second death. By the immediate experience of spiritual death man's first parents were converted downward and became a kind of being wholly different from that which God created. As in all nature, they could propagate henceforth only after their kind. The offspring did not receive the unfallen nature with which their parents were created; they received the fallen nature that the parents had acquired. Proof of this is found in the record that the first-born was a murderer, and in the intimation that Abel recognized his own sin when he presented a slain lamb as his offering to Jehovah. From that fall of the first parents every member of the human race is blighted and they, each one for himself, must accept God's redeeming grace or go on to the consummation of spiritual ruin, which consummation is known as the second death (cf. Rev. 2:11; 20:14; 21:8). Thus the effect of the fall is universal. Men are not in need of the saving grace of God merely because of the sins they have committed as fruitage of the fallen nature; they are in need of a complete regeneration and eventual release from every effect of the fall. Such blessing, with vastly more, is the portion of all who are divinely saved.

FATHERHOOD OF GOD

While it is not given to the finite mind fully to comprehend the infinite God, it may be observed that some knowledge of Him is available and to enter into it becomes a privilege and duty. He is revealed through nature as its Designer and Creator. God is revealed also through the Scriptures, which directly testify of Him, and through the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, who came to reveal Him (John 1:18) and to introduce men to Him (Matt. 11:27). God is to be recognized both as Creator and Father. The human mind seems to comprehend God as Creator more readily than it does as Father. It is more common to investigate the creative activities of God, therefore, than to consider His Fatherhood. In spite of this tendency, there is an extended body of truth bearing on the Fatherhood of God. He has been presented by the Sacred Text as Father in four respects.

1. Of the Lord Jesus Christ. At this point the phrase, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," used three times (cf. John 20:17; 2 Cor. 11:31; Eph. 1:3; 1 Pet. 1:3), should be considered. It is quite unlike the more common phrase with which the Apostle opens nearly every one of his Epistles, namely, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (cf. 2 Cor. 1:3). In the latter passage only the Fatherhood in respect to Christ is asserted, while in the former declaration Christ has been said to sustain a twofold relationship which is first to God and second to the Father. These distinct relationships are not the same. On the side of His humanity, the First Person is said to be His God. On the side of His Deity, the First Person is declared to be His Father. The connection in which the First Person is set forth as His God began with the incarnation and continues as long as His humanity continues. The connection in which the First Person is mentioned as His Father has continued from all eternity and will ever remain as it has been. The First Person is never the God of the Second Person, but His Father in a peculiar sense which belongs more to other spheres of existence than it does to this earthly sphere. The thought of inferiority or succession is not to be included in a divine Father and Son relationship. It is more nearly that of manifestation. There appears to be that in the unique, eternal affiliation between the First and Second Persons of the Godhead which may best be conveyed to the human mind by the pattern of the appellations used for an earthly father and his son. Whenever Christ addressed the First Person as *God*, it is clearly indicated by so much that He spoke out from His humanity (cf. Matt. 27:46; Heb. 10:7).

The Arian dishonor to Christ raised the contention that Christ, although unique, was inferior to the Father. This evil conception is now perpetuated by Unitarian theology and doubtless is the conviction of most so-called modernist theologians today. Rejection must also be accorded the four beliefs: (a) that Christ became a Son by His incarnation (Luke 1:35), (b) that He became one by the resurrection (Rom. 1:4), (c) that He is one only by virtue of office, and (d) that He is one only by title. It rather was a Son whom God sent into the world, whom He "gave" (cf. Isa. 9:6; John 3:16). The Second Person did become a human son by assumption of human form and He was begotten in His humanity by the Holy Spirit, but that is all far removed from the fact that He was forever the Son of the Father. He was the eternal Son before He came into the world. Other titles—*Only Begotten* and *First Begotten*—speak of His Deity and are also eternal in their reference. Christ, being God, is sent forth the Son that He was and is, not however in order to become a Son.

2. Of All Who Believe. A fact infinitely true, yet difficult to believe, is that all who receive Christ (cf. John 6:53), or believe on His name (cf. John 1:12–13), become legitimate offspring of God; they become conformed eventually to the image of God's Son—Christ, which truth requires that they have become actual sons of God, else Christ would not be able to call them *brethren* (cf.

Rom. 8:29), nor could they be heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ except they be constituted *actual* sons of God (Rom. 8:17). To the one thus recreated, the measureless value of his estate does not appear in the present world. It will be the major distinction characterizing throughout eternity those who are sons of God. As His present supreme purpose, God is now "bringing many sons unto glory" (Heb. 2:10) .

3. Of Israel. Several times God addresses the nation of Israel as a father or as his sons (cf. Ex. 4:22; Deut. 32:6; Isa. 63:16; 64:8). The latter designation when applied to Israel does not intimate that individual Israelites were regenerated sons of God. The term appears to connote national solicitude or fatherhood by reason of parental care for all, much as Jehovah declared Himself to be a husband unto Israel (cf. Jer. 31:32).

4. Of All Men. In tracing the genealogy of Christ back to Adam, Luke accounts for Adam's existence by declaring him to be a son or creation of God (Luke 3:38). This, most evidently, is sonship by right of creation—the only conception of divine fatherhood which an unregenerate person can entertain. The Apostle similarly quotes the pagan poets as asserting that all men are the offspring of God thus (cf. Acts 17:28). All men may indeed be considered sons of God inasmuch as they owe their existence to Him. This greatly restricted conception has been seized upon by modern men, however, as a basis for a supposed universal sonship and universal fatherhood of God on intimate terms. It should be remembered, contrary to such an assumption, that Christ told the very authorities of the Jewish nation how they were children of the devil (cf. John 8:44). Hence sonship that is based on mere existence, which existence but links man to God as Creator, must be far removed from a sonship which is the estate of each believer—regenerated, born of God, and member of the family and household of God as he is.

FIRST-FRUITS

One of Israel's feasts appointed by Jehovah was the feast of first-fruits. The feast centered about the waving of a sheaf of first-fruits which was waved before Jehovah at the time of harvest. It was a representative sheaf and contemplated all the sheaves of the whole harvest, since unto Jehovah must thanks be given for the increase which sowing and reaping secured. The term *first-fruits* is used variously in the Bible and each one of several applications should be considered:

1. Christ. Twice is Christ said to be First-Fruits and that in His resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20, 23). With His glorified human body Christ appeared in heaven immediately after resurrection. His appearance in the realm above became a representation of the vast harvest of those who are to follow in glorified bodies like His body of resurrection glory (Phil. 3:20–21). None of His people who have died are yet in possession of their resurrection bodies. The acquiring of that body awaits the coming of Christ. Thus it is true that He "only hath immortality, dwelling in the light …" (1 Tim. 6:16). He died and was buried, and because of this experience it would be natural to say that He put on incorruption as all who are resurrected will do (1 Cor. 15:51–52); but still Christ did not see corruption (cf. Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:25–28). Therefore, He as no other put on immortality in His resurrection. Christ as one glorified in His resurrection human body is the Antitype of the Old Testament wave sheaf.

2. Early Christians. Christ alone is the First-Fruits in heaven. James, however, declared: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his

creatures" (1:18). This declaration recognizes both the sovereign election of God—for it is by His own will that He was directed—and the fact of the regenerating power of the Spirit. The latter is achieved by the agency of the Word of Truth. That the ones said to be begotten are first-fruits can be pressed no further than that they were first in order among the vast company of redeemed belonging to the Church which no man can number. That they were "a kind of firstfruits" evidently recognizes the truth of Christ alone being the First-Fruits, strictly speaking.

3. Blessings. As an earnest, a foretaste, of that which awaits the child of God in glory, the blessings which are now realized by the believer because of the presence of the Spirit in his heart constitutes what is called first-fruits. The Apostle said: "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23). Thus a reckoning may be made to some extent of the experience in glory for all who are now among the saved, if the Holy Spirit is the first-fruits.

4. First Believers in a Locality. Quite similar to the preceding classification is another whereby when the gospel is first preached in a locality there are those who believe and become the first-fruits of that locality. Twice the Apostle refers to the spiritual first-fruits of Achaia thus (Rom. 16:5; 1 Cor. 16:15).

5. Israel. Jeremiah stated: "Israel was holiness unto the Lord, and the firstfruits of his increase: all that devour him shall offend; evil shall come upon them, saith the Lord" (2:3). As Israel is the first in order of the unfolding of divine purpose for this world, that people became a first-fruits on an extended scale of the whole divine program. It will be observed how warning is given here to all peoples respecting the grievous punishment that shall fall on those who persecute Israel.

6. Revelation 7 and 14. Twice is reference made in Revelation to a company numbering 144,000. In the first instance (Rev. 7:1–8) they are identified as from the tribes of Israel—which identification should direct all attempts at interpretation. These individuals are sealed with the protective and selective seal of God. In Revelation 14:1–5 this same company—being sealed, their number cannot be increased or decreased—are seen to be the first-fruits of the coming kingdom age wherein the King shall reign from Zion.

FLESH

It has been generally recognized that the Christian is in unceasing conflict with three major foes, namely, the world, the flesh, and the devil. The combats with the world and the devil are waged from without, but the strife opposing the flesh operates from within. A more extended contemplation of the doctrine of flesh is presented in Volume VI. It may be restated, however, that the Greek word σάρξ with its various forms appears in the New Testament under two general meanings. It, like its synonym σῶμα, may refer to no more than the physical body. Christ accordingly declared, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and this birth He held in distinction from that which is wrought of the Spirit (John 3:6; cf. 6:51; 1 Cor. 15:39; Eph. 5:31). The second and more vital meaning of this term carries with it an ethical import. When thus used, the word may embrace all—spirit, soul, and body—or that which is the entire being of unregenerate man. It includes thereby the fallen Adamic nature. The Apostle has written of the sin nature which is found in the flesh (Rom. 8:3). The Scriptures are exceedingly clear in teaching that the flesh with its sin nature is still a living, vital part of every believer and that he will continue in possession of the flesh and its fallen nature until the

body is redeemed at the coming of Christ or until he leaves this earthly frame behind in death. Notions are entertained that the sin nature which is in the flesh can be eradicated now by some supposed divine achievement. But the truth obviously remains that the world, the flesh, and the devil are never removed; they are overcome by the superior power of the Holy Spirit in response to an attitude of faith. Thus it may be seen that even were the sin nature eradicated the believer's three major conflicts abide, and it is not only revelation but reason that the divine method of overcoming them must be that which alone succeeds when dealing with the sin nature—which nature happens to be only an integral part of the flesh anyway: hence this nature is always to be governed by the power of God rather than eradicated.

The essential evil character of the flesh is seen from the direct assertions of the New Testament that it is "enmity against God" (Rom. 8:7–8), that it is "contrary" to the Spirit (Gal. 5:17); of it the Apostle testified: "In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). God faithfully declares that this mighty opposing factor is present in every believer, nor does He withhold the revelation that it may be held in subjection by the power of the Holy Spirit, who indwells the believer to this end. This evil nature which is termed "sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) and "sin that dwelleth in me" (cf. Rom. 7:17, 20–21, 23) has already been brought into judgment by Christ in His death. The judgment is set forth in Romans 6:1–10, which context has no bearing upon the great fact of salvation from the penalty of sin or upon that of the believer's justification before God (cf. Col. 2:11–12). In this connection the Apostle declares: "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24). The statement thus presented is not only true but becomes fundamental to any right understanding of this great theme. The judgment of the flesh with its lusts was achieved perfectly by Christ in His death unto the sin nature. This judgment is referred to in Romans 8:3, where the Apostle says that Christ "condemned [or, judged] sin in the flesh." Paul does not imply that the flesh and its lusts were rendered inactive or destroyed, as the A.N. translation in Romans 6:6 suggests. A judgment rather is gained against the flesh and its lusts by Christ and so the "old man's" power may by the Spirit be disannulled for such time as victory is claimed by means of the Spirit. The objective is that sin (the nature) should not be served. This particular judgment makes it righteously possible for the indwelling Spirit to hold the sin nature in check. Were it not for this judgment of the cross, the Spirit could not thus deal with the nature, and it is equally evident that He could not dwell where an unjudged sin nature reigns. Deliverance from the flesh and its lusts, then, is by the Spirit on the ground of Christ's death. This deliverance is assured on the fulfillment of three conditions hinging on as many verbs: (1) "reckon," which means to count on the plan and provisions of God to be sufficient therefor (Rom. 6:11), (2) "let not," which command points to a conflict and implies that the power of the flesh will be disannulled if this foe is fought in the way and with the resources that God has provided (Rom. 6:12), and (3) "yield," which word directs the human will how to walk in the path of God's holy ways (Rom. 6:13). Were the theory of eradication of the sin nature found to be true, all this Scripture with its extended analysis of the life under the enabling power of the Spirit would be rendered both aimless and useless.

The word σαρκικός (or σάρκινος) used eleven times in the New Testament is a reference to that which may be characterized by the flesh, usually with an uncomplimentary signification. The Apostle declares himself to be σαρκικός (Rom. 7:14). Here the evil character of the flesh residing within is seen, as also in 1 Corinthians 3:1–4, in which context this word has been used four times. *Things* may be fleshly (1Cor. 9:11), *wisdom* (2 Cor. 1:12) and Christian *weapons* (2 Cor. 10:4) and *commandments* (Heb. 7:16) and *lusts* too (1 Pet. 2:11).

The spelling σάρκινος, strictly speaking, indicates that of which a thing is made. In 2 Corinthians 3:3 reference is made accordingly to the “fleshy tables of the heart.”

Psuchē and *psuchikos* are held in distinction from *sarkikos*. The former refers to the natural unregenerate person as such or to that which is soulish in character. The present body, in contrast to the future “spiritual body,” is a natural or *psuchikos* entity (1 Cor. 15:44, 46). Its limitations, both natural and spiritual, are indicated thereby (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14; James 3:15; Jude 1:19).

Pneuma and *pneumatikos* complete the triad of word roots related to spirituality in the New Testament. Under these special terms the Spirit-filled life is in view. Reference is made hereby to a life dominated and directed by the Holy Spirit.

In the Apostle’s threefold division of humanity with respect to their attitude toward the Word of God—“the natural man,” “he that is spiritual,” and “carnal”—the unregenerate persons are *natural* as being spiritually unchanged (1 Cor. 2:14), the saved ones who are walking in the Spirit are by so much *spiritual* (1 Cor. 2:15), while believers who are influenced by the flesh and its lusts are accounted *carnal* (1 Cor. 3:1–4).

Two different “walks,” then, are possible to the believer: one “after the flesh” and one “after the Spirit.” The saved person is never considered to be longer within the sphere of the flesh, though he may be fleshly in conduct (Rom. 8:9).

FOREKNOWLEDGE

The foreknowledge which God possesses must be distinguished from mere prescience or knowledge of future events. Prescience may depend upon the will of creatures for its immediate execution or for its expectation, but foreknowledge in God is that which He Himself purposes to bring to pass. In this way, then, the whole order of events from the least detail unto the greatest operates under the determining decree of God so as to take place according to His sovereign purpose. By so much, divine foreknowledge is closely related to foreordination. Likewise, foreknowledge in God should be distinguished from omniscience in that the latter is extended sufficiently to embrace all things past, present, and future, while foreknowledge anticipates only the future events. Again, foreknowing in God should be distinguished from His knowledge of events which are merely possible. It is in the range of divine understanding to foresee what would happen under certain circumstances but in His providence never does occur. Manifesting this so-called hypothetical prescience, Christ declared: “Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes” (Matt. 11:21).

The doctrine of divine foreknowledge is, as regards the evidence upon which it rests, confined to the Sacred Text. In that Text it will be found that God is working according to His own eternal purpose, and that this purpose includes all that comes to pass; therefore, foreknowledge in God as presented in the Scriptures must be contemplated, not as a mere preview of events that blind fate might engender or that are supposed to arise in the will of men and angels, but as a program incorporated in the decree of God respecting all things. Theories and notions which introduce hypothetical issues foreign to this Biblical conception must be treated as unrelated to the scope of the

doctrine. Such a side to this theme is well stated by Dr. Caspar Wistar Hodge in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*:

> Now while the writers of the Old Testament and the New Testament do not write in an abstract or philosophical manner nor enter into metaphysical explanations of the relation between God's foreknowledge and foreordination, it is perfectly evident that they had a clear conception upon this subject. Although anthropomorphisms are used in regard to the manner in which God knows, He is never conceived as if He obtained His knowledge of the future as a mere onlooker gazing down the course of events in time. The idea that the omnipotent Creator and sovereign Ruler of the universe should govern the world and form His plan as contingent and dependent upon a mere foresight of events outside His purpose and control is not only contrary to the entire Scriptural idea of God's sovereignty and omnipotence, but is also contrary to the Scriptural idea of God's foreknowledge which is always conceived as dependent upon His sovereign purpose. According to the Scriptural conception, God foreknows because He has foreordained all things, and because in His providence He will certainly bring all to pass. His foreknowledge is not a dependent one which must wait upon events, but is simply the knowledge which God has of His own eternal purpose. Dillmann has called this "a productive foreknowledge" (*Handbuch d. alttest. Theol., 251*). This is not exactly correct. The Old Testament does not conceive God's foreknowledge as "producing" or causing events. But when Dillmann says that in the Old Testament there is no hint of an "idle foreknowledge" on God's part, he is giving expression to the truth that in the Old Testament God's foreknowledge is based upon His foreordination and providential control of all things. The Divine foreknowledge, therefore, depends upon the Divine purpose which has determined the world plan (Amos 3:7), and all its details (Job 28:26–27). Before man is born God knows him and chooses him for his work (Jer. 1:5; Job 23:13–14), and God's thorough knowledge of man in Psalm 139 is made to rest upon the fact that God has determined man's lot beforehand (Ps. 139:14–16).
>
> The same thing is true of the New Testament teaching on this subject. The Divine foreknowledge is simply God's knowledge of His own eternal purpose. This is especially clear in those cases where God's eternal purpose of redemption through Christ is represented as a mystery which is known by God and which can be known by man only when it pleases God to reveal it (Eph. 1:9; 3:4–9).—II, 1129–30

Referring to the central passage on foreknowledge (Rom. 8:28–29),

Dr. Hodge continues:

> In Romans 8:29–30 the word "foreknow" occurs in immediate connection with God's predestination of the objects of salvation. Those whom God foreknew, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His son. Now the foreknowledge in this case cannot mean a mere prescience or foresight of faith (Meyer, Godet) or love (Weiss) in the subjects of salvation, which faith or love is supposed to determine the Divine predestination. This would not only contradict Paul's view of the absolutely sovereign and gracious character of election, but is diametrically opposed to the context of this passage. These verses form a part of the encouragement which Paul offers his readers for their troubles, including their own inward weakness. The apostle tells them that they may be sure that all things work together for good to them that love God; and these are defined as being those whom God has

called in accordance with His purpose. Their love to God is evidently their love as Christians, and is the result of a calling which itself follows from an eternal purpose, so that their Christian love is simply the means by which they may know that they have been the subjects of this call. They have not come within the sphere of God's love by their own choice, but have been "called" into this relationship by God, and that in accordance with an eternal purpose on His part.

What follows, therefore, must have as its motive simply to unfold and ground this assurance of salvation by tracing it all back to the "foreknowledge" of God. To regard this foreknowledge as contingent upon anything in man would thus be in flat contradiction with the entire context of the passage as well as its motive. The word "foreknowledge" here evidently has the pregnant sense which we found it to have in Peter. Hence those whom God predestinates, calls, justifies and glorifies are just those whom He has looked upon with His sovereign love. To assign any other meaning to "foreknowledge" here would be out of accord with the usage of the term elsewhere in the New Testament when it is put in connection with predestination, and would contradict the purpose for which Paul introduces the passage, that is, to assure his readers that their ultimate salvation depends, not on their weakness, but on God's sovereign love and grace and power.—*Ibid*., p. 1130

Any right comprehension of divine foreknowledge, then, must see it as the Biblical and reasonable recognition on the part of God concerning that which He has made certain by His all-inclusive decree. In the Old Testament such foreknowledge is indicated in Job 23:13–14; Psalm 139:1–24; Jeremiah 1:5; and in the New Testament in Acts 2:23; 15:18; Romans 8:28–29; 11:2; 1 Peter 1:2, all of which Scripture should be attended with care.

FOREORDINATION

The entire field of God's revealed purposes will be seen only when all the various approaches to His decree have been noted. This theme includes the doctrine of decrees, of election, of predestination, of foreordination or divine choice, of foreknowledge, of efficacious call, and of the free will of man. In its simplest form, the one phase of foreordination means ascribing to God the ability and sagacity to provide with infinite precision the things which form the ongoing of the universe He has created. That the theme extends into realms of other worlds and contemplates that in God which His creatures may not now understand is readily conceded. There is probably little difficulty in the mind of any serious person who holds God in due respect over the issue of His right and accompanying necessity to plan the course of His universe before He brings it into being. Difficulty may arise with respect to the evil that is present now in that which a holy God designed, created, and is executing. Pious souls, however, will not allow that evil is engendered by God, and a reasonable person will not claim that evil is present because God could not prevent it, nor will thoughtful, observing men conclude that the universe is a gigantic accident moving ungoverned to its own destruction. It must be recognized that in some way quite beyond man's comprehension the permission and presence of evil in God's uni verse is consistent with His holy character and cannot be linked with Him as in any wise responsible for it. This principle is to be seen operating in another and more attractive form when it is observed that, though all fruitful service is being wrought by the enabling power of the Holy Spirit, God does not withhold or claim for Himself any reward for that service when the believer stands before the judgment seat of Christ. The Christian is then rewarded

as though he had by himself achieved all that may have been done in the overcoming power of the Spirit.

The doctrine of foreordination, then, is almost identical with that of predestination. The former term doubtless has a wider significance in that it may include all things within the scope of God's purpose, while the latter is usually employed only of people and restricted to the predetermined destiny of those who are saved, with the exception of Acts 4:27–28 which is a reference to that determined respecting the sufferings of Christ (cf. Rom. 8:29–30; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:5, 11).

FORGIVENESS

The correct understanding of the teaching of Scripture on forgiveness will go far in the direction of clarifying other doctrines of the Bible. Because of the fact that this theme is so constantly misunderstood, special attention should be given to it. Forgiveness on the part of one person toward another is the simplest of duties, whereas forgiveness on the part of God toward man proves the most complicated and costly of undertakings. As seen in the Bible, there is an analogy between forgiveness and debt and, in the case of that forgiveness which God exercises, the debt must be paid—though it be paid by Himself—before forgiveness can be extended. Thus it is learned that while human forgive ness only remits a penalty or charge divine forgiving must require com plete satisfaction for the demands of God's outraged holiness first of all. This doctrine may be divided into seven important particulars.

1. In the Old Testament. This aspect of divine forgiveness, though rich in typical significance, is nevertheless a complete forgiveness in itself. The all-important feature which enters into all divine remission, namely, payment of every obligation to injured holiness as the preliminary to forgiving, is included in the offering of animal sacrifices. First, the sacrifice itself was deemed by the one who offered it a substitute in that upon it fell the just penalty of death. It was only when a sacrifice had thus been presented that the offender could be forgiven. Accordingly, it is declared in Leviticus 4:20, as always in the Old Testament: "The priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them." But, since the sacrifice served only typically and as a covering of sin until the appointed time when God should deal finally or righteously with sin in the death of Christ, the transaction was in complete on the divine side, sin necessarily being pretermitted. However, divine forgiveness as such was extended to the offender perfectly. Two New Testament passages shed light upon the nature and fact of this temporary divine dealing with sin. In Romans 3:25 reference is made by the word πάρεσις to the pretermitting or passing over of sins aforetime, that is, before the cross; likewise in Acts 17:30 by the word ὑπερεῖδον—translated "winked at"—reference is made to the fact that in times past God did not then fully judge sin. It should be remembered, however, that the vast array of divine promises for full and perfect dealing with every sin thus passed over was all gathered up and accounted for by Christ on the cross eventually.

2. For the Unsaved. In this aspect of the general doctrine of forgiveness there is need for emphasis on the truth that forgiveness of sin is extended to the unsaved only as an integral part of the whole divine undertaking called salvation. Of the many transformations wrought by God in response to simple faith in Christ, the remission of sin is but one. Hence it should be observed that the forgiveness of sin can never be claimed by itself on the part of those who are unregenerate. Forgiveness is provided for them to infinite completeness, but may be secured only as a phase of God's whole work in salvation. Though too often supposed to be the truth, remission of sin for the

unsaved is not equivalent to salvation. Forgiveness connotes subtraction, indeed, whereas all else in salvation is glorious addition. It is therefore written, "I give unto them eternal life" (John 10:28), and in Romans 5:17 reference is made, for example, to "the gift of righteousness."

3. For Christians Who Sin. The foundational truth respecting the believer in relation to his sins is the fact that when he was saved all his trespasses (the past, present, and future)—so far as condemnation may be concerned—were forgiven. This must be the meaning of the Apostle's word in Colossians 2:13, "having forgiven you all trespasses." So complete proves this divine dealing with all sin that it can be said, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). The believer is not condemned (John 3:18), and therefore shall not come into judgment ("condemnation," John 5:24). It need only be remembered that, since Christ has borne all sin and since the believer's standing is complete in the risen Christ, he is perfected forever by reason of being in Christ. As a member in the household and family of God, the Christian—should he sin—of course is, as any child, subject to chastisement from the Father, but never to be condemned with the world (1 Cor. 11:31–32).

The cure for the effect of his sin upon himself is confession thereof to God. By this he is returned to agreement with God respecting the evil character of all sin. It is written: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). The simple act of penitent confession results with absolute divine certainty in the forgiveness and cleansing of the sin. The believer thus exercised about evil conduct should not wait until some change of feeling respecting the sin is experienced; it is his privilege to accept by faith that restoration which God so certainly promises as following at once. It may be added here that, though confession is always directed to God (cf. Ps. 51:4; Luke 15:18–19), there are times and situations when such admission should be extended to the person or persons wronged also. This will be especially true when those wronged are aware of the evil. However, it must be emphasized that confession is primarily made unto God and should in the vast majority of experiences go no further.

As for the effect of the believer's sin upon God, it may be observed how, were it not for that which Christ has wrought and that which He undertakes when the Christian sins, the least sin would have the power to hurl the one who sins from the presence of God and down to eternal ruin. In 1 John 2:1 it is asserted that Christ advocates before God for the believer without delay at the very time that he sins. By so much it is revealed that He enters a plea before God the Father in the court of heaven that He bore that very sin in His body on the cross. This is so complete an answer to the requisite divine judgment which, otherwise must fall upon the believer that by such advocacy He wins here the exalted title, "Jesus Christ the righteous." There was a specific and separate dealing by Christ on the cross with those sins which the believer would commit. It is written, consequently, "He is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:2). It is true, also, that he has become the propitiation "for the sins of the whole world." However, in any right understanding of the doctrine of divine forgiveness, a wide difference will be observed between the propitiation which Christ became for Christians and that which He became for the world of the unsaved.

4. In the Coming Kingdom. Being itself the manifesto of the King respecting the terms of admission into the Messianic kingdom as well as of conditions which are to obtain in that kingdom, the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:1–7:27) affords a specific indication of the terms on which divine forgiveness may be secured during the extended period. This indication is found in the prayer (Matt. 6:9–13) which Christ taught His disciples to pray during the period of His kingdom preaching to Israel—a time when His ministry was wholly confined to the proclamation of that kingdom. It is

therefore imperative, if any semblance of a right interpretation is to be preserved, that this prayer, including the disclosure respecting divine forgiveness, be confined in its doctrine and application to the age unto which it belongs. In that age much is made of man's relationship to his fellow man. It is then that what has become known as the Golden Rule (Matt. 7:12) has its proper place. The specific phrase in the prayer which discloses the terms of divine forgiveness reads: "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." No misinterpretation should be permitted here regardless of sentiment or custom pertaining to this prayer formula. The passage conditions divine forgiveness upon human alacrity to forgive. This could not apply to one who as a believer has been forgiven all trespasses already—past, present, and future; nor could it apply to the Christian who has sinned and who is subject consequently to chastisement, since of him it is written that if he but confesses his sin he will be forgiven and cleansed. The acts of confession and of forgiving others have no relation to each other whatsoever. This is the one petition in the prayer which Christ took up afterwards for a special comment and interpretation. It is as though He anticipated the unwarranted use of the prayer in this age and sought to make its character all the more clear. The comment of Christ reads: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt. 6:14–15). No unprejudiced contemplation of this petition or of Christ's interpretation of it has ever rescued it from being in complete disagreement with the fact of divine forgiveness in the grace age. It is written, for example, in Ephesians 4:32: "And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Here a contrast between law and grace is again set up. To be forgiving because one has already been forgiven of God for Christ's sake is quite removed from the condition wherein one will be forgiven only in the measure in which he himself forgives. The latter belongs to a merit system such as will obtain in the kingdom; the former is in harmony with the present riches of divine grace.

5. The Obligation Between Men. Though, as stated above, the terms upon which divine forgiveness may be secured in the kingdom is that of having forgiven others, the motive for forgiving others in the kingdom proves similar to that under the present reign of grace, namely, the fact that one has been forgiven. This principle of action as one related to the kingdom requirements is declared by Christ in Matthew 18:21–35. A certain king forgave a debt of ten thousand talents—an enormous sum of money, whereupon the one thus forgiven refused to cancel a debt in the paltry amount of one hundred pence. That such an incident could have no place in the life of all who are perfected in Christ and therefore secure forever is learned from the closing verses of this portion, which reads: "And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses" (Matt. 18:34–35). The believer who belongs to this age is enjoined to be kind unto other believers, tenderhearted, and forgiving to one another even as God "for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

6. The Unpardonable Sin. When Christ was on earth ministering in the power of the Holy Spirit, a peculiar sin was possible and might have been committed, namely, attributing to Satan the power of the Spirit thus manifested. For this sin there could be no forgiveness either in the age then present or the age immediately following (Matt. 12:22–32). It is evident that no such situation exists in the world now. It is wholly without warrant to suppose that any human attitude toward the Holy Spirit is a duplication of this evil and hence as unpardonable as the one sin of which Christ gave warning. An unpardonable sin and a "whosoever will" gospel cannot coexist. Were there an unpardonable sin possible today, every gospel invitation in the New Testament would have to exclude specifically those who had committed that sin.

7. A Sin Unto Death. The Apostle John writes of a sin resulting in physical death which believers may commit. The passage reads, “If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it” (1 John 5:16). It will be remembered that, according to John 15:2 and 1 Corinthians 11:30, God reserves the right to remove from this life a believer who has ceased to be a worthy witness in the world. Such a removal does not imply that the one thus removed is lost; it only means a form of drastic chastisement and to the end that such may not be condemned with the world (1 Cor. 11:31–32).

G

GENEALOGY

The *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* presents an exhaustive listing of forty-one genealogies all of which, excepting two of Christ, are in the Old Testament. To the historian as well as to the theologian these genealogies contribute much, especially in tracing the line of the seed from Adam to Christ. In the wording of these genealogies a phrase like "the son of" should be interpreted according to the custom in force at the time that the genealogy was written. The Jews, for instance, in reckoning a genealogy counted grandsons and great grandsons as if *sons*. This fact is of real importance when tracing a recorded lineage.

Turning to the all-important genealogies of Christ—one by Matthew (1:1–16) tracing the line of Messianic seed from Abraham to Christ, and one by Luke (3:23–38) tracing the lineage of the seed from Christ back to Adam—it will be seen that the important point is that the virgin birth with its divine character and the fact of Christ's lineage through David are established, whatever may be the variations or omissions in these two records.

In the conclusion of an article on these particular genealogies for the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* Dr. Louis M. Sweet presents the following pertinent material:

> It is clear, therefore, from the general trend as well as from specific state ments of both Gospels, that the genealogies and the birth-narratives were not floating traditions which accidentally touched and coalesced in mid-stream, but that they were intended to weld inseparably the two beliefs that Jesus was miraculously conceived and that He was the heir of David. This could be done only on the basis of Joseph's genealogy, for whatever the lineage of Mary, Joseph was the head of the family, and the Davidic connection of Jesus could only be established by acknowledgment of Him as legal son by Joseph. Upon this basis rests the common belief of the apostolic age (see Zahn, *ibid.*, 567, note references), and in accordance with it all statements (such as those of Paul, Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8) must be interpreted.
>
> For it must be remembered that, back of the problem of reconciling the virgin birth and the Davidic origin of Jesus, lay the far deeper problem—to harmonize the incarnation and the Davidic origin. This problem had been presented in shadow and intimation by Jesus Himself in the question: "David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he his Son?" It is further to be noticed that in the annunciation (Lk. 1:32) the promised One is called at once Son of God and Son of David, and that He is the Son of God by virtue of His conception by the Spirit—leaving it evident that He is Son of David by virtue of His birth of Mary. With this should be compared the statement of Paul (Rom. 1:3–4): He who was God's Son was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." This is at least most suggestive …, for it indicates that as Paul and Luke were in very close sympathy as to the person of Our Lord, so they are in equally close sympathy as to the mystery of His origin. The unanimity of conviction on the part of the early church as to the Davidic origin of Jesus is closely paralleled by its equally firm conviction as to His supernatural derivation. The meeting-point of these two beliefs and the resolution of the mystery of their relationship is in the genealogies in which two widely diverging lines of human ancestry, representing the whole

process of history, converge at the point where the new creation from heaven is introduced.—II, 1198–99

Because of the twofold fact that Christ on His human side was the Son of David and on the divine side was Messiah, Jehovah incarnate, Emmanuel, as such David's Lord, the problem posed to finite minds was beyond solution by the Jewish rulers (Matt. 22:41–46). It may be noteworthy also that the pronoun *whom* of Matthew 1:16 is feminine in gender, thus relating the child as a son to Mary.

The Apostle Paul warns against inordinate expenditure of time upon genealogies (1 Tim. 1:4; Titus 3:9) as being for the people of little value.

GENTILES

The Bible presents the origin, present estate, and destiny of four classes of rational created beings in this universe: the angels, the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Christians. Of these, the angels and the Christians have previously been considered. Nothing is more germane to a true Biblical interpretation than observance of the truth that these specific classes continue what they are—except that in the present age individual Jews or Gentiles may by faith in Christ become Christians—throughout their history, which history in each instance extends into eternity.

As for their racial stock, the Gentiles had their origin in Adam and consequently their natural headship in him. They have partaken of the fall; and, though they are the subjects of prophecy which predicts that some of them will yet share, as a subordinate people, with Israel in her coming kingdom glory (Isa. 2:4; 60:3, 5, 12; 62:2; Acts 15:17), they, as respects their estate in the period from Adam to Christ, rested under a fivefold indictment: "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12). With the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ together with the descent of the Spirit, however, the door of gospel privilege was opened unto the Gentiles (Acts 10:45; 11:17–18; 13:47–48), and out of them God is now calling an elect company (Acts 15:14). The new proffered blessings for this age do not consist in being permitted to share in Israel's earthly covenants, all of which even Israel is not now enjoying, but rather, through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, in being privileged to be partakers of a heavenly citizenship and glory. It is revealed too that the mass of Gentiles will not in the present age enter by faith into these heavenly riches.

Therefore, Gentile people, designated as "the nations," go on until at the end of their stewardship as earth-rulers, which spells a final termination for "the times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24; cf. Dan. 2:36–44), they of that particular generation will, at the end of the tribulation period (cf. Matt. 24:8–31 with 25:31–46), be called upon to stand before the Messiah King seated on the throne of His glory (Matt. 25:31–32) here upon earth. At that time, some who are set on the left hand and designated "the goats" will be dismissed into "everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," but others who are stationed on His right and designated "sheep" will be ushered into "the kingdom" prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:31–46). The basis of such judgment and its disposition of each of these groups, who together represent the sum total of that generation from among the Gentile nations, will be what is meritorious to the last degree. For the "sheep" enter the kingdom and the "goats" ultimately a lake of fire on the sole issue of their treatment of a third group whom Christ designates "my brethren." The context does not bear out the usual interpretation that

this is a description of a last and final judgment when all people of all the ages are ushered into either judgment or heaven, because the saved, each one, when departing this world are translated so as to be immediately present with the Lord in heaven (Acts 7:55–56; 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23); and furthermore, who, according to such an exegesis, would answer to "my brethren"? The scene is at the close of the great tribulation (Matt. 24:21), after removal of the Church from the earth, and at a time when nations will be divided over the Semitic question. The issue is concerned with what nations will be chosen to enter Israel's Messianic kingdom on the earth.

The destiny of the Gentiles has been further revealed when it is declared concerning the city which, after creation of the new heavens and the new earth, comes down from God out of heaven (Rev. 3:12; 21:2, 10) that "the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. … And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it" (Rev. 21:24–26). The terminology *the nations of them which are saved* could not refer to the Church when her destiny is not earthly; neither is she ever termed *the nations*, nor does she include the kings of the earth in her number. In this same context, the city itself is said to be "the bride, the Lamb's wife," which means the Church (Rev. 21:2, 9–10). Thus it is disclosed how, in spite of the fact that a dispensation of world rule was committed unto them, that in the present age the gospel is preached unto them with its offers of heavenly glory, that in the coming age they share the blessings of the kingdom with Israel, and that they appear in the eternal glory, they remain Gentiles in contradistinction with the one nation Israel onward to the end of the picture; and so there is no defensible ground for diverting or misapplying this great body of Scripture bearing on the Gentiles.

Gentiles in their relation to God are never placed by Him under the Mosaic Law. Likewise, the direction for life which has been addressed to Christians is never applicable to Gentiles as such. Almost no Scripture is written to Gentiles, though much Scripture has to do with them (cf. Ps. 2:10–12).

GENTILE TIMES

A prediction to Israel of the long period in which their possession of Jerusalem should be released to Gentiles and Jerusalem be in the hands of Gentiles, as now, is the measurement of that period known as Gentile times. Christ termed this era "the times of the Gentiles." What He said is recorded in Luke 21:24: "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Thus is introduced one of the most important time-periods in human history. Over against "the times of the Gentiles" is a phrase—*the times and the seasons*—which refers to God's dealing with Israel (cf. Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1). Under what is contemplated by these two prophetic indications, "the times of the Gentiles" and "the times and the seasons," the entire prophetic prospect of the Old Testament as well as of the New Testament largely is accounted for well.

The times of the Gentiles measure foreign dominion over Jerusalem, evidently began with the Babylonian captivity, and continue until the present hour and will do so on until Israel is returned to possession of her own land. However, another period unforeseen in Old Testament prediction has intervened meanwhile, leaving Israel's "times and seasons" and Gentile times as well yet to be consummated.

It follows, then, that measurements have been divinely indicated both for the duration of Jewish times and of Gentile times. There is no occasion for misunderstanding about these periods. To Daniel it was disclosed that 490, which is a matter of 70 sevens, would intervene before Israel's kingdom bringing in "everlasting righteousness" might be set up: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy" (Dan. 9:24). Till the cutting off of Messiah would be 483 years, or a total of 69 sevens. Only *one* seven or week of years remains unfulfilled, but between the sixty-ninth seven and the seventieth seven very much is still to be fulfilled. The intercalatory period is left indefinite in extent, nevertheless the seventieth seven of years has yet to run its course. Daniel declares: "And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined" (9:26). Thus it is suggested respecting Jewish times and seasons that an indefinite period must be anticipated to occur between the cutting off of Messiah in death and the consummation of the whole 490-year period. A Gentile intercalation was inserted in the Jewish calendar and in this time no Jewish purpose or prediction is being fulfilled; all the same, a seven-year period yet remains to run its course. In like manner, Gentile times which began with the captivity of Babylon about 600 years before Christ may be measured by two periods. One of these is a time of seventy years during which Jerusalem remained in complete desolation. Of this period Jeremiah had predicted: "And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the LORD, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations" (Jer. 25:11–12). This time of ruin Daniel discovered to be near its termination once when he was in the spirit of prayer. He records his experience: "In the first year of his [Darius'] reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem" (9:2).

The second subdivision period is indicated not by precise measure ment of years, as with the two Jewish times, but by the succession of world empires. These empires are indicated by the colossal image—made from gold, silver, brass, and iron—of Daniel, chapter 2. History revealed the gold to be Babylon, the silver to be Media-Persia, the brass to be Greece, and the iron to be Rome. The same four great empires are anticipated in Daniel, chapter 7, under the characters of nondescript beasts. Since Rome was the fourth, the period covered by this empire is that of its predicted end. The metallic image had feet of iron and clay and these apparently by so much removed from the legs of iron, so that in Rome between the legs of iron and the feet there is again an indefinite period extending onward; but the time of the feet and toes must still run its course to complete Gentile times. That hour evidently corresponds to the seventieth week in Jewish times. Both Jewish times and Gentile times anticipate the era known as the great tribulation.

Gentile times are therefore inclusive of about 600 years before Christ and will end seven years after this age of grace is completed. The present age while concerned with both Jews and Gentiles in the earth is neither advancing Jewish times nor Gentile times. It is quite unrelated to any other time.

GLORY

Since glory is one of the greatest themes related to God and to heaven, it is important that its outreach should be understood so far as human minds may proceed to comprehend. It would be natural enough to conceive of glory as some supernal illumination with an appeal to the range of human vision, but it rather includes the ecstatic state of mind and physical enjoyment which belong to celestial realms.

In the case of the boundless glory of God, it is said to be both essential or intrinsic and declarative. As for that glory which is called intrinsic or essential, it may be observed that, regardless of any recognition of it on the part of creatures, God is Himself a glorious being. Glory belongs to Him as light and heat belong to the sun. It therefore becomes a misrepresentation of infinite proportions to withhold from God a worthy acknowledgment of His glory. An injustice is forced upon Him if the entire universe of created beings does not ascribe to Him that essential glory. To fail to do so is to "lie, and do not the truth" (cf. 1 John 1:6). The declarative glory of God, on the other hand, is that which His creatures may accord to Him. Unfallen angels and the redeemed in heaven declare His praises forever. Only fallen angels and members of this fallen race withhold glory from God. Such indignity and insult shall be accounted for to Him alone. It is this rebellion within God's universe which the Son of God will judge in time to come.

Of the essential glory of God, again, it may be said that His glory is concentrated in Himself. It is because of what He is that glory belongs to Him and only Him. Respecting the declarative glory, furthermore, it may be stated that all His creation, as all His works, declare to a certain degree that glory—"The heavens declare the glory of God" (Ps. 19:1). However, that which concerns the child of God more particularly is the essential glory itself for it will be that which he must ascribe to Him as rightfully His, and this is not difficult to do at all in the light of what He is and has revealed Himself to be.

Beyond all that Solomon's glory typified, Christ's earthly glory will be supreme when He sets up the kingdom on earth.

Essentially, the New Testament use of the word *glory* is of a place and not an estate. God, for example, is now "bringing many sons unto glory" (Heb. 2:10). When Christ shall appear in glory, then shall His Bride appear with Him all glorious herself (Col. 3:4). Doubtless glory is the same location as that to which Christ referred when He said in John 14:1–3, "I go to prepare a place for you."

GOD

As in any usual composition the personality of the author is taken for granted, so a knowledge of God is secured by induction of all passing intimations about the writer to be found in the Sacred Text which He wrote.

Many efforts have been made to define God, but perhaps none more satisfactory than that of the *Westminster Larger Catechism*, which reads: "God is a Spirit, in and of himself infinite in being, glory, blessedness, and perfection; all-sufficient, eternal, unchangeable, incomprehensible, every where present, almighty, knowing all things, most wise, most holy, most just, most merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth" (Question 7).

As good an analysis of this whole theme as might be had anywhere would be secured if each one of the descriptive terms in the Catechism statement were treated by itself.

The doctrine of God in the Old Testament is set forth in three primary names which He bears. These are:

1. EL, meaning strength, and its two cognates—Elah, meaning a covenant-keeping God, and Elohim, a plural name that is used constantly as if a singular grammatical form. It seems evident that the doctrine of the Trinity is foreshadowed in this plural name. The one passage—Deuteronomy 6:4—is most revealing and might be translated: "Jehovah [a singular form] our Elohim [a plural] is one Jehovah." The word for *one* here may signify an integration of constituent parts as for instance when it is said, "And the evening and the morning … one day," "And they [two] shall be one flesh" (Gen. 1:5; 2:24).

Many modern scholars assert that the plural form of *Elohim* does not intimate the Trinity. Oehler, for one, asserts that it is a case of the plural of *majesty*—some kind of attempt to multiply the force of the title. However, he gives no sufficient reason, nor do others succeed in proving that a trinitarian thought is not present. It all seems, then, to be a form of unbelief. The Old Testament certainly does not lack for emphasis upon the majesty of God. (The triune mode of existence has had its treatment earlier in Volume I.)

2. JEHOVAH. The meaning of this term is 'Self-Existent One.' As an exalted title it was so sacred to the Jew that use of it was avoided by the people for many generations. The moral implications of God seen in this name are dwelt upon by T. Rees in his article "God" written for the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia:*

> The most distinctive characteristic of Jehovah, which finally rendered Him and His religion absolutely unique, was the moral factor. In saying that Jehovah was a moral God, it is meant that He acted by free choice, in conformity with ends which He set to Himself, and which He also imposed upon His worshippers as their law of conduct.
>
> The most essential condition of a moral nature is found in His vivid personality, which at every stage of His self-revelation shines forth with an intensity that might be called aggressive. Divine personality and spirituality are never expressly asserted or defined in the Old Testament; but nowhere in the history of religion are they more clearly asserted. The modes of their expression are, however, qualified by anthropomorphisms, by limitations, moral and physical Jehovah's jealousy (Ex. 20:5; Deut. 5:9; 6:15), His wrath and anger (Ex. 32:10–12; Deut. 7:4) and His inviolable holiness (Ex. 19:21–22; 1 Sam. 6:19; 2 Sam. 6:7) appear sometimes to be irrational and immoral; but they are the assertion of His individual nature, of His self-consciousness as He distinguishes Himself from all else, in the moral language of the time, and are the conditions of His having any moral nature whatsoever. Likewise, He dwells in a place and moves from it (Judg. 5:5); men may see Him in visible form (Ex. 24:10; Num. 12:8); He is always represented as having organs like those of the human body, arms, hands, feet, mouth, eyes and ears. By such sensuous and *figurative language* alone was it possible for a personal God to make Himself known to men.—II, 1256

3. ADONAI, meaning 'Master'; used of God and of men.

The New Testament presents God as Father of all who believe and as one to be known through His personal interrelations. The name of God in the New Testament is again a threefold revelation:

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Not just one of these but all are required to present the one God.

Though God exists in a threefold mode of being, He is represented in the New Testament as one God, and so the Christian is as much under obligation to defend the doctrine of one God as the Unitarian, the Jew, or the Mohammedan.

GOSPEL

The word εὐαγγέλιον means 'good news' and was fully appreciated when all the news of the day had to be carried by couriers. To bear good news was a high honor. Four different messages of good news have been rightly identified and set forth by Dr. C. I. Scofield:

> (1) The Gospel of the kingdom. This is the good news that God purposes to set up on the earth, in fulfillment of the Davidic Covenant (2 Sam. 7:16 …), a kingdom, political, spiritual, Israelitish, universal, over which God's Son, David's heir, shall be King, and which shall be, for one thousand years, the manifestation of the righteousness of God in human affairs. …
>
> Two *preachings* of this Gospel are mentioned, one past, beginning with the ministry of John the Baptist, continued by our Lord and His disciples, and ending with the Jewish rejection of the King. The other is yet future (Matt. 24:14), during the great tribulation, and immediately preceding the coming of the King in glory.
>
> (2) The Gospel of the grace of God. This is the good news that Jesus Christ, the rejected King, has died on the cross for the sins of the world, that He was raised from the dead for our justification, and that by Him all that believe are justified from all things. This form of the Gospel is described in many ways. It is the Gospel "of God" (Rom. 1:1) because it originates in His love; "of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:14) because it flows from His sacrifice, and because He is the alone Object of Gospel faith; of "the grace of God" (Acts 20:24) because it saves those whom the law curses; of "the glory" (1 Tim. 1:11; 2 Cor. 4:4) because it concerns Him who is in the glory, and who is bringing the many sons to glory (Heb. 2:10); of "our salvation" (Eph. 1:13) because it is the "power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1:16); of "the uncircumcision" (Gal. 2:7) because it saves wholly apart from forms and ordinances; of "peace" (Eph. 6:15) because through Christ it makes peace between the sinner and God, and imparts inward peace.
>
> (3) The everlasting Gospel (Rev. 14:6). This is to be preached to the earth-dwellers at the very end of the great tribulation and immediately preceding the judgment of the nations (Matt. 25:31 …). It is neither the Gospel of the kingdom, nor of grace. Though its burden is judgment, not salvation, it is good news to Israel and to those who, during the tribulation, have been saved (Rev. 7:9–14; Luke 21:28; Ps. 96:11–13; Isa. 35:4–10).
>
> (4) That which Paul calls, "my Gospel" (Rom. 2:16 …). This is the Gospel of the grace of God in its fullest development, but includes the revelation of the result of that Gospel in the outcalling of the church, her relationships, position, privileges, and responsibility. It is the *distinctive* truth of Ephesians and Colossians, but interpenetrates all of Paul's writings.

> … There is “another Gospel” (Gal. 1:6; 2 Cor. 11:4) “which is not another,” but a perversion of the Gospel of the grace of God, against which we are warned. It has had many seductive forms, but the test is one—it invariably denies the sufficiency of grace alone to save, keep, and perfect, and mingles with grace some kind of human merit. In Galatia it was law, in Colosse fanaticism (Col. 2:18, etc.). In any form its teachers lie under the awful anathema of God.—*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 1343

Strong objection is offered by Covenant theologians to a distinction between the gospel of the kingdom as preached by John the Baptist, Christ, and the other disciples and the gospel of the grace of God. One of them states that to make such a distinction is “unfortunate” and “dangerous.” He with others contends that the kingdom gospel is identical with the gospel of divine grace. Here nevertheless will arise an absurdity which does not deter this type of theologian, namely, that men could preach the grace gospel based as it is on the death and resurrection of Christ when they did not believe Christ would die or be raised again (cf. Luke 18:31–34).

GOVERNMENT

Authority for human government dates from the flood when God expressly established it on the earth. This is well indicated, again, by Dr. C. I. Scofield:

“The Third Dispensation: Human Government. Under Conscience, as in Innocency, man utterly failed, and the judgment of the Flood marks the end of the second dispensation and the beginning of the third. The declaration of the Noahic Covenant subjects humanity to a new test. Its distinctive feature is the institution, for the first time, of human government—the government of man by man. The highest function of government is the judicial taking of life. All other governmental powers are implied in that. It follows that the third dispensation is distinctively that of human government. Man is responsible to govern the world for God. That responsibility rested upon the whole race, Jew and Gentile, until the failure of Israel under the Palestinian Covenant (Deut. 28:1–30:10) brought the judgment of the Captivities, when ‘the times of the Gentiles’ (See Luke 21:24; Rev. 16:14) began, and the government of the world passed exclusively into Gentile hands (Dan. 2:36–45; Luke 21:24; Acts 15:14–17). That both Israel and the Gentiles have governed for self, not God, is sadly apparent” (*Ibid.*, p. 16).

The government of God must be supreme since His authority over the universe is that of Creator. His plans must usually be realized through providence. The Christian is called upon, then, to recognize human government as of God (Rom. 13:1–7; 1 Pet. 2:13–17; cf. Matt. 22:21). Any organized people must have some form of government, as did Israel in the Old Testament and the local church in New Testament times.

There are three forms of church government which correspond to the familiar three forms of civil administration: strictly democratic, government by the voice of the people as in the congregational form of church organization; monarchial, government by chosen leaders as in the Methodist and Episcopal Churches; and republican, or government by representation as in those churches governed through elders and deacons.

In Luke 4:5–6 it is clearly indicated that the governments of this world system (cf. Matt. 4:8–9) are under Satan’s authority. So also in John 5:27 and in 1 Corinthians 15:27 it is revealed that all

authority has been committed to Christ by the Father. Eventually, Christ will put down all finite rule and authority (1 Cor. 15:25, 28).

GRACE

Grace—a much misunderstood feature of God's ways with lost men—is itself a revelation and all human hearts not having this truth of Scripture revealed will be unable to comprehend it or to adjust themselves to its provisions.

Grace is not mercy or love. In Ephesians 2:4–5 these three doctrinal words appear severally and in their individual, specific manner: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)." Speaking first of mercy, it is defined as that compassion in God which moved Him to provide a Savior for the lost. If He had been able to save even one soul on the basis of His sovereign mercy alone, He could have saved every person on that basis and the death of Christ would have been rendered unnecessary. As for divine love, it is an emotion of infinite character, the motivating purpose back of all that God does in saving a soul. But since God is holy and righteous too and the sinner's sins are an offense to Him, He might perfectly desire to save a soul and still be utterly helpless to do so in the light of the claims which divine righteousness make against the sinner. Not until those claims are met can God's infinite love realize its desire. Therefore, to come now to the third definition, grace is what God may be free to do and indeed what He does accordingly for the lost after Christ has died on behalf of them. "By grace are ye saved" (Eph. 2:8). When thus released from His holy demands against the sinner by the sacrificial death of Christ, and that sacrifice is accepted intelligently, the love of God will never be satisfied until He has done all He can do for such a one. The greatest thing God can do, reverently speaking, is to make someone like His Son. Such, then, will be the destiny of everyone who believes (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2). Since grace only represents what God can and will do for those who trust the Savior, it must needs function apart from all human works or cooperation. It calls for no more than confidence in the only One who can save.

The Scriptures assign to the operating of grace the only salvation now offered to sinful men. God's grace also provides security for the saved one. This is done by continuing the grace work of God with the individual in spite of his imperfections. Grace also undertakes to direct the saved one in the new manner of his daily life after he has been saved. A new motive for this is set up by the fact that the one saved was perfected forever in the sight of God as being in Christ, therefore partaking of His merit and standing forever. Nothing of merit need be added to that which is perfected forever (cf. John 1:16; Rom. 5:1; 8:1; Heb. 10:14). Hence the obligation to gain merit is removed completely, and the whole law system with its merit ceases to be applicable to the saved one under grace. He is no longer under law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14). The new problem becomes that of how a perfected person should walk in this world. Grace teaches the saved one concerning his holy walk in daily life. The standard is as high as heaven itself. God requires, and with reason, that the saved one, by reason of being a citizen of heaven, should live according to the standards of heaven (cf. John 13:34; Eph. 4:1, 30; 1 Thess. 5:19).

GUILT

The divine disposition of guilt proves to be one of the great triumphs won by grace. For sin, which must be charged against all individuals, is rebellion itself against God and His authority. There are two aspects of guilt: (1) Personal guilt, which is nothing other than the historical fact of committing sin. That will be a fact which abides forever though the guilt may be lifted through forgiveness. Personal guilt is not transferable. (2) Guilt as an obligation to justice. In so far as another may bear the penalty, this type of guiltiness becomes transferable. Christ as Substitute once did bear the obligation of the world to justice. Therefore, the substitution on Christ's part engenders a universal obligation to acknowledge and to stand before God under this gracious provision. For anyone thus to recognize his obligation would be an act of faith—"by grace are ye saved through faith" (Eph. 2:8).

H

HADES

Like all otherwise unknown truths, the doctrine of a future state depends wholly on what is declared in the Sacred Text. It is usually asserted that the word *Sheol* of the Old Testament finds its equivalent in *Hades*, but Dr. E. W. Bullinger objects to such a conclusion in the following note: "This [Gen. 37:35] being the first occurrence of the word *Sheōl*, the R.V. gives a note in the margin, 'Heb. *Sheol*, the name of the abode of the dead, answering to the Greek Hades, Acts 2:27.' This note is altogether wrong. (1) It is *interpretation* and *not translation*. (2) It prejudges the word from the outset, fixing upon it the word 'abode,' which has a technical meaning applicable only to the living: thus anticipating the conclusion, which cannot be arrived at until we have obtained all the evidence, and have it before us. (3) *Sheōl* has nothing in it 'answering to the Greek *Hadēs*.' Hadēs must have the same meaning as Sheōl; and must answer to that. It must have the meaning which the Holy Spirit puts upon it, and not the meaning which the heathen put on it" (*A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament*, 6th ed., revised, p. 368). A study of these words is at once required.

1. Old Testament Teaching. Having cited the use of *Sheol* in sixty-five passages and pointed out that it is usually translated *grave*, sometimes *pit*, and sometimes *hell*, Dr. Bullinger declares:

> On a careful examination of the above list, a few facts stand out very clearly. (i.) It will be observed that in a majority of cases *Sheōl* is rendered "the grave." To be exact, 54 per cent.: while "hell" is 41½ per cent.; and "pit" only 4½ per cent. *The grave*, therefore, stands out on the face of the above list as the best and commonest rendering. (ii.) With regard to the word "pit," it will be observed that in each of the three cases where it occurs (Num. 16:30, 33; and Job 17:16), *the grave* is so evidently meant, that we may at once substitute that word, and banish "pit" from our consideration as a rendering of *Sheōl*. (iii.) As to the rendering "hell," it does *not* represent *Sheōl*, because both by Dictionary definition and by colloquial usage "hell" means the place of future *punishment*. *Sheōl* has no such meaning, but denotes the *present state of death*. "The grave" is, therefore, a far more suitable translation, because it visibly suggests to us what is invisible to the mind, *viz.*, the state of death. It must, necessarily, be misleading to the English reader to see the former put to represent the latter. (iv.) The student will find that "THE grave," taken literally as well as figuratively, will meet all the requirements of the Hebrew *Sheōl*: not that *Sheōl* means so much specifically A grave, as generically THE grave. Holy Scripture is all-sufficient to explain the word *Sheōl* to us. (v.) If we enquire of it in the above list of the occurrences of the word *Sheōl*, it will teach (a) That as to *direction* it is down. (b) That as to *place* it is in the earth. (c) That as to *nature* it is put for *the state of death*. Not the *act* of dying, for which we have no English word, but the *state* or duration of death. The Germans are more fortunate, having the word *sterbend* for the act of dying. *Sheōl* therefore means *the state of death*; or *the state of the dead*, of which *the grave* is a tangible evidence. It has to do only with the dead. It may sometimes be personified and represented as speaking, as other inanimate things are. It may be represented by a coined word, Grave-dom, as meaning the dominion or power of *the grave*. (d) As to *relation* it stands in *contrast* with the state of the living, see Deut. 30:15, 19, and 1 Sam. 2:6–8. It is never once connected with the living, except by contrast. (e) As to *association*, it is used in

connection with mourning (Gen. 37:34–35), sorrow (Gen. 42:38; 2 Sam. 22:6; Ps. 18:5; 116:3), fright and terror (Num. 16:27, 34), weeping (Isa. 38:3, 10, 15, 20), silence (Ps. 31:17; 6:5; Eccles. 9:10), no knowledge (Eccles. 9:5–6, 10), punishment (Num. 16:27, 34; 1 Kings 2:6, 9; Job 24:19; Ps. 9:17, R.V., RE-turned, as before their resurrection). (f) And, finally, as to *duration*, the dominion of *Sheōl* or the grave will continue until, and end only with, *resurrection*, which is the only exit from it (see Hos. 13:14, etc.; and compare Ps. 16:10 with Acts 2:27, 31; 13:35).—*Ibid.*, pp. 368–69

2. New Testament Teaching. Here three words are present: *Gehenna* used eight times, *Hades* eleven times, *Tartaros* once. (a) Gehenna is a place of future punishment. (b) To quote Bullinger again, this time on Hades:

"If now the *eleven* occurrences of Hadēs in the New Testament be carefully examined, the following conclusions will be reached: (a) *Hadēs* is invariably connected with *death*; but *never with life*: always with *dead* people; but never with the *living*. All in *Hadēs* will 'NOT LIVE AGAIN,' until they are raised from the dead (Rev. 20:5). If they do not 'live again' until after they are raised, it is perfectly clear that they cannot be *alive* now. Otherwise we do away with the doctrine of resurrection altogether. (b) That the English word 'hell' by no means represents the Greek *Hadēs*; as we have seen that it does not give a correct idea of its Hebrew equivalent, *Sheōl*. (c) That *Hadēs* can mean only and exactly what *Sheōl* means, *viz.*, the place where 'corruption' is seen (Acts 2:31; compare 13:34–37); and from which, *resurrection* is the only exit" (*Ibid.*, p. 369).

So also on (c) Tartaros: "Τάρταρος is not Sheōl or Hadēs, … where all men go in death. Nor is it where the wicked are to be consumed and destroyed, which is Gehenna … Not the abode of *men* in any condition. It is used only here, and here only of 'the angels that sinned,' (*see* Jude 6). It denotes the bounds or verge of this material world. The extremity of this lower air—of which Satan is 'the prince' (Eph. 2:2) and of which Scripture speaks as having 'the rulers of the darkness of this world' and 'wicked spirits in aerial regions.' Τάρταρος is not only the bounds of this material creation, but is so called from its coldness" (*Ibid.*, p. 370).

HEADSHIP

As the human head governs the body to which it belongs, so authority is vested in the headship relation wherever it exists.

1. Christ sustains at least five such relations, as: (a) Head of the corner (Acts 4:11; 1 Pet. 2:7). See Ephesians 2:19–22, where the whole company of believers is seen as a building of God, Christ being the Headstone of the corner. (b) Head over every man (1 Cor. 11:3; cf. Eph. 5:23). Whether recognized or admitted by men, Christ is ruling over all of them. To Him they must one day render an account. (c) Head over,the mystic Body of Christ, the Church (Eph. 4:15; Col. 1:18; 2:19). This figure is used more than any other to represent the service and manifestation of Christ by or through the members of His Body. (d) Head over the Bride (Eph. 5:23–33). Here again the Church is in view with a unique relationship, which relationship is to be realized fully after the marriage of the Lamb. (e) Head of principalities and powers (Eph. 1:21; Col. 2:10). Christ has universal authority over all angelic hosts.

2. The Head of Christ is God (1 Cor. 11:3). The authority which Christ exercises was given Him by the Father (John 5:27; Acts 17:31; 1 Cor. 15:25–28).

3. Adam is the natural head of the race, which race fell in him (Rom. 5:12).

4. Christ ranks as Head over the New Creation, which creation is in Him and partakes of His resurrection life (Eph. 1:19–23).

5. Man is head over the woman (1 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 5:23). Exceptions due to personalities and unusual situations make this a difficult phase in the doctrine of headship. Nevertheless, by divine arrangement the man is set over the woman in authority and conditions are never happy when this divine order has been ignored. The woman is not made with ability to exercise authority and often becomes eccentric or out of balance.

HEALING

Spiritual believers in all past generations have experienced divine favor, healing included. The claims of so-called divine healers, however, assume and imply that to secure such healing it is needful to go to them. At least seven errors are nevertheless to be found in their teaching, and these should be taken up separately.

1. “Healers” alone control God’s healing of the body. But any company of spiritual believers, if asked to do so, would testify of divine curing far beyond the claims of professional healers.

2. Healing was provided in the atonement. It is taught that Christ bore diseases as He bore sins on the cross and therefore healing may be claimed absolutely by faith and without fail. Such error will mislead for few are prepared to refute these fantastic claims. So great an issue should be fully sustained by Scripture, doubtless, but it is not. It rather should be recognized that the body is not yet redeemed. The believer awaits a redeemed body. Romans 8:23 clearly states this: “And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.” The physical man will be redeemed at the return of Christ, as the Scripture foretells: “And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away” (Rev. 21:4). Extremists do not dare claim redeemed bodies for themselves, when they all increase in age and limitations.

If Christ bore all sickness the healing in answer to true faith should of course never fail, but it does. Isaiah 53:5 in this connection reads: “But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” Reference here may well be to spiritual healing. The Old Testament, indeed, teaches both spiritual healing and physical healing (cf. Ps. 103:3). In Matthew 8:16–17 reference is made to Isaiah 53:4, for Christ healed because He bore all afflicted ones on His heart of compassion.

Divine healers base their authority to heal the sick on Matthew 10:8, which reads: “Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give,” but there the command is given as well to raise the dead, heal leprosy, and cast out demons. The kingdom gospel

was to be accompanied with wonders and miracles like these, but no such command for the supernatural ever came with the gospel of grace.

It remains to be noted that Paul's thorn in the flesh was not healed in spite of all his faith (2 Cor. 12:1–9), and that he with sadness left Trophimus sick at Miletum (2 Tim. 4:20). Epaphroditus, however, was healed as a direct mercy of God (Phil. 2:26–30; cf. Ps. 41:3; Gal. 4:13).

3. Sickness is from Satan and never in the will of God (cf. Deut. 32:39; Job 1–2; Hos. 6:1). By their taking this position the whole field of divine chastisement is rejected. But a man was blind from his birth that the glory of God might be seen in him, and Paul had a thorn in the flesh which was sent directly from God. It cannot be proved that Satan is the one cause of sickness or that disability may not be the will of God in some instances.

4. Anointing from the healer is as essential as faith. In all His healings, nonetheless, Christ anointed but once in so far as the record goes (Mark 6:13), and it is not mentioned again for curative purposes in the New Testament except in James 5:14. The Jewish rite of laying on of hands seemed to be observed at times. Peter cast a shadow and some were healed, but he never went into the shadow-casting business. Multitudes are healed today because it is directly in the will of God for His children apart from anointings, laying on of hands, or Peter's shadow.

5. Remedies are against the will of God. This assertion would change all medical missions and the work of Christian physicians and hospitals. Medicine, to be sure, is usually the supply of elements needed in the system for its recovery. Hence to use remedies for healing is no different in principle than to feed the body with food or to clothe it for warmth.

Healing for the believer is within the Father's care of His child as also all financial support, or for that matter every good and perfect gift.

Two Old Testament types are evidence of divine cure. Each secured physical healing and for a reason: (1) leprosy (Lev. 14:1–57) and (2) the serpent bite (Num. 21:5–9). The healing in both cases was absolute and becomes clearly a type of the remedy for sin, which healing is in the death of Christ and never fails in answer to faith.

6. Christ must heal because He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. He may be the same Person, beyond all question, but not always have the same purpose. The Apostle, if his example means anything, prescribed wine for Timothy (1 Tim. 5:23).

7. Personal faith is required. This demand provides the divine healer's way out of difficulty when he fails to help. To put it back on the afflicted for lack of faith, however, is cruel and unscriptural. Many sufferers are driven insane by this treatment. In,the Bible faith is required likewise on the part of the one who heals. One instance is actually recorded where healing failed because of unbelief on the part of those who would cure (cf. Matt. 17:14–21).

In conclusion, it may be asserted that it pleases God to heal His children of physical diseases when it is in the way of His parental dealing with them. It was said by David: "This poor man cried, and the LORD heard him, and saved him out of all his troubles" (Ps. 34:6). The death of Christ provides no absolute cure for physical ills, though it does so provide for spiritual ills. As well might one claim financial prosperity from the death of Christ according to 2 Corinthians 8:9, as to claim present-day physical healing from the Scriptures on the basis of the death of Christ.

HEART

Like *soul* and *spirit*, *heart* is a Biblical term which may represent the individual (Gen. 18:5; Lev. 19:17; Ps. 104:15; cf. Matt. 13:15 with 1 Cor. 2:10).

The meaning of the term has never been fully defined. This can be done only by a complete induction of all Scripture bearing upon the subject.

By referring to the heart as an organ of the physical body attention can be drawn to human emotions—courage, anger, fear, joy, sorrow, devotion, hatred (Deut. 19:6; 1 Sam. 25:37; Ps. 4:7; 12:2; 27:14). A man may love God with all his heart.

HEAVEN

The Scriptures appear to indicate that there are three heavens. The first and second are not specifically mentioned as such, but "the third heaven" is declared to exist (2 Cor. 12:2). It is evident that there cannot be a third heaven without also a first and second heaven.

a. The first heaven must be the atmosphere which surrounds the earth. Reference is certainly made to the fowls of heaven (Hos. 2:18) and to the clouds of heaven (Dan. 7:13). Herein is the native abode of human beings and all created life upon earth.

b. The second heaven may be the stellar spaces (cf. Gen. 1:14–18 for stars of the heaven) and so is the abode of all supernatural angelic creatures.

c. The third heaven (its location however wholly unrevealed) is the abode of God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and until this age has never been entered by any created being—angel or human. The present divine purpose is to populate the third heaven. It is called *glory* (Heb. 2:10) and represents a place rather than a state of mind or being (John 14:1–3). Those who enter will be "made meet" (Col. 1:12). More specifically, they will become actual sons of God (John 1:12; 3:3). They will be perfected forever (Heb. 10:14), justified (Rom. 5:1), and made partakers of Christ's πλήρωμα (John 1:16), which is all fullness (Col. 1:19), the very nature of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9).

Similarly, the Scriptures employ the word *heaven* itself in a threefold usage:

a. *The kingdom of heaven* is a phrase peculiar to Matthew's Gospel (3:2, etc.) and indicates the earthly Messianic reign of Christ. Any rule of God over the earth is a form of the kingdom of heaven (cf. Dan. 2:44).

b. *The heavenly*, a phrase peculiar to the Epistle to the Ephesians (1:3, etc.), is a reference to the sphere of present association between believers and Christ, a copartnership in various respects. It signifies, therefore, not some favored place on the earth, but anywhere this communion with Christ may exist.

c. *Heaven* may represent the abode of the Godhead and of the redeemed forever.

As in many instances, knowledge about this place is wholly a matter of the testimony of the inspired Bible. It has been said that men really know nothing of heaven from experience since none

have returned to tell of it. There are, however, three experienced witnesses:

a. Christ. Heaven was His abode for all eternity. He discloses more regarding it than does any other person in Scripture.

b. The Apostle Paul, who—probably when stoned to death in Lystra—was caught up to the third heaven (Acts 14:19–22; 2 Cor. 12:1–9). He was prohibited, however, from disclosing what he saw and heard. A thorn in the flesh was given to remind him to keep this mighty secret.

c. John the Apostle, who was called into heaven (Rev. 4:1), and then given instruction to write a book (Rev. 1:11) and record all that he saw and heard. If it is asked why Paul could not report but John was told to report, it may be observed that Paul's experience was typical of a believer at present departing by death while John's experience was more like that common to all believers at the rapture in a future day. After his experience and in spite of prohibition the Apostle Paul wrote: "To depart and to be with Christ is far better" (Phil. 1:23).

One has well said, "Heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people." Very definite preparation is required of those who would enter that celestial sphere (cf. Col. 1:12). They must be like Christ both in standing and state (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2).

It remains to observe that heaven is a place of beauty (Rev. 21:1–22:7) with various inhabitants (Heb. 12:22–24), of life (1 Tim. 4:8), holiness (Rev. 21:27), service (Rev. 22:3), worship (Rev. 19:1–3), fellowship with God (2 Tim. 4:8), glory (2 Cor. 4:17. See Revelation 21:4–5).

HOLINESS

Whether found in the Hebrew of the Old Testament or the Greek of the New Testament, three words arise from the same root, namely, *holy, saint, sanctify* (see SANCTIFICATION). No induction of holiness truth will be complete, therefore, which does not include all passages where these three words appear.

A thing may be holy because of its relation to God—for example, the holy place, the holy of holies. A thing may be holy because of actual association with Him or divine purpose—for instance, a holy nation, holy brethren.

Those who would live unto God and in fellowship with Him are enjoined to be holy in life. Since the Creator is holy in Himself, quite apart from all evil (Ps. 22:3; 1 John 1:6; James 1:17), the obligation to be holy—simply of course because He is holy—rests alike upon all God's creation. To sum it all up:

a. God is holy (Ps. 99:1–9; Isa. 6:2–3; Hab. 1:13; 1 John 1:5).

b. Being set apart or sanctified, some men are holy (Heb. 3:1).

c. Some angels are holy, being separate from evil (Matt. 25:31).

An unusual text appears in the words: "Ye shall be holy; for I am holy" (Lev. 11:44; cf. I Pet. 1:16). Man the creature is plainly required to be like his Creator. This obligation is unusual and constitutes an inherent or intrinsic law, binding on all created beings. After one is saved and brought

into vital union with Christ a new responsibility is engendered to walk worthy of salvation, and this means to be as He was in this world.

The holiness of man is subject to a threefold consideration:

a. What is known as positional (Luke 1:70; Acts 20:32; 1 Cor. 1:2; 6:11; Eph. 4:24; Heb. 3:1; 10:10, 14).

b. Experimental (Rom. 6:1–23).

c. Ultimate (Rom. 8:29; Eph. 5:27; 1 John 3:1–3).

HOPE

Hope is expectation directed toward that which is good. Sometimes in Scripture the word is translated *trust*. Christ never used the term as such. There was of course certainty in all that He said. Two aspects of the doctrine may be noted:

a. Israel's hope (Luke 1:54, 67–79; 2:38; Acts 26:6–7; 28:20; Eph. 2:12) is of their coming Messiah and His kingdom on the earth.

b. Hope for the Christian is centered on the soon return of Christ (Titus 2:13–15; 1 John 3:2–3).

Bishop H. C. G. Moule lists seven elements when discussing Christian hope in general, as follows:

a. The return of Christ.

b. The resurrection body.

c. Being presented spotless before Christ.

d. Rewards.

e. Deliverance from Satan, sin, and death.

f. Companionship with saints.

g. Endless life with God.

The believer's hope, which operates as an anchor of the soul, is that he will one day join our great High Priest within the veil (Heb. 6:10–20).

HORN

The term *horn* is a symbol of power and authority. Reference is made in Scripture to the following:

1. “The horn of David” (Ps. 132:17; cf. 92:10).

2. “The horn of the house of Israel” (Ezek. 29:21).

3. “A little horn”—the man of sin yet to appear with all his signs and lying wonders (Dan. 7:8, 11, 20–21; 8:5, 8–9, 21; Mic. 4:13; Zech. 1:21; 2 Thess. 2:9).

HUMILITY

Humility is a divine characteristic to be found in human hearts only as inwrought by the Spirit of God. It is far removed from self-depreciation or an inferiority complex. Perhaps no better word has been written on the subject than that of Archbishop Fénelon (1651–1715), himself a most holy and spiritual man, which runs as follows:

“He who seeks not his own interest, but solely God’s interest in time and eternity, he is humble. … Many study exterior humility, but humility which does not flow from love is spurious. The more this exterior stoops, the loftier it inwardly feels itself; but he who is conscious of stooping does not really feel himself to be so low that he can go no further. People who think much of their humility are very proud” (cited by F. E. Marsh, *Emblems of the Holy Spirit*, p. 173). Archbishop Fénelon thus declares humility to be the effect of yieldedness to God’s will.

In the Old Testament this word appears as a noun 3 times and in all its forms about 40 times. It is found in the New Testament some 15 times. It always has the meaning of true piety (cf. Deut. 8:2–3; 1 Kings 21:29; 2 Chron. 7:14). Such virtue was anticipated under the law (Mic. 6:8). Humility as a virtue occupies a large place in the coming kingdom (Isa. 57:15; Matt. 5:3; 11:25; 18:4; 23:12; Luke 10:21; 14:11; 18:14). As a fruit of the Spirit it is wrought in the believer today (Gal. 5:22–23; cf. 1 Cor. 13:4; 1 Pet. 5:5–6).

Since man has no merit in himself before God but receives all that he has, humility is only the right and natural attitude. Christ was humble, still not because He was a sinner or meritless. To become conscious of humility is its utter ruin.

I

IMMORTALITY

Three important statements will serve to clarify this doctrine concerned with the future life. (1) Immortality is not endless existence or mere existence after death (for dying does not terminate human life). The unsaved go on living after death as do the saved, too. (2) Immortality likewise is not the same as the gift of eternal life, that which is bestowed on all who believe in Christ. (3) Immortality is something related to the material part of man rather than the immaterial. The commonly used phrase *immortality* of the *soul* is most unscriptural. The soul is never considered mortal by Scripture.

Immortality and incorruption, however, are companion terms. As there are two ways of leaving earth for heaven—by death and resurrection or by translation directly from the living state, at the coming of Christ—so many will see corruption and through resurrection put on incorruption, while others because alive when Christ comes shall put on immortality. In the end both groups reach the same estate, that is, a "body like unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3:21).

It remains to be declared that no believer has yet an immortal body. Only one such body actually exists and is in heaven. Christ it was who did not see corruption (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:31). He therefore put on immortality over a mortal (dead) body. He is now the only one who has immortality, dwelling in the light (cf. 1 Tim. 6:16), "and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10).

IMPUTATION

The word *impute* means to reckon over unto one's account, as the Apostle writing to Philemon regarding whatever Onesimus might owe Philemon declared: "Put that on mine account" (1:18). Because of the various phases of doctrine involved, imputation becomes at once one of the major or fundamental doctrines of Christianity. On this account great care is enjoined, that the student may comprehend the teaching perfectly. There are three major imputations set forth in the Scriptures, as will be seen below.

Imputation may either be real or judicial. A real imputation calls for the reckoning to one of what is antecedently his own, while a judicial imputation for the reckoning to one of what is not antecedently his own.

1. Of Adam's Sin to the Race. The central passage bearing on imputation is found in Romans 5:12–21. In verse 12 it is declared that death as a penalty has come upon all men in that all have sinned. This does not refer to the fact that all men sin in their daily experience, but as the verb *sinned* is in the aorist tense it refers to a completed past action. That is, all men sinned when Adam sinned, and thereby brought the penalty of physical death upon themselves by so doing. That this evil may not be deemed personal sins, the Apostle points out how all died in the period between Adam and Moses, or before the Mosaic Law was given (which law first gave to sin the heinous character of transgression), and likewise how all irresponsible persons such as infants and imbeciles died although

they have never sinned willfully, as in the case of Adam's transgression. Since God reckons each member of the race to have sinned in Adam's sin, this becomes the one case of real imputation, that is, a reckoning to each person that which is antecedently his own. An illustration of like seminal action may be seen in the record that Levi, who was supported by tithes, paid tithes while being in the loins of his great grandfather Abraham (Heb. 7:9–10, meaning when Abraham gave tithes to Melchizedek).

2. Of the Sin of the Race to Christ. In this particular field of truth the whole gospel resides. Though the word *impute* is not used, similar terms are to be found such as "made him to be sin," "laid on him," "bare our sins" (Isa. 53:5–6, 11; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:24). Here is a judicial imputation since the sin was never antecedently Christ's, for when laid upon Him it became His in an awful sense.

3. Of the Righteousness of God to the Believer. This third imputation constitutes the Christian's acceptance and standing before God. It is the only righteousness that God ever accepts for salvation and by it alone may one enter heaven. The entire book of Romans is more or less occupied with setting forth the doctrine respecting the imputed righteousness of God, and as the purpose of the Romans Epistle is to reveal the truth concerning salvation it follows that the imputed righteousness of God must be a most important factor therein. The apostolic phrase *the righteousness of God* (Rom. 1:17; 3:22; 10:3), then, means a righteousness from God rather than the mere fact that God Himself is righteous. In Romans 3:10 it is declared that none among men are in the sight of God righteous; hence an imputed righteousness is the only hope for men on this earth. Regarding the hope of imputed righteousness, the Apostle wrote: "… not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil. 3:9). To be fitted for the presence of God is of immeasurable importance (Col. 1:12). This calls for a righteousness which is made over to the believer even as Christ was made to be sin for all men (2 Cor. 5:21). Obviously here must be a judicial imputation as this righteousness is not antecedently the believer's. Nevertheless, when imputed to him by God he will possess it forever.

This imputation which provides the believer with all he needs before God forever is so important that its basis is revealed in the Scriptures, and so it is quite essential for each believer to understand the revelation. It is made unto him a legal bestowment through the death of Christ and is applied by the Holy Spirit through His baptism of the believer into Christ.

a. Such imputation is constituted legal before God since Christ offered Himself without spot to God (Heb. 9:14). This is to say, Christ not only was made a sin offering by His death, by which remission of sin is legally possible on the ground of the truth that He substituted for those who believe, but also He presented Himself without spot as an offering wellpleasing to God, thus providing a release of all that He is in infinite merit and making His merit available for those who had no merit. As God goes to the cross for the legal basis to remit sin, so He goes to the same cross for the legal basis to impute righteousness. All of this is typically presented in the five offerings of Leviticus, chapters 1–5, where Christ's death may be seen both as a sweet savor and a non-sweet savor in the estimation of the Father. There is that in His death which was not a sweet savor to God as seen in the words of Christ, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46; cf. Ps. 22:1). Similarly, as cited above, Hebrews 9:14 suggests a sweet savor offering to God. He offered Himself without spot to God not merely to inform the Father of Himself, but in behalf of others. Here also He served as a Substitute. When others did not have and could not secure a standing and merit before God, He released His own self and all its perfection for them. Nothing could be more needed on the part of meritless sinners.

b. Imputed righteousness is applied directly on the ground of the pivotal fact that the believer is in Christ. By the baptism of the Spirit, being joined thereby to Christ, one is in Christ as a new Headship. As hitherto that one was in the first Adam, fallen and undone, now in the resurrected Christ he partakes of all that Christ represents, even the righteousness of God which Christ is. Christ is thus made unto the believer righteousness (1 Cor. 1:30), and being in Him the believer is "made" the righteousness of God (2 Cor. 5:21). Unto this marvelous standing the Great Apostle aspired when he wrote: "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil. 3:9).

The extent of this position in Christ cannot be estimated or understood. In Hebrews 10:14, however, it is declared: "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," and in John 1:16 reference is made to the πλήρωμα or fullness of Christ which the believer has received. That fullness is described in Colossians 1:19: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell," and again in 2:9: "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," while verse 10 repeats the message of John 1:16, namely, that the believer is filled with the πλήρωμα (or, is complete) in Him.

The legal basis for the imputing of God's righteousness to the believer is found, then, in the sweet savor offerings and the application is accomplished by his being placed in union with Christ through the working of the Holy Spirit.

The three imputations named above prove foundational to all that enters into Christianity. They are wholly foreign to the Mosaic system and never mentioned in any Scriptures related to the coming kingdom. This teaching, along with other foundational doctrines such as propitiation, accordingly should be comprehended by every student at any cost.

INCARNATION

Because of the immeasurable truths involved, the incarnation—whereby a member of the Godhead is entering permanently into the human family and becoming part of it—proves one of the seven greatest events in the history of the universe, as follows: (1) creation of angels, (2) creation of material things including all life on the earth, (3) the incarnation, (4) death of the Incarnate One, (5) His resurrection, (6) His coming again to reign on the earth, and (7) His reign on the earth forever and ever. Naturally two questions will arise: Who is this incarnate Person? and What can be His mode of existence?

a. The identification is complete. He must be the Second Person or Son who became incarnate, not the Father or the Spirit. It remains true that Christ was and is God in the mystery of the Godhead Three; but He alone of the Three became flesh and took upon Him the form of man. He therefore is unique. There has never been and never will be again one like this theanthropic Person. Nor should there be surprise that He is different from all other human beings. The Scriptures are ever concerned to set forth in knowable terms the eternal character of the One who became incarnate. In the opening of John's Gospel it is written: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. … And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (1:1–3, 14). The attempt by John through the Spirit of God in the opening verses of his Gospel is to

declare the eternal character of the One who became flesh and dwelt among us. The term *logos* (see Logos) refers to the preincarnate Christ and embodies a truth far too little employed by theologians. The "beginning" of John 1:1 must go back before all creation came into existence and therefore far antedates the "beginning" of Genesis 1:1. John is saying of the dateless past that the Person who became incarnate *was* existent already. He then existed as old and as wise as now. He did not sometime begin to be; He *was* in the beginning. The Logos is and always has been the expression of God, the Manifester. Those who desire to know what God is like need only to behold the Son of God as He showed Himself to the world. Of this the Apostle John writes: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John 1:18) .

Though no man ever spoke as that One spoke, He did not come into the world merely to manifest the wisdom of God. Though no man could do the miracles which He wrought except God be with him, He did not come to manifest the power of God. He came rather to manifest the love of God, and not in a whole lifetime of compassion for us but rather in one event of His life especially. Of this it is written: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8); "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" (1 John 3:16).

b. Christ entered the human family that He might be a kinsman and thus meet the requirements laid down for a kinsman redeemer. According to the type seen in the Old Testament, especially the Book of Ruth (cf. Lev. 25:49; Isa. 59:20), no one could redeem except he be a near kinsman not involved in the condition from which he wished to rescue. He must also be willing as well as able to redeem. All this Christ fulfilled perfectly when He became a kinsman by being born into the human family.

Through His incarnation Christ combined both the perfect, divine nature of God and human nature in one Person. He was no less God because of His humanity and no more than human as respects humanity because of the divine being which He was.

If the Logos was to become "flesh" and as Immanuel be one of the human family, there was but one way it could be done. He must submit to a human birth. Had He suddenly appeared on earth among men as if one of them or even been seen descending from heaven, the identity of His Person —without a human body, soul, and spirit all of His own—could never have been established satisfactorily.

It is too often assumed that Christ began to be at the time of His birth of the virgin, whereas He was from all eternity. From the standpoint of fact, then, humanity was only added to Deity.

INFANT SALVATION

Many and varied problems are discovered in a study of the doctrine of infant salvation. Like all salvation issues, the doctrines here involved must ever be correctly stated and harmonized—election, Anthropology, the fall of the race, Soteriology, together with redemption. The entire field of sovereign grace toward a lost world is in view. No theology is established or complete which does not account for the salvation of those who die in infancy. This company is great numerically, and without this group some representation from every tribe and nation might not be included among the redeemed. Being unable to respond to God's proffered grace in Christ, the child, if saved at all, must

be saved on other terms than those imposed upon the adult portion of humanity. God's freedom to save the lost in righteousness is evidently at stake.

It will be recognized that when a disproportionate emphasis on the lost estate of men is present there may well be a tendency to think of all children as if they were born reprobate. That they are unregenerate at birth is certain; yet God likewise has in great mercy provided for the unsaved whom it is His purpose to save. Earlier, extreme Calvinists asserted that hell is a place paved with infants not over a span long; because of this sort of teaching and as a heritage from Rome came about the belief in baptismal regeneration. To such a position, of course, the Word of God gives no sanction either directly or indirectly.

In *The Sunday School Times* (beginning November 10, 1928) was published a symposium by well-known Bible teachers and theologians on the subject of infant salvation; and it was the expressed opinion of all who wrote articles that infants are saved in and through the death of Christ for them, that Christ's sacrifice provided righteous freedom on God's part to save all for whom Christ died and that, since He died for all mankind, God is free to save whom He will and upon such terms as He may elect to impose. As infants cannot possibly respond to the terms of faith imposed upon the adult portion of the race, God may and does act directly in behalf of those who die in infancy. No unrighteousness can be found in this outworking of God's purpose and will.

The whole subject of infants being saved, though it introduces many and varied theological problems, is first of all somewhat established by the fact that in Scripture little ones are seen in heaven and are recognized as being there (cf. 2 Sam. 12:23; Matt. 18:3–5, 10; 19:14).

In an article for *Bibliotheca Sacra*, furthermore, at the beginning of his discussion on the doctrine, Dr. Alan H. Hamilton states:

> The entire program of Christian religious education will be built upon the educator's answer to these three questions: (1) What is the spiritual state of the child as he comes into the world? To this, two contrasting answers have been given, the one that he is born with a spiritual life which must be carefully cultivated and directed, the other that he inherits the curse of a fallen race and is born devoid of spiritual contact with God or of ability within himself to make that contact. (2) What are the spiritual needs of the child? The school of thought following the first concept given above will respond with a training designed to enhance and bring into full fruition the essence of spiritual life which the child possesses. Those who are convinced of the second concept will lay major emphasis upon the child being brought, as early as possible, to a saving relationship with God through Christ. As we will see, ecclesiastical bodies differ as to the manner in which this relationship is thought to be effected; but the general agreement is there, nonetheless, that in some manner a spiritual life must be imparted. This will lay the foundation upon which Christian character can be built and from which Christian virtue will flow. (3) What are the spiritual possibilities of the child? To the first group the child, already in possession of spiritual life, may be so enlightened and hedged about that he can retain his original spiritual life and develop from birth to manhood without interruption. Should he turn aside to actual sin, of course, that life is lost and a subsequent conversion experience is necessary. To the second group it is not considered possible that the appreciation and appropriation of spiritual things can be realized prior to the time of regeneration. No lack of emphasis upon moral training is to be noted among this group, neither is there, generally, a failure to present Scripture truths; but all of this is done with the realization that there is no spiritual life to develop until the occurrence of the new,

spiritual birth. Since, however, this school of thought conceives of regeneration as a sovereign act of God, it is able to expect (where thinking along this line is consistent) that salvation can occur very early in the child's life and need not tarry until a period of greater intellectual comprehension is reached.

Both of these schools of thought have developed within evangelical Christianity. The first, as will be readily recognized, has grown out of a rationalism which has tended toward universalism. It began to gain prominence in the latter half of the nineteenth century with the writings of Horace Bushnell (*Christian Nurture*, 1847), F. G. Hibbard (*The Religion of Childhood*, 1864), R. J. Cooke (*Christianity and Childhood*, 1891), and C. W. Rishell (*The Child as God's Child*, 1904). The title of a pamphlet by J. T. McFarland from this period indicates the trend of thought. It is called *Preservation versus the Rescue of the Child* (see Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, *s.v.*, "Child hood").

The second school has followed more closely the supernaturalism presented by the Scriptures. It represents the view taken in this study, in which the authority of the Bible is assumed and which, it is hoped, will be shown to be the only system of thought which can stand the tests of the Scriptures, of consistency, and of the approval of the Christian consciousness.

It is of interest to note that the findings of the child study movement, not following the teachings of Scripture but instead the tenets of psychology, have given support to the view taken here by asserting that religion is something external to the child. It is usually considered as being imparted to him by his environment.

There has been also, during the past twenty years especially, a growing conviction in the hearts of the Christian public that the little child is a proper object for the simple teaching of the gospel. This movement finds its roots in the view presented here: the complete depravity of every member of the human race, and the absolute possibility of regeneration, even for the very young child, because of the supernatural operation of God in saving grace.

With these three values in view, therefore, the study of the doctrine of infant salvation is undertaken: (1) its practical value in bringing a certain and Scriptural answer to the questionings of those whose lives are touched by the death of an infant; (2) the theological value in providing a test of current theological systems; and (3) the contribution which it may make, in a foundational way, to the construction of a proper program of evangelism and education for the child.—CI, 343–45

Dr. Hamilton goes on to quote from the early Fathers and to demonstrate that this doctrine did not then have the place of importance theologically which it has now. Its present significance was well declared by Dr. B. B. Warfield when he said: "No system of theological thought can live in which it [the doctrine of infant salvation] cannot find a natural and logical place" (*Two Studies in the History of Doctrine*, p. 239, as cited by Hamilton, *ibid.*, p. 343).

Certain problems require consideration.

a. That infants are saved by reason of being innocent. This is a universal belief, especially being entertained by parents of a deceased child; but innocence can save no one when all are born depraved (see DEPRAVITY).

b. That proper baptism will save all so presented. But if baptism can save any or at all, Christ's death is in vain. Why should He die?

c. That in so far as Christ died for all, all are saved thereby. This is the viewpoint which Richard Watson declares upon the supposed authority of Romans 5:17–18 (see Watson's *Theology*, II, 57 ff.), where the gift of righteousness extends to those who "receive abundance of grace." But here God speaks to reasonable adult persons; still, He is nonetheless free to save as He will.

d. That infants belong to the election. Are infants who die in infancy necessarily of the elect? It is evident that they are if saved at all. Is a child fortunate, then, who dies in infancy because more sure of heaven than if he were to continue and perhaps be unwilling to be saved even in late years? Of that none can speak. God guides and works out His own plan in every life which is lived on earth. It is probable that the elect company, in order for it to be from every kindred, tribe, and people, will be built up in part out of those who die in infancy.

It may be definitely asserted, in conclusion, that infants who die before accountability begins are saved through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.

INFINITY

The doctrine of infinity, such as it is, will be contained in the one word *infinite*. It represents only that which is of God, since His power and resources and mode of being are infinite (Ps. 147:5). Due to the poverty of human language and a disposition oftentimes to speak in superlatives, this particular term, which in itself is most restricted, has become to many a mere form of exaggeration (cf. Job 22:5; Nah. 3:9). *Infinite* occurs three times in Scripture, as indicated above.

INHERITANCE

As an Old Testament doctrine, the theme of inheritance begins with Jehovah's partitioning of the promised land to tribes and families (Lev. 25:23–28; Num. 26:52–56; 27:8–11). When no heir existed the estate went to the nearest kinsman. God's way of preserving these properties in line with their original grants was to cause that all estates should be restored in the year of jubilee or every fifty years.

The New Testament doctrine is to the effect that the believer has an inheritance in God (Rom. 8:16–17; Eph. 1:14; 1 Pet. 1:4) and God a heritage in the believer (Eph. 1:18; cf. Rom. 5:8–10).

INNOCENCE

The term *innocent* implies only absence of evil (Matt. 27:4, 24). It is thus altogether negative. By so much it corresponds with the legal words *not guilty*.

A child is an example of innocence (Matt. 18:3). Adam as created was innocent; but the term does not describe the Last Adam's life on earth. He on the contrary was holy and undefiled and

separate from sinners (Heb. 7:26). Here, then, is another term which should be used with care and discrimination.

INSPIRATION

As applied to Scripture, the term *inspiration* means 'God-breathed' (2 Tim. 3:16–17) and more particularly that the words of Holy Writ are derived from God. *All* Scripture is said to be God-breathed, not as the Revised Version might suggest: "Every scripture inspired of God [or, God-breathed] is also profitable …" Regarding the Scriptures and plenary, verbal inspiration, it may be said that no other explanation has been the belief of the church from the beginning.

The English word *inspiration* is from the Latin root *spiro*, which means 'to breathe,' translating the Greek word θεόπνευστος (used but once in the New Testament, 2 Tim. 3:16) that means 'God-breathed or inbreathed of God.' Scripture did not originate with men, but with God. It is one of God's most wonderful actions. 2 Peter 1:21 has to do with the counterpart to this divine work respecting human reception of the God-directed words. The Bible authors were moved or borne along as a ship by the wind. Each word of the Bible is, therefore, to a certain degree of dual authorship—both from the Holy Spirit and its human authors.

Men of serious mind have sought to prove the authoritative character of the Scriptures by declaring that only some parts are inspired; but this approach leaves to man the responsibility of determining how much is inspired, and man indeed may as well be sole author of the text if he can pass such a discriminating judgment.

No progress has ever been made in formulating doctrine from the Bible when men have doubted the inspiration of the Scriptures in all its parts. This work on Systematic Theology, then, is based on a complete credence respecting the plenary, verbal inspiration of the Bible, the very position which has been defended on earlier pages.

INTERCESSION

Interceding is a form of prayer sufficiently particular to justify separate consideration apart from the general doctrine of prayer (see PRAYER).

Intercession contemplates the ministry of one who stands between God and some great need, as in the case of Abraham interceding for the cities of the Jordan plain. Rightfully it is said in Romans of all praying: "We know not what we should pray for as we ought," when so much is involved in God's purpose and plan for each human life. Only "Thy will be done" (Matt. 6:10) can be the final attitude of all who intercede. The Christian cannot himself know the scope and force of prayer; however, in this respect God makes provision. The one central passage on intercession (Romans 8:26–27), therefore, reads: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." The Spirit knows omnisciently (cf. 1 Cor. 2:10–11), then, and God who searches the heart knows the mind and language of the Spirit. This

portion of Romans is a peculiar passage in that it records communication between the Father and the Spirit. Prayer in all its forms has adequate enablement. It is to be offered to the Father (Matt. 6:9), in the name of the Son (John 16:23–24), and in the power of the Spirit's enablement (cf. Eph. 6:18; Jude 1:20).

INTERMEDIATE STATE

The doctrine of an intermediate state concerns the estate of the redeemed between death and resurrection of the body. Some treatment of this theme is usually incorporated into works on Systematic Theology as a phase of Eschatology.

There is little or no direct teaching on this doctrine in the Old Testament; yet when the Synoptic Gospels are considered as a continuation of the Old Testament revelation, as indeed they should be considered, much light is thrown on the Hebrew Scriptures respecting the intermediate state. Two important passages may be cited for illustration: "And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom" (Luke 16:23); "And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43). These verses are revealing in respect to the estate of the Old Testament saints. Christ Himself, in the former, pictures the rich man suffering torment and the beggar enjoying Abraham's bosom. To a Jew, Abraham's bosom is the sublime place of rest and peace; but of course this is far removed from the believer's place in this age, for the Apostle Paul says that "to depart and to be with Christ is far better" than anything the world may afford.

The body rests in the grave, accordingly, and must see corruption. There is no Scripture which justifies the notion that the soul and spirit sleep in unconsciousness during the interval between death and resurrection. The dying thief, as noticed above, was assured of a place in paradise the day that he died. It is probable that paradise—now the place of waiting for the blessed dead before they rise—was at the resurrection of Christ moved into heaven; for Paul, likely when stoned to death at Lystra (2 Cor. 12:1–10), was caught up into a paradise located in the third heaven. God does not reveal further the estate of those with Christ in paradise.

2 Corinthians 5:1–8 may promise an intermediate body for those believers who die lest they be found disembodied. It is a body "from heaven," not indeed the resurrection body from the grave.

In answer to the question whether those now with Christ know of conditions on earth and whether they know each other, no revelation is given; and here, as always, the silence of God should be respected.

INTERPRETATION

The doctrine of interpretation contemplates the science of discovering the exact meaning of the Spirit Author as this is set forth in a given Scripture passage. Such a science may be described theologically as *hermeneutics*. To fathom this doctrine it is necessary to know and follow the recognized rules of Scripture interpretation. In his classroom textbook on hermeneutics Dr. Rollin T. Chafer advances the following four major rules, to which less important rules may be added:

1. “The first rule of Biblical interpretation is: Interpret grammatically; with due regard to the meaning of words, the form of sentences, and the peculiarities of idiom in the language employed. The sense of Scripture is to be determined by the words; a *true* knowledge of the words is the knowledge of the sense. … The words of Scripture must be taken in their common meaning, unless such meaning is shown to be inconsistent with other words in the sentence, with the argument or context, or with other parts of Scripture. … The true meaning of any passage of Scripture, then, is not every sense which the words will bear, nor is it every sense which is true in itself, but that which is intended by the inspired writers, or even by the Holy Spirit, though imperfectly understood by the writers themselves” (Angus-Green, *Cyclopedic Handbook of the Bible*, p. 180).

Out of the multitude of examples cited in the various texts, one from Lockhart on Ephesians 2:8 may be cited. “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.” He says: “We may ask, what is the gift of God? Many would answer, ‘grace’; many others, ‘faith’; some, ‘salvation.’ But what does the grammar require?” After eliminating “grace” and “faith” as the antecedents of “that,” he proceeds: “The only other possible antecedent is the salvation expressed by the verb ‘saved.’ Some have objected that the Greek noun for salvation is feminine; but we must notice that salvation is here expressed … by the verb, and Greek grammar again requires that a pronoun which refers to the action of a verb for its antecedent must be neuter. This exactly suits the case; and the meaning is, Ye are saved by grace through faith; but the salvation is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Here the interpretation that accords with the grammar is reasonable and satisfactory” (*Principles of Interpretation*, p. 85–86). I have pointed out before, however, that the observance of all grammatical requirements often leaves one short of the meaning of the doctrinal contents of the text. Cellérier has this in mind when he says: “Suppose that he [an interpreter] undertakes to explain the words of Jesus to the paralytic: ‘My son, thy sins be forgiven thee’ (Mark 2:5), Grammatical Hermeneutics may readily do its work, but it will not fathom the depth of meaning which these words contain’ (*Biblical Hermeneutics*, Elliott and Harsha, translators, p. 53).

2. The second rule of interpretation is: “Interpret according to the context.” “The meaning of a word, again, will often be modified by the connexion in which it is used. … This rule is often of great theological importance” (Angus-Green, *op. cit.*, p. 186–87). (Examples: Various meanings of *Faith, Flesh, Salvation, Grace*, etc.). “The study of the context is the most legitimate, efficacious, and trustworthy resource at the command of the interpreter. Nothing can be more convenient, more logical than to explain an author by himself, and to have recourse to the entire train of thought. It is much less easy for sophism to abuse this mode of interpretation than that of dealing with etymology, philology, and exceptions of syntax” (Cellérier, *op. cit.*, p. 101). Although these latter are often valuable aids, they may also be pushed to harmful effects. (Example: The etymological study of some words indicates that their significance has entirely departed from the root meaning. On the ground of etymology, therefore, it would be misleading for an interpreter to hold to the root meaning in such cases.) One of the most helpful results of contextual study is furnished by the definitions of the author’s own terms. (Examples: “That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Tim. 3:17. By *perfect* here is meant: “Thoroughly furnished” for service. There are a number of contexts in which the word

perfect needs the light from the context for its exact meaning. In such passages the thought is not perfection in its widest sense, but maturity in a specified line of experience or endeavor.)

3. Sometimes the context does not give all the light needed to determine the meaning of a word or a phrase. In such cases a third rule is necessary, namely: "Regard the scope or design of the book itself, or of some large section in which the words and expressions occur" (Angus-Green, *op. cit.*, p. 192). The purpose in writing a book is often clearly mentioned, especially in the N.T. Epistles. This avowed purpose will often throw light on passages otherwise obscure. Terry gives the following example: "There can be no doubt, … that, after his opening salutation and personal address, the apostle [Paul] announces his great theme [of Romans] in verse 16 of the first chapter. It is *the Gospel considered as the power of God unto salvation to every believer, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.* … It manifestly expresses, in a happy personal way, the scope of the entire epistle." After an analysis of the entire epistle, he says: "It will be found that a proper attention to this general plan and scope of the Epistle will greatly help to the understanding of its smaller sections" (*Biblical Hermeneutics*, p. 111–12).

4. "The fourth and most comprehensive rule of Biblical interpretation is: Compare Scripture with Scripture. … A Scripture truth is really the consistent explanation of all that Scripture teaches in reference to the question examined; and a Scripture duty is the consistent explanation of all the precepts of Scripture on the duty" (Angus-Green, *op. cit.*, p. 195). As has already been noted, this procedure was not employed until the Reformation; and sound hermeneutics was not developed until this method was adopted. It results in "the analogy of faith which regulates the interpretation of each passage in conformity with the whole tenor of revealed truth." Under this general head Cellérier also says: "To admit a positive revelation and to reject things positively revealed is a great inconsistency" (*Op. cit.*, p. 19). This inconsistency is not uncommon. Some interpreters who claim to accept the Bible as the revealed Word of God, reject specific revelations in it because these do not fit into the framework of their preconceived theology.—*The Science of Biblical Hermeneutics*, pp. 75–78

Since every student of Scripture, especially the one who would attempt to expound the Word of God, is confronted with the problem of giving to the Sacred Text its precise meaning, the need of following these rules is imperative.

ISRAEL

An elect, sacred, and everlasting nation is the plan or purpose of God for Israel. This people came into being miraculously as the seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. They are the object of immeasurable covenants and promises and this becomes their major identification or destination, for the covenants are secured or sealed by the act of Jehovah. Israel stands alone, in distinction from all other nations combined. Those many nations are known as Gentiles, but Israelites as Jews. Individual Jews are such because of the fact that they were born into covenant relations with God by a physical birth. Herein lies a great contrast, since Christians are such because they were born by a spiritual birth into right relations with God. Because Israel sustains a covenant relationship to God, He gave them a specific rule of life through Moses. Keeping the rule of life, however, did not and could not

make them children of Jehovah's covenant. They were to keep the rule of life because they were already in the covenant. The believer has a rule of life secured by his position under grace today and so keeping this or any rule will not make him a child of God, although being a child of the Father above he should walk according to His revealed will.

Israel's relationship to Jehovah remained unchanged until the present age, in which time God has ordained that there should be "no difference" between Jew and Gentile (Rom. 10:12). All alike are under sin (Rom. 3:9; Gal. 3:22), and the individual Jew like the Gentile may be saved alone through faith in Christ. In similar manner, all Jews are now subject to divine judgment, which is something eternal if they continue as Christ rejecters. When the present age is completed, Israel will return to Jehovah's purpose for her and will enter, properly purged, the long-promised and anticipated kingdom glory. God must yet deal specifically with Israel in judgment (Ezek. 20:33–34). So also all the nations shall stand before the throne of Christ's glory to be judged respecting their treatment of Israel as a people (cf. Matt. 25:31–46).

In a manner and to an extent quite impossible of comprehension by the finite mind, Israel is appointed to glorify God. This truth must not be slighted. God speaks of the elect nation as "Israel my glory" (Isa. 46:13), and indeed He has chosen that nation above all nations for His glory (Gen. 12:1–3). He loves them with an everlasting love (Jer. 31:3). When the Christian loves with a divine compassion he will acknowledge what God loves. Therefore, he too must love Israel.

J

JEHOVAH

As an introduction to the name *Jehovah*—one of the three primary Old Testament names for God—and its import, two paragraphs from the article by Dr. T. Rees on "God" in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* may well be quoted:

> *Jehovah (Yahweh*).—This is the personal proper name *par excellence* of Israel's God, even as Chemosh was that of the god of Moab, and Dagon that of the god of the Philistines. The original meaning and derivation of the word are unknown. The variety of modern theories shows that, etymologically, several derivations are possible, but that the meanings attached to any one of them have to be imported and imposed upon the word. They add nothing to our knowledge. The Hebrews themselves connected the word with hāyāh, "to be." In Exodus 3:14 Jehovah is explained as equivalent to *ʾehyeh*, which is a short form of *ʾehyeh ʾăsher ʾehyeh*, translated in R.V. "I am that I am." This has been supposed to mean "self-existence," and to represent God as the Absolute. Such an idea, however, would be a metaphysical abstraction, not only impossible to the time at which the name originated, but alien to the Hebrew mind at any time. And the imperfect' *ʾehyeh* is more accurately translated "I will be what I will be," a Semitic idiom meaning, "I will be all that is necessary as the occasion will arise," a familiar Old Testament idea (cf. Isa. 7:4, 9; Ps. 23).
>
> This name was in use from the earliest historical times till after the exile. It is found in the most ancient literature. According to Exodus 3:13 f., and especially 6:2–3, it was first introduced by Moses, and was the medium of a new revelation of the God of their fathers to the children of Israel. But in parts of Genesis it is represented as being in use from the earliest times. Theories that derive it from Egypt or Assyria, or that would connect it etymologically with Jove or Zeus, are supported by no evidence. We have to be content either to say that Jehovah was the tribal God of Israel from time immemorial, or to accept a theory that is practically identical with that of Exodus—that it was adopted through Moses from the Midianite tribe into which he married. The Kenites, the tribe of Midianites related to Moses, dwelt in the neighborhood of Sinai, and attached themselves to Israel (Judg. 1:16; 4:11). A few passages suggest that Sinai was the original home of Jehovah (Judg. 5:4–5; Deut. 33:2). But there is no direct evidence bearing upon the origin of the worship of Jehovah: to us He is known only as the God of Israel.—Pp. 1254–5

The various compounds with *Jehovah* being used in the Old Testament are:

Jehovah-jireh—'Jehovah sees' (Gen. 22:13–14),

Jehovah-nissi—'Jehovah is my banner' (Ex. 17:15),

Jehovah-shalom—'Jehovah is peace' (Judg. 6:24),

Jehovah-shammah—'Jehovah is there' (Ezek. 48:35),

Jehovah-tsidkenu—'Jehovah our righteousness' (Jer. 23:6),

Jehovah-rā-ah—'Jehovah my shepherd' (Ps. 23:1),

Jehovah-rapha—'Jehovah that healeth' (Ex. 15:26).

In the light of the plural form of *Elohim*, Deuteronomy 6:4 is significant, also the collective use there of the word *one*. The text reads: "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD." A translation just as acceptable might read: "Jehovah [note the name is singular] our Elohim [now it is plural] is one [several entities united in one] Jehovah." What, therefore, must be the significance of Christ's reference to Himself as Jehovah or the "I am" (John 8:58)?

JERUSALEM

The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (p. 1596) declares: "The earliest mention of Jerusalem is in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1450 B.C.), where it appears in the form of Uru-sa-lim …" The earthly Jerusalem, sometimes called Zion because such was the name for the city's ancient citadel, is referred to as the city of David (cf. 2 Sam. 5:6–12) and the city of the great king (Matt. 5:35). It is indeed a city of an incomparable history and of a marvelous destiny. It will yet be the capital of the whole earth. Out from it Messiah's law and rule shall go, for Isaiah 2:1–4 declares: "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

During the time of Messiah's absence now, Jerusalem is a sign; for as long as it is under the leadership of foreign powers, as today, Gentile times are unfulfilled, though Gentile times are to be fulfilled at once when the city is returned to Israel's ownership or authority: "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24). The city of the future will have a specific religious character: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts; It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts: I will go also. Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD. Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you" (Zech. 8:20–23). Again, Isaiah declared regarding the filth of the city: "And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem: when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning. And the LORD will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night: for upon all the glory shall be a defence. And there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the daytime from the heat,

and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain" (4:3–6; cf. Jer. 31:6–14; Mic. 4:6–7).

While the name *Jerusalem* may likely mean 'city of peace,' it has in its history been the location of more wars than any other locality in the world. It proves indeed the symbol of Israel dwelling in the land, so that as long as Israel is living out of the land and scattered among the nations there can be no world peace, as there is none today.

The present situation, with many nations aroused to action as in the United Nations Council, has not been duplicated before since Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus in 70 A.D. It is to be observed, certainly, that action could be taken at any time which would restore the promised land to Israel. It assuredly is a land of promise and Jehovah's covenant respecting it cannot be broken.

The new Jerusalem is a city yet to be (Rev. 21:1–2). It was the hope of Old Testament saints (cf. Heb. 11:10). According to the present plan of spiritual citizenship it is described in Hebrews 12:22–24. This description conforms completely to the one given in Revelation 21:2–22:5. According to Revelation 22:5 the heavenly city endures forever. This city is not the new heaven, for it comes down out of heaven (Rev. 21:10). See Zion.

JESUS

Jesus, the human name for the Son of God, is really the Greek form of the Hebrew name *Joshua* (cf. Acts 7:45; Heb. 4:8). The incarnate One was named by God, His full title being *Lord Jesus Christ. Lord* relates Him to His eternal Deity and *Christ* to His threefold office in relation to Israel, that of prophet, priest, and king, as the Messiah.

The name *Jesus*, bestowed according to divine command, means "He shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21), as Joshua meant "Jehovah is salvation." This signification has given a very important and far-reaching meaning to the cognomen *Jesus*.

In Revelation 19:11–16 the last and final description of Christ's second advent is given. In this passage He appears under four titles. Three are revealed and one is withheld. He is Faithful and True (vs. 11), which characterization relates Him in language chosen by the Spirit to the Gospel by Mark. He is the Word of God (vs. 13), which relates Him to the Gospel by John. He is King of kings and Lord of lords (vs. 16), which relates him to the Gospel by Matthew. The name "that no man knew" (vs. 12) is likely one related to the Gospel by Luke, speaking of His humanity. *Jesus* is the human name, of a certainty, and what is involved thereby in His people being removed from their many sins is not knowable. The time will nevertheless come when, according to Philippians 2:9–10, "at the name of Jesus" every knee is forced to bow.

JUDAISM

There is no revelation of any distinctive relationship being set up either between God and the angels or between God and the Gentiles which partakes of the character of a true religion, but God has entered into relations with the Jew which results in Judaism, or what the Apostle identifies as the

religion of the Jews (Acts 26:5; Gal. 1:13; cf. James 1:26–27), and with the Christian which results in Christianity, or what the New Testament writers designate as “the faith” (Jude 1:3) and “this way” (Acts 9:2; 22:4; cf. 18:26; 2 Pet. 2:2). Judaism and Christianity have much in common, for each is ordained of God to serve a specific purpose. They incorporate similar features in the realm of religion —God, man, righteousness, sin, redemption, salvation, human responsibility, and human destiny; but these similarities do not establish identity since the dissimilarities far outnumber the similarities. There are also remarkable points of likeness between the laws of Great Britain and the statutes of the United States, but this fact does not constitute the two nations one.

A complete religious system provides at least seven distinctive features, all of which accordingly are present both in Judaism and Christianity. These elements are: (1) an acceptable standing on the part of man before God, (2) a manner of life consistent with that standing, (3) a divinely appointed service, (4) a righteous ground whereon God may graciously forgive and cleanse the erring, (5) a clear revelation of the responsibility on the human side upon which divine forgiveness and cleansing may be secured, (6) an effective basis upon which God may be worshiped and petitioned in prayer, and (7) a future hope.

It should be made emphatic that to observe distinction between Judaism and Christianity is the beginning of wisdom in understanding the Bible. Theologians of past generations have made no greater mistake than to suppose, despite all the evidence to the contrary, that Judaism and Christianity are one and the same, or as some have said: “One is the bud and the other is the blossom.” Judaism has not merged into Christianity. This is a colossal error of Covenant Theology perpetuated to the present day. Inasmuch as the Bible contains both these systems and any comprehensive theology which is systematic at all will distinguish between the two systems, it is to be reckoned but incidental that both are found in the one divine revelation or volume. Howbeit, admittedly they have much in common.

These systems doubtless set up conflicting and opposing principles, but since these difficulties appear only when an attempt is made to coalesce systems, elements, and principles which God has separated the conflicts really do not exist at all outside the unwarranted unifying efforts of theologians; in fact, they rather demonstrate the *necessity* of a due recognition of all God’s different and distinct administrations. The true unity of the Scriptures is not discovered when one blindly seeks to fuse these opposing principles into one system, but rather when God’s plain differentiations are observed. The dispensationalist does not create the great differences as he is sometimes accused of doing. The conflicting principles, such as may be found in the text of Scripture, are observable by all who penetrate deep enough to recognize the essential features of divine administration. Instead of creating the problems, the dispensationalist is actually the one who has a solution for them. If the ideals of an earthly people for long life in the land which God gave unto them (Ex. 20:12; Ps. 37:3, 11, 34; Matt. 5:5) does not articulate with the ideals of a heavenly people who, while on the earth, are but “strangers and pilgrims” and enjoined to be looking for and loving the imminent appearing of Christ (2 Tim. 4:8; Titus 2:13; 1 Pet. 2:11), the problem is easily solved by the one whose system of interpretation will be proved rather than distressed by such distinctions. A plan of interpretation which, in defense of an ideal unity of the Bible, contends for a single divine purpose, ignores drastic contradictions, and is sustained only by occasional or accidental similarities, must be doomed to confusion when confronted with the many problems which such a system imposes on the text of Scripture, which problems are recognized by the dispensationalist only as he observes them in such a system as would create them.

All Scripture "is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16), but all Scripture is not of primary application to a particular person or class of persons which the Bible designates as such. All Scripture is not about the angels nor about the Gentiles. In like manner, all Scripture is not addressed to the Jew nor to the Christian. These are obvious truths, and the dispensationalist's plan of interpretation is none other than an attempt to be consistent in following these distinctions in the primary application of Scripture as far as, and no further than, the Bible carries them. However, all Scripture is profitable just the same, that is, it has its moral, spiritual, and secondary application. To illustrate this: Much valuable truth may be gained from the great body of Scripture bearing on the Jewish Sabbath; but if that body of Scripture has a primary application to the Church, then the Church has no Biblical ground for observance of the first day of the week (which she certainly has) and she could offer no excuse for her disobedience respecting the Sabbath, and her individual members, like all Sabbath breakers, should be stoned to death (Num. 15:32–36). In like manner, if all Scripture is of primary application to believers of this age, then they are in danger of hell fire (Matt. 5:29–30), of unspeakable plagues, diseases, and sicknesses, and by reason of these to become few in number (Deut. 28:58–62), and of having the blood of lost souls required at their hands (Ezek. 3:17—18). Moral and spiritual lessons are to be drawn from God's dealing with Israelites quite apart from the necessity being imposed upon Christians to comply with all that a primary application of the Scriptures which are specifically addressed to Israel would demand. Of the believer of this age it is said: "He shall not come into condemnation [judgment, R.V.]" (John 5:24) and "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). These precious promises are disannulled by diametrically opposite declarations if all Scripture applies primarily to the Christian. Arminianism is the legitimate expression of all this confusion, to be sure, and the would-be Calvinist who ignores the plain distinctions of the Bible has no defense against Arminian claims.

Both Christianity and Judaism have their separate histories and are in existence at the present time. So, likewise, they have their separate eschatologies, all of which the student should recognize and study.

JUDGMENT

Again, many theologians have erred greatly in contending that there is one judgment and in seeking to merge several other judgments into this particular one. For instance, they are convinced that the judgment of the nations (Matt. 25:31–46) is the same as the judgment of the great white throne (Rev. 20:11–15). One Christian young man when asked concerning the judgment of the nations precisely who the sheep were said in reply: "The saved people, of course." To the next question —"And who are the goats?"—he replied: "Those are the unsaved people." When asked who are the ones called "my brethren," he was helpless to answer. This problem drove him to the study of the Scripture and made him a most exceptional and useful Christian. Inattention to the details of Scripture is without excuse in the light of the disclosure that there are at least eight well-defined judgments presented by the Word of God. These are:

1. Of the Cross. Sin has been judged by Christ as Substitute for all on behalf of whom He died. The believer has been in court, condemned, sentenced, and executed in the Person of his Substitute (John 5:24; Rom. 5:9; 8:1; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; Heb. 9:26–28; 10:10, 14–17; 1 Pet. 2:24). In this connection it may be said that Satan has been judged at the cross (John 16:11; Col. 2:14–15), which

judgment evidently consists in taking from him much of the authority he had over the unsaved in keeping them from knowing the gospel of grace (cf. Isa. 14:17 with 61:1). The cross completed this judgment upon sin. “It is finished” (John 19:30). It therefore becomes something to believe for salvation.

2. Of Self. The warning to judge self is addressed directly to those who are saved: “For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world” (1 Cor. 11:31–32). Here chastisement of the believer is contemplated as a judgment from God which will not occur if the believer will be faithful in judging himself before God. Hence the promise of 1 John 1:9 is to be included with thought of this warning. Forgiveness and cleansing are assured once the believer has made confession to God, since that really means self-judgment.

3. Of Believers. As stated above, this kind of judgment is experienced by believers and only when confession or self-judgment is lacking. It is a most real and practical thing in daily experience and underlies all Christian spirituality. Right relations with God can be maintained only as one is attentive and faithful in the matter of confession to God covering all known sin. The extreme form of chastisement is removal of the believer from this life through death (John 15:2; 1 Cor. 11:30–32; 1 John 5:16). The central passage on chastisement is found in Hebrews 12:3–15.

4. Of the Believer’s Works. According to 2 Corinthians 5:10—“For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad”—all who are saved must come before the βῆμα or judgment seat of Christ. This experience occurs in spite of the assurance given by John 5:24 that the child of God shall not come into judgment. Although his sins have been judged at the cross and will not be brought up again, at the judgment seat of Christ his works or service must be judged. This distinction is made clear in 1 Corinthians 3:9–15. “If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire” (vs. 15). See Romans 14:10; 1 Corinthians 4:5; Ephesians 6:8; 2 Timothy 4:8; Revelation 22:12.

5. Of Israel. That Israel must come into judgment is most clearly taught, and indeed before they enter the kingdom or more specifically at the end of the great tribulation. The central passage is Ezekiel 20:33–44, with added confirmation from the parable of the ten virgins (see likewise all of Matt. 24:9–25:30; cf. Joel 3:11–15).

It would seem probable that there will be a resurrection of all Israel of the past dispensation in connection with this special judgment and that the nation shall awake to its national importance and past greatness then. Those who lived with the kingdom in view are to rise and enter the earthly glory (cf. Ezek. 37:1–14; Dan. 12:1–3).

6. Of the Nations. At the close of the great tribulation and at the time when the nations will have taken sides, as they must do during the tribulation, for or against Israel, the Semitic question will be the problem of those days. All nations then living and immediately involved in their relation to Israel will be judged. That judgment will consider every nation on the earth at the time, some peoples to be dismissed unto the lake of fire to which they by reason of their actions were destined to go, others to enter the kingdom with Israel. The latter are the sheep nations and the former—those on the left hand—are the goat nations (cf. Matt. 25:31–46). The issue is the kind of treatment accorded Israel during the tribulation period. Prophecy has indicated that certain Gentile nations will share the coming kingdom with Israel (cf. Isa. 60:3; 61:6; 62:2). These nations shall serve Israel (cf. Isa. 14:1–

2; 60:12). The Gentile nations are declared to be present in the earth when the new city comes down from God out of heaven (cf. Rev. 21:24, 26).

The astonishing thing is that, when the King-Messiah tells the sheep nations of their faithfulness to Him through kind treatment of Israel (Matt. 25:35–36), they do not recognize they have done these things (cf. vss. 37–39). Likewise, when the goat nations are informed regarding their failure toward Christ through harsh treatment of Israel (Matt. 25:41–43) they are also unaware of having done anything amiss and must, as the sheep nations, ask "When …?"

The question may therefore be raised: Is there an issue in the world so great that it determines the destiny of nations, yet the nations do not know about it? Yes there is, and that issue must be Israel, the elect, sacred nation. Of a truth, the nations of the earth cannot understand how God has an elect people in Israel, a chosen stock. But "I have chosen thee above all the nations of the earth for my glory" (cf. Deut. 7:6; Isa. 46:13) is not said of any other people, nor can it easily be understood by the nations of the earth.

At the beginning of their history as a people, God gave to Abraham a warning in which he said: "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. 12:3). It is not accidental that the word "curse" appears in both the Genesis and Matthew passages. At the time when God is anticipating the period of Israel's life among the nations, He said: "I will bless them that bless thee," while at the end of this period He in the Person of His Son also said: "Come, ye blessed of my Father." Likewise, at the beginning: "I will curse him that curseth thee," whereas at the end it must be said: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." And all of this judgment comes because of Christ's "brethren"—Israel.

7. Of Angels. The central passage here (1 Cor. 15:24–26) indicates that during the kingdom reign of Christ angelic powers must be judged, and among them as a last enemy death must be destroyed. There are also fallen angels to be judged (cf. 1 Cor. 6:3; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6; Rev. 20:10).

8. Of the Great White Throne. The major passage for this last judgment is Revelation 20:11–15, which reads: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." This is God's final dealing with all the wicked dead. That all unsaved humanity must be raised to judgment is taught by Christ in John 5:28–29. Nobody has any authority to modify the terrible revelation that God has made in connection with the final reckoning. The Word of God must stand as it is. But a moment's comparison between the events enumerated in relation to the judgment of the nations (Matt. 25:31–46) as contrasted with those of the great white throne (Rev. 20:11–15) ought to show that they are utterly incomparable.

THE JUST

The just is a distinctive phrase peculiar to the Old Testament where men are classed as either wicked or just. In Psalm 37:12, for example, it is written: “The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnasheth upon him with his teeth.” This term *just* is applied to individual men like Noah (Gen. 6:9). The terminology refers to the qualities in a person of justice, reasonableness, righteousness in life and compliance with all the law of God. Bildad asked the question: “How then can man be justified with God?” (Job 25:4). Micah came nearer than any other to answering this question according to the Old Testament when he said: “He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?” (6:8).

The student should distinguish between the just man of the Old Testament who manifestly was constituted such by his own good works, on the one hand, and the justified man of the New Testament who is constituted thus by faith in Christ (Rom. 5:1), on the other hand.

JUSTICE

Justice refers to a virtue which doubtless has its only perfect manifestation in God, although He cleanses the sinful and forgives. The gospel of God’s grace is the solution to the problem of how God can remain the just One and yet pardon sinners (Rom. 3:25–26). See the doctrines of Gospel, Government, Grace, Guilt, Holiness, Judgment, Punishment, and Righteousness.

JUSTIFICATION

Those who would discern the important facts and force of Christian doctrine do well to distinguish between the things which God does for the Christian and the things which the Christian may do for God. The wide difference in activities is obvious. What God does is usually His to do of necessity since no one else could do it, and what the Christian may do for God may be superhuman and thus dependent on an enabling power of the indwelling Spirit of God.

The things which are wrought of God on behalf of the Christian in his salvation are, again, to be grouped into two classes: those which are done when one believes and is saved and those which are done when Christ comes to take His own unto Himself. So much is accomplished in the first undertaking that he may well say in the words of the Apostle: “Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. 1:12) . In the second undertaking the body will be changed (cf. 1 Cor. 15:51–54; Phil. 3:21), and the saved one will pass out of all limitations of knowledge into the immeasurable knowledge of God. This is indicated in 1 Corinthians 13:12: “For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.”

Manifestly, to be justified before God is His own undertaking. It appears as the consummation of God in the work of salvation—not chronologically, however, but logically. That is, it does not occur after some other features of His saving work, only because of those features. The Apostle has indicated certain achievements of God in logical order. It is written then: “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:29–30). In

this passage justification is named as the last and consummating work for the believer while still in the world. In so justifying God does not legalize a fiction or make-believe. He must and does have a righteous ground on which to justify the ungodly (cf. Rom. 4:5). A distinction must be observed here between just men of the Old Testament and those justified according to the New Testament. According to the Old Testament men were just because they were true and faithful in keeping the Mosaic Law. Micah defines such a life after this manner: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (6:8). Men were therefore just because of their own works for God, whereas New Testament justification is God's work for man in answer to faith (Rom. 5:1).

Throughout past generations the theologians have striven to form definitions of justification but perhaps with uniform incompleteness and failure. So great and valuable a theological treatise as the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* presents the following effort: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by faith alone" (Question 33). Yet there is no Biblical ground whatever for this reference to divine pardon of sin in connection with justification, for justifying has not anything to do with pardon or forgiveness though it is true that none are forgiven who are not justified and none justified who are not forgiven. To forgive means subtraction while to justify means addition. Justification is a declaration by God respecting the Christian that he has been made forever right and acceptable to Himself. For so much as this to be declared there must be an unalterable reality on which it may rest. This basis is the position to which the Christian has been brought through God's grace. All whom God has predetermined are called, and all who are called are justified, and all who are justified are now (logically speaking), and to be (chronologically speaking), glorified (Rom. 8:29–30). God cannot afterwards condemn the one that He has before justified (Rom. 8:33). In fact, four great supporting realities are to be named at this point. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. 8:34). Thus a justified state must be unchangeable since the ground upon which it rests is so secure forever. There is no justification provided for man which is not eternal in character. Because the actual standing of the Christian before God is so little understood, justifying is also misunderstood. Of the Christian, however, it is revealed that:

1. HE IS A NEW CREATION. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:17–18). The old things which have passed away are not habits or failures in daily life, but positions, which positions were cared for by God—being reconciled of God by Jesus Christ.

2. HE IS MADE THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD through being in Christ.—"But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30); "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21). Observe accordingly the ambition of the great Apostle at the time when he was saved and had abandoned all his former confidences for the sake of Christ: "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil. 3:7–9).

3. He is Prefected Forever. According to Hebrews 10:14 the Christian is perfected forever in position though not yet in daily life. In this passage the word *sanctify* must be given its true meaning, 'to set apart or classify' as all are so grouped by themselves who are in Christ. It therefore relates to every Christian. The passage reads: "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14).

4. He Has the Fullness of Chirst. Furthermore, to be in Christ, as all saved persons are by the baptism of the Spirit, means that the fullness or *plērōma* of Christ becomes their unchangeable portion. Consider with special care the amazing declarations bearing upon this: "And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace" (John 1:16); "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell" (Col. 1:19); "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power" (2:9–10). To be "complete in him" is but a restatement of John 1:16. The words *ye are complete* are translated from the same root as yields the form πλήρωμα, since all that Christ is—the πλήρωμα of the Godhead bodily—becomes the Christian's possession because of the fact that he lives in Him. One cannot be thus perfectly in Christ (1 Cor. 12:13) and not partake of all that Christ is.

It is this complete standing which belongs to every believer, which position God recognizes whether anyone on earth recognizes it or not. And it is such a one that God justifies. Indeed, He defends that justification as faithfully and as definitely as once He condemned man as ungodly.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that God undertakes by His Spirit and through His Son to make all He saves meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, and because of the perfection or quality of the imputed merit of the Son of God He accepts them and is free to justify them forever. If God could be just Himself in justifying His own Son who is the embodiment of divine righteousness, He will be just likewise when He justifies the ungodly who through the mighty changes achieved by salvation appear before Him in the imputed merit of His Son. This is not legalizing a mere fiction nor is it any form of pardon and forgiveness only.

A notable passage is properly considered here, namely: "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:22–24). A righteousness from God is said to be received and possessed on a faith principle in answer to faith in Christ Jesus, and it reaches unto and comes down upon all who believe—that must signify "being justified freely," not hoping to be because of a good manner of life. The word translated *freely* presents a peculiar meaning and revelation here. It does not mean without hesitation on God's part or any expense on the part of the one who is justified. It means here *without a cause*, no otherwise than the same word does in John 15:25 where Christ is reported as saying: "They hated me without a cause." There was no basis in Him for their hatred. Thus the thought in Romans is: "Being justified without a cause for justification in the one who is justified." None could find a cause in Christ for any hate against Him, so none could find a cause for justification in those who have come short of the glory of God through sin.

If it be inquired how God can justify the ungodly and sinful, the answer is to be found in the last part of Romans 3:24. It is all by His grace. But how can God exercise such matchless grace and achieve so much for the ungodly by grace? Verse 24 answers this query also: "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Then Paul's great verse may well be read in reverse order: Because of the redemption which is secured in Christ Jesus, God is free to exercise His grace toward the ungodly sinner, even justifying him eternally, though finding no cause for justification in the

sinner outside of the fact that the righteousness of God has been bestowed upon all who believe. In verse 26 it is declared too that God is Himself just and righteous when He justifies the one who does no more than to believe on Jesus. The verse reads: “To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Let no one, therefore, add to or take from the sole fact that ungodly sinners are saved—even to eternal justification—who only believe.

Justification rests on the redeeming death of Christ and not, as sometimes supposed, on His resurrection. When it is believed that it depends on the resurrection, it is usually because of some misunderstanding of Romans 4:25, which reads: “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” He was raised again, however, not to the end that justification might be possible, but because the free grant of it had been secured by His death. When the thing which completes the whole basis of justification was achieved, Christ came out of the realms of death. His great redemption work was thus shown to be something perfectly done.

Justification causes no one to be righteous. It is not the bestowment as such of righteousness. It rather proclaims one to be justified whom God sees as perfected in His Son. Therefore, this may be stated as the correct formula of justification: The sinner becomes righteous in God’s sight when he is in Christ; he is justified by God freely, or without a cause, because thereby he is righteous in His sight.

K

KING

The term *king* is used of one who rules over a people and is in possession of a dominion. It is applied as a concept first of all to God (1 Sam. 8:7), for He is sovereign over all. Secondly, the term is applied to Christ. Every Old Testament prophecy of the kingdom anticipates His kingly office: (a) Christ will yet sit on the Davidic throne as David's heir (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:20–37; Isa. 11:1–16; Jer. 33:19–21). (b) He came as a King (Luke 1:32–33). (c) He was rejected as a King (Mark 15:12–13; Luke 19:14; cf. Gen. 37:8; Ex. 2:14). (d) He died as a King (Matt. 27:37). (e) When He comes again, it is as a King (Rev. 19:16; cf. Luke 1:32–33).

A complete induction should be made here of all the Scripture bearing on David's throne and David's Son. Christ combined the offices of King and Priest (which latter office is found in connection with the Church as well as Israel; cf. Heb. 7 where Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek). His reign is mediatorial in that God will reign through Christ. The mediatorial feature which contemplates victory over all enemies, angelic and human, will cease eventually (1 Cor. 15:25–28). However, His reign is eternal nonetheless (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:36–37; Isa. 9:6–7; Luke 1:33), for He continues to reign by the same authority of the Father (cf. 1 Cor. 15:28).

KINGDOM

Two specific realms are in view as the doctrine of kingdom receives consideration:

1. The Kingdom of God, which includes all intelligences in heaven or on earth who are willingly subject to God.

2. The Kingdom of Heaven, which embraces any sort of empire that God may have on earth at a given time. The kingdom of heaven appears then in various aspects through the centuries, as—

a. THEOCRATIC. First the rule was exercised by divinely appointed leaders, judges, and patriarchs.

b. COVENANTED. It thus became the national hope of Israel (2 Sam. 7).

c. PREDICTED. Much prophecy anticipates a glorious kingdom for Israel on the earth.

d. ANNOUNCED. The ministry of John the Baptist, Christ, and the Apostles was to announce the kingdom unto the nation as at hand. That offer, however, was rejected.

e. POSTPONED UNTIL CHRIST RETURNS. One of the greatest errors of theologians is an attempt, as essayed now, to build a kingdom on the first advent of Christ as its basis, whereas according to the Scriptures it will be realized only in connection with the second advent. All Scriptures conform to this arrangement, strange though it may look.

f. MYSTERY. According to Matthew 13:11 the present conditions in Christendom are a mystery form of the kingdom. Since the kingdom of heaven is no other than the rule of God on the earth, He

must now be ruling to the extent of full realization of those things which are termed “the mysteries” in the New Testament and which really constitute the new message of the New Testament.

g. REALIZED. Not until the millennium will the kingdom of heaven come to realization.

A distinction should be made between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven. It is to be observed that Matthew employs the terminology *kingdom of heaven* and that Mark and Luke, when presenting much of the same teaching, use the phraseology *kingdom of God*. Some have assumed on this basis that the two kingdoms are one and the same. However, the differences seem more important than the similarities. Entrance into the kingdom of God is by a birth from above (John 3:3), for instance, whereas to the Jew of Christ’s day and in anticipation of His earthly kingdom entrance to the kingdom is based upon righteousness. Matthew 5:20 declares this: “For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.”

As for another impressive difference, Matthew 8:12; 24:50–51; 25:28–30 declare that “the children of the kingdom” may be cast out. This retribution cannot be applied to the kingdom of God and its members (John 3:18). The parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:24–30, 36–43) and that of the good and bad fish (Matt. 13:47–50), significantly enough, are spoken only of the kingdom of heaven. However, the parable of the leaven (Matt. 13:33; Luke 13:21) is predicated of both kingdoms. Leaven represents evil doctrine rather than evil persons, and evil doctrine may and does corrupt both kingdoms.

LAW

Law is a term used about 200 times in the Bible, meaning a rule which regulates human conduct. Six subdivisions of the Bible doctrine of law follow:

1. Natural, Inherent, or Intrinsic. That which God requires of every creature because of His own character, as it is written: “Be ye holy; for I am holy” (Lev. 11:44; 1 Pet. 1:16). This law was binding upon all, from Adam to Moses (cf. Gen. 26:5; Rom. 2:14–15; 5:12–14).

2. Prescribed by Man (Gen. 9:6; Matt. 20:15; Luke 20:22; Acts 19:38; 1 Tim. 1:8–10; 2 Tim. 2:5). That which human government requires of its subjects.

3. Of Moses. A rule divinely given through Moses to govern Israel in the land of promise. It was commended to them because they were a covenant people. Thus it defined the manner of their daily life. It was itself a covenant of works (Ex. 19:5–6). This covenant they soon broke. It will yet be superseded by the New Covenant (Jer. 31:31–34; Heb. 8:8–13). This agreement will include the former Law of Moses (Deut. 30:8).

The Law of Moses is recorded in three parts:

a. COMMANDMENTS. Embrace the moral government of Israel (Ex. 20:1–17). They are condensed and summarized in Matthew 22:36–40; fulfilled by love (Rom. 13:10; Gal. 5:14; James 2:8); proved to be law in character (Rom. 7:7–14).

b. JUDGMENTS. Embrace the social requirements (Ex. 21:1–23:33).

c. ORDINANCES. Regulate the worship (Ex. 25:1–31:18).

These three forms of law satisfied all of Israel's requirements before God. But the entire system, including the commandments as a rule of life, ceased with the death of Christ (John 1:17; Rom. 10:4). The Law of Moses, to be sure, was an ad interim dealing in effect only until Christ should come. For the time being it gave to sin the character of transgression (Rom. 5:13; Gal. 3:19). It was preceded (Ex. 19:4) and followed (John 1:17) by grace.

4. Revealed Will of God in Any Form. That which has been disclosed in addition to law codes. Observe the definite article with *law* in Romans 7:15–25 because thus Paul may refer to something besides the Law of Moses. The law as the will of God includes all His revealed orders for any people at any time. The word *law* in Romans, then, is used nine times without the article and many more times with the article (cf. Rom. 8:4), and not always referring to Moses.

5. Messianic Rule of Life for the Kingdom. That which governs the millennium (Matt. 5:1–7:29). Proof that the Messianic rule is pure law may be gained in the following tests: (1) any action is legal which aims to secure merit (Matt. 6:14–15); (2) any action is legal which has been wrought in reliance upon the flesh (Rom. 6:14).

6. Of Christ. That which now governs the Christian (1 Cor. 9:20–21; Gal. 6:2). Observe the term "my commandments" which was used by Christ only in the upper room (John 14:15, etc.). This form of lifedirection includes all the teachings of grace addressed to the Christian, who is not himself under law since grace has provided all the merit that ever could be required (John 1:16; Rom. 5:1; 8:1; Col. 2:10). The saved one is "inlawed to Christ" (1 Cor. 9:20–21, lit. rendering). The believer is not without law to govern his conduct when "inlawed" to Christ.

L

LIFE

Life represents something mysterious and undefined, but more especially that which is consciousness, energy, and existence. No one has comprehended even what animates the smallest insect. A man might be weighed a few moments before he dies and the same body also be weighed immediately after death. The weight would be the same, yet something most essential—though little understood—has evidently departed. Life is that which gives sensation to the whole body whereby all functions of the body continue in their orchestration. With the passing of life, however, every function of the natural body ceases.

From a Biblical viewpoint, life may signify: (1) that which is natural and animal or (2) what is divine and eternal.

1. NATURAL. This form of life is subject to death and is derived by human generation. It is nevertheless endless in every human being, that is to say, a continuing on forever in the future of everyone born into this world. Natural life has a beginning, but no end.

2. ETERNAL. This priceless treasure, which is the gift of God, should not be confused with the mere endless existence which all possess. It is a life added to that which has been experienced before by itself. Christ said: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10). This life is no less than "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27). It comes free because a gift of His love. It at once relates the one who has received it to God and to things eternal. Christ likened it to a birth from above (John 3:3, R.V. margin) "for those which were born … of God" (John 1:13).

Thus all depends upon receiving Christ and being saved through Him. John has said so again: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life" (1 John 5:12).

LOGOS

Logos is a term which John by the Holy Spirit applies to Christ as a cognomen six times (John 1:1, etc.). The same word was especially employed by Philo (c. 40 A.D.) to mean something in God corresponding to *reason* in man as well as something emanating from Him corresponding to *speech* in man. Though used by the Holy Spirit to designate Christ in His preincarnate state, there is no record that Christ ever applied the term to Himself. It is probable that the name should have a more general use even within the bounds of Christ's preincarnate state.

In the blessed Trinity of Persons, Christ has always been the revealer; hence the Angel of Jehovah is Christ. He came into the world, the incarnate One, in order to reveal God as perfectly as possible. This is declared in John 1:18, which reads: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

Though Christ manifested both the wisdom and the power of God, He came principally to declare the bosom of the Father, that is, His love. Christ as Logos is to the Father what speech is to reason.

He declares the love of God. Not throughout all His life on earth nor even in all His healings, but particularly in one event of His first coming does He tell out the divine love. It accordingly is written: “But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:8); “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren” (1 John 3:16).

As the written Word declares God to man, so Christ the living Word perfectly declares God to man. Both are said to be truth (John 14:6; 17:17), everlasting (Ps. 119:89; John 8:58), life-giving (John 14:6; James 1:18), saving (Acts 16:31; 1 Cor. 15:1–2), purifying (Titus 2:14; 1 Pet. 1:22), sanctifying (John 17:17; Heb. 10:14), glorifying to God (Acts 13:48; Rom. 15:9), judging (John 5:27; 12:48), living (John 11:25; 1 Pet. 1:23).

LORD’S DAY

The Lord’s Day does not represent merely a change from the Sabbath, but a new day belonging to a new order. It celebrates the New Creation with Christ Himself resurrected as its Head, whereas the Sabbath was related to the old creation (Ex. 20:8–11; 31:12–17; Heb. 4:4). The new day, to be sure, was anticipated in prediction (cf. Lev. 23:11; Ps. 118:22–24 with Acts 4:11–12; Matt. 28:1). It is the first day or, as following seven days before, the eighth day after a completed week (cf. Col. 2:12).

The day began with a normal appreciation of the resurrection of Christ and His work. It has been signally blessed of God throughout the present age. True to its character as a day of rest, however, the Sabbath came at the end of a week of labor. That is the order expected under the law. Under grace the week begins with its day of privilege, which properly enough is the order for grace.

The Lord’s Day belongs only to Christians; it is not for all men, nor for creation as a whole. Hence the day should not be legislated upon an unwilling public; indeed, for its keeping no rules are recorded, which is fitting enough to the order and character of grace. Men are not justified in returning to the rules provided for the Sabbath in order to secure directions for observance of the Lord’s Day. When Christ came from the grave, He said to His friends: “Rejoice” (cf. Ps. 118:24) and “Go tell …” (Matt. 28:9–10, lit. rendering). These words may well be taken as wise direction respecting observance of the day. The Lord’s Day, moreover, can be extended to all days as the Sabbath could not be (cf. Rom. 14:5–6).

LORD’S SUPPER

The ordinance of the Lord’s Supper is a divinely appointed testimony from the believer’s heart to God respecting his trust in Christ’s efficacious death. As such it has nevertheless been greatly perverted, the Church of Rome having developed the unwarranted doctrine of transubstantiation. The Lutheran doctrine is to the effect that Christ must be present by omnipotent power in the elements—a blessing to believers and a condemnation to others.

The words, “as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup” (1 Cor. 11:26), indicate the liberty under grace in any matter of times and seasons, that is, relative to frequency in partaking of the Lord’s Supper. Here, then, is a testimony from the heart to God by which the Lord’s death is shown

forth, and one to continue “till he come” again (1 Cor. 11:26), as the Jewish altar set forth Christ’s death until He came the first time.

As the resurrection is celebrated by fitting observance of the Lord’s Day each week, so it seems probable that it is well to celebrate Christ’s death just as often (as some Christians make a practice of doing today).

LOVE

Love must be what Dr. Henry Drummond chose to term it, “the greatest thing in the world” (the title of his addresses on 1 Cor. 13). It is that which God is like to infinity. To realize the personal, unchanging love of God is a supreme experience.

There is everywhere a very real human love; but all Christian love, according to the Scriptures, is distinctly a manifestation of divine love operating through the human heart. A statement of the difference is found in Romans 5:5, “… because the love of God hath been shed abroad [‘poured out,’ margin] in our hearts through [as produced, or caused, by] the Holy Spirit which was given unto us” (R.V.). This activity, then, is not the working of human affection; it is rather the direct manifestation of the “love of God” passing through the heart of the believer out from the indwelling Spirit. It is realization of the last petition in the High Priestly prayer of Christ: “… that the love where-with thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them” (John 17:26). It is simply God’s love working within and out through the believer. Such a feeling could not be humanly produced or even successfully imitated, for it, of necessity, goes out to the objects of divine affection and grace rather than to the objects of human desire. A human heart cannot *produce* divine love, but it can *experience* it. To have a heart that feels the compassion of God is to drink of the wine of heaven. In considering this imparted love of God, it should be noted:

1. The love of God being imparted is not experienced by the unsaved: “But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you” (John 5:42).

2. The love of God reaches out to the whole world: “For God so loved the world …” (John 3:16); “… that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. 2:9); “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our’s only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 John 2:2). This is a divine love for the world of lost men. It indicates how God’s affection knows no bounds. What is sometimes called “the missionary spirit” is none other than that compassion which brought the Son of God from heaven “gushing forth” or overflowing from a human heart. Interest in lost men is not secured by any attempted development of human affections; it however will be immediately Low realized in a Christian heart when there is a right relationship to the Spirit of God. A desire for the salvation of others becomes the first thought of many after they are born again.

3. The love of God abhors the present world system: “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world” (1 John 2:15–16). Such purified feeling will always be the experience of the one to whom the love of God is imparted.

4. The love of God is directed especially toward His Spirit-born children: “Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life” (Rom. 5:9–10); “… Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it” (Eph. 5:25). He loves His own even though they are wandering away, for so it is revealed in the return of the “prodigal son” (Luke 15:11–32). Furthermore, “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us” (1 John 4:12). By divine compassion, then, the Christian proves his reality before the world. As also in another place: “A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another” (John 13:34–35). Such divine love is also the test of our brotherhood in Christ: “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world’s good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?” (1 John 3:16–17); “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren” (1 John 3:14).

5. The love of God continues without end: “… Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end” (hence, eternally, John 13:1) . Of the love of God operative in the believer it is said that it “suffereth long” and then still “is kind” (1 Cor. 13:4).

6. The love of God is exercised toward Israel: “… Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love” (Jer. 31:3). So the Spirit-filled believer will learn to rejoice in the great prophecies and purposes of God for that people with whom He is in everlasting covenants and for whom He has correspondingly an everlasting love.

7. The love of God is sacrificial: “For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich” (2 Cor. 8:9). Such an attitude on the part of the Son of God toward the eternal riches must, if reproduced in the Christian, affect largely his attitude toward earthly wealth.

Not only is the love of God sacrificial respecting all riches, it is sacrificial in regard to life itself: “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.” It therefore follows: “and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren” (1 John 3:16–17). The Apostle Paul testified: “I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:1–3). The Apostle knew full well that there was no occasion for him to be accursed since his Lord had been made a curse for all; but the fact remains how he could still be *willing* to be made a curse. This kind of experience is the direct outworking in a human life of the divine love which gave Jesus to die under the curse or judgment of all the sin of the world. When this divine compassion for lost men is reproduced in the believer, it becomes the true and sufficient dynamic for soul-saving work.

Thus the mighty heart of God may be manifested in a human life, and the one word, “love,” together with the other eight words which indicate all the fruit of the Spirit, be a representation of true Christian character (Gal. 5:22–23). The other eight words, when traced in the Scriptures, will also prove to be divine graces which can be realized in the human heart only as they are *imparted;* for example, “… that my joy might remain in you,” “… My peace I give unto you” (John 15:11;

14:27). These divine graces are not produced in every Christian's heart. They will be achieved only within those who are "by the Spirit walking" (cf. Gal. 5:16).

M

MAN OF SIN

Two important personages appear in the anticipations which prophecy of evil places before the Bible student—the man of sin as mentioned by Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2 and the first beast of Revelation 13. The man of sin is identified throughout the Bible by his blasphemous assumption that he is God. He looms as the political ruler who will yet head up the nations. He indeed is designated in the Old Testament "the prince of Tyrus" (Ezek. 28:1–10), the "little horn" (Dan. 7:8), the desolator (Dan. 9:27), the willful king (Dan. 11:36), and in the New Testament "the abomination of desolation" (Matt. 24:15), "that man of sin" (2 Thess. 2:3–10), the "white horse" rider (Rev. 6:2), and probably also the first-named beast (Rev. 13:1–10). It is indicated too that he will federate the ten divided kingdoms of the Roman world and rule over them during the great tribulation. His coming and rule will be "after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness …" (2 Thess. 2:9–10). He becomes the embodiment of Satan's power (Luke 4:5–6). He is Satan's masterpiece and counterfeit of Christ as King, indeed a counterfeit of the Second Person in Satan's aping of the Trinity. He is included with Satan in those revelations which reach back to Satan's creation (Isa. 14:12–17; Ezek. 28:1–19). He shares the lake of fire with Satan (Rev. 20:10). His earth-rule is terminated by the glorious coming of Christ (2 Thess. 2:6–8). He must appear, however, before the Day of the Lord (2 Thess. 2:2–4, R.V.). This order of events is maintained in each important Scripture bearing on the theme (cf. Dan. 7:8–9; Matt. 24:15–31; 2 Thess. 2:1–10, R.V.; Rev. 13 and 19). He continues "forty and two months" (Rev. 13:5). Christ indicates that the man of sin, when standing in the holy place, is the sign to Israel of the end of their age (Matt. 24:14–19). He is known especially by his blasphemous assumption to be God (Ezek. 28:1–10; John 5:43; 2 Thess. 2:4; Rev. 13:5–6). His character is estimated in the Scripture from the divine standpoint of God's holiness and purpose.

MARRIAGE

Marriage is one of the oldest institutions in the world. It was established by God in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:21–25), was blessed by the presence of Christ in the wedding at Cana of Galilee (John 2:1–11), and is declared by the Apostle to be honorable in all men (Heb. 13:4).

The Old Testament records plural marriages, and that with the most prominent of the saints. However, according to the record in the primeval Garden of Eden, it was doubtless God's intention that a man should have one wife and the wife but one husband. It was clearly taught in the New Testament that, because of an advance in the relationship between God and His saints, there should be the most careful recognition of this more exalted ideal of one wife and one husband (Eph. 5:22–33).

According to the New Testament, then, the husband is to function as the head of the wife, to love his wife and cherish her even as Christ loved the Church. So, also, the wife is to reverence her husband and be obedient to his wishes. There will be little difficulty about the wife so adjusting herself to her own husband if he is carrying out the instructions for him by loving her as Christ loved the Church.

Certain questions arise which are not easily answered. Is marriage a rite binding upon unregenerate people? May divorced people be married again? If so, then under what conditions? So, also, there is a problem which appears on mission fields: Should any man who is the husband of plural wives abandon all of them excepting one if he were to become a Christian? Is this requirement altogether necessary? One thing is certain: a believer should never be married to an unbeliever. All such practices ought to be discouraged on every hand. The reason, too, is obvious: God cannot bless one in a household without blessing all, but the blessing He would design for a believer cannot rightfully be extended to an unbeliever. If the saved person proposes to marry an unsaved person, let them first consider whether they are pleased to live on such limited blessing as God might extend to the unsaved person of the couple.

MEDIATION

A major aspect of Christology, the doctrine of mediation is spoken of as such only once in the Old Testament (Job 9:33) and six times in the New Testament—Galatians 3:19–20; 1 Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 8:6; 9:15; 12:24. Mediation is the work of one who reconciles persons at variance with one another. Sin set man at odds with God. An "at-one-ment" based upon divine satisfaction was therefore required. Accordingly, "there is one … mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5). The fact of His two natures is required for such a responsibility. In Him both Deity and humanity do meet, of course, and in Him the full representation of each is secured or perfected. He must be a sinless man on whom no charge rests, first of all, otherwise He needs a mediator Himself. He must be actually God likewise, not a mere agent of representation. Job's "daysman" then is the precise thought—one who has a right to lay His hand on God in behalf of man and to lay His hand on man in behalf of God. This indeed was Job's cry of appeal unto God, according to Job 9:33.

The mediation of Christ is to be observed in three aspects. (1) As a prophet (Heb. 1:1 ff.). Here He represents God to man. (2) As a priest. Here He especially represents man to God (Heb. 9:15). (3) As a king (Ps. 2). In this particular He reigns as God's choice of king over the earth. His kingdom will be mediatorial, in which time every enemy must be destroyed, even death. That kingdom reign lasts forever and forever (1 Cor. 15:24–28). Christ is the Interpreter of God to man and the Door of access for man to God (John 1:18; 10:7).

MERCY

Three words need especially to be distinguished, namely, *love, mercy,* and *grace* (Eph. 2:4 ff.). Love is that in God which existed before He would care to exercise mercy or grace. Mercy, on the other hand, is that in God which duly provided for the need of sinful man, while grace is that in Him which acts freely to save because all the demands of holiness have been satisfied. Salvation is as much adjusted to justice (Rom. 3:26), then, as to love (John 3:16). Sinners are not actually saved by mercy but by grace. Mercy only provides a Savior and draws the sinner to Him. God's mercy alone goes out to every living creature, not His active grace.

Mercy is the Old Testament equivalent of the New Testament word, *grace*. Men, furthermore, are especially enjoined to be merciful (Deut. 25:4; Ps. 37:21; 109:16; Prov. 12:10; Dan. 4:27; Mic. 6:8;

Matt. 5:7; James 3:17).

MERCY SEAT

The doctrine of mercy seat is divided into two parts, that related to the Old Testament and that related to the New. In the Old Testament the lid of the ark found in the holy of holies which covered the broken Law and which was overshadowed by the cherubim—protectors of the holiness of God—was the mercy seat (Ex. 25:17–22). It became a seat of mercy thus when sprinkled with typical blood. The animal blood was efficacious in that it looked on typically to the death of Christ. The high priest—a sinful man needing to offer sacrifice for himself as much as for others—went in before the mercy seat once a year (Lev. 16:2–15) on behalf of the people and there found mercy from God for them.

In the New Testament (Rom. 3:25; Heb. 9:5) the mercy seat is identified with its antitype, the body of Christ which hung on the cross, sprinkled upon as it were by His own blood. It becomes thereby the place where God can meet the sinner in saving favor. The justifying grace of God is only possible through the redemption that is in Christ (Rom. 3:24). The importance of this theme is not seen in the Old Testament type of the ark and its covering, but rather in the antitype or New Testament doctrine of propitiation (which doctrine see).

MESSIAH

The word *Messiah* contemplates Christ as the final or greatest Prophet, the final Priest, and the final King. In Psalm 2:2 indeed two Persons of the Godhead are distinguished—Jehovah and His Messiah. The New Testament rendition of the word, *Messias* (A.V.), used twice (John 1:41; 4:25), no less than its Old Testament predecessor means ‘anointed.’ The common and real Greek equivalent in the New Testament is the title translated *Christ*. The entire field of prediction relative to Jehovah’s coming one whom He would send to redeem man is involved in this Messianic theme. The Messiah is Israel’s one hope. As the Anointed or Sent One, it is said of Christ that God gave the Spirit to Him without measure (John 3:34). In Him, to be sure, all the fullness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily (Col. 2:9). Both the priestly and the kingly aspects of Messiah continue forever, if not the prophetic.

MILLENNIUM

(See KINGDOM)

The term *millennium* is used to indicate the period of Christ’s reign on the present earth which Revelation 20 foretells. It is far more accurate and satisfactory to speak of this period as the kingdom, however, than to indicate merely the time during which it continues (as with the terminology, *millennium*).

The early church was concerned with the doctrine of *chiliasm* (which term is drawn from the Greek word for thousand, as *millennium* from the Latin). The fact of a millennium indeed was held

by all evangelical teachers until recent centuries, when the teachings of postmillennialism and amillennialism came to be received by some.

There are now, in consequence, three millennial theories, generally speaking. (1) Postmillennialism began to take theological shape with the teaching of Daniel Whitby in England, who lived two centuries ago (1638–1726). Though believing with the Early Church that the kingdom would come at the second advent of Christ, Whitby went on to state that by the present gospel agencies every evil in the world would be corrected until Christ should have a spiritual reign over the earth and continue that reign for a thousand years, at which time His second advent would occur and He come back to set up the judgment and close the present order. The supposed progress of righteousness in the world has been hindered so much, however, that this theory has proved a dead issue for upwards of twenty-five years. Men who held this view have largely drifted into (2) amillennialism or nonmillennialism, which theory teaches that there will be no millennium other than that which supposedly is in progress at the present time. Its advocates believe that, since the thousand-year period is mentioned only in Revelation 20, and this chapter looks (?) obscure, and fulfillment of the prediction concerning the thousand-year period as found in the chapter can be placed back into the past as already accomplished, there remains no earthly kingdom reign whatever for Christ in the body. Such a theory is born out of the theology of Rome which teaches that the church is the kingdom and therefore is reigning or should be reigning now. Men holding this viewpoint are obliged to contend that Satan is bound at present, ox at least that he is bound with regard to believers if not with regard to the unsaved. That very position was espoused by the late B. B. Warfield of Princeton and is held doubtless by many teachers of theology in seminaries today.

(3) Premillennialism teaches that the present age increases with evil and ends in judgment at the second advent of Christ, when He will set up His kingdom and reign with righteousness for a thousand years. The length of the reign is not the important thing, but the fact that the Church will reign with Him as His Bride. When it is contended that there is only one reference to a kingdom lasting one thousand years, it should be remembered that in connection with the Day of the Lord, which is terminology equivalent to the kingdom age, Peter said a day with the Lord seems a thousand years and a thousand years a day (2 Pet. 3:8). That Day begins with Christ’s coming as a thief in the night and ends with fire descending from heaven (2 Pet. 3:10).

It should be remembered that the millennium is not heaven. On the contrary, it is to be characterized by a limited amount of evil which Christ the King will judge perfectly and immediately (Isa. 11:1–16). Neither is it that new earth which God will yet create (Isa. 65:17; 66:22; 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1) for therein righteousness dwells, which is something not true of the millennium.

MINISTRY

In Old Testament times spiritual ministry was for the most part limited to prophets and priests, and was largely a temple ritual. Christ’s ministry is a perfect example of what such work should be like, for He said, “I am among you as he that serveth” (Luke 22:27; cf. John 13:15). The ministries in the Church hinge upon a gifted leadership (Eph. 4:11) which is unto the service and edification of the Body of Christ (Eph. 4:12–16). “The work of the ministry,” it will thus be seen, is committed to the whole company of believers (Eph. 4:12). Those who serve with definite responsibility in the church are known as deacons and elders. The deacons are usually responsible for the temporalities while the

elders are responsible for the spiritualities (see Elders or Bishops). Rewards are promised to such as minister and prove faithful in service. This does not entail the adding of merit to salvation, but simply a recognition of man's faithfulness on the part of God (see Rewards).

MIRACLE

In God's universe He is both immanent and transcendent. The powers of nature are limited, but God is able to introduce unto infinity therein whatever He wills to do. His own works as manifest in creation and providence are hardly to be classed as miracles. They are rather the normal works of God in His own particular sphere of action. What is natural with God may be supernatural with man.

Theology properly distinguishes the miracles of the Old Testament from the marvels of the New Testament. The latter are characterized by the fact that they were wrought either by Christ personally or by others whose undertakings were accomplished in the name of Christ.

The evidence supporting miracles as a reality is the same as for any supernatural feature of divine revelation.

Consideration should be given to the supernatural power of Satan (Rev. 13:13–15; cf. Isa. 14:12, 16–17). That Satan has power to perform supernatural things is clearly indicated in the Scripture (2 Thess. 2:9).

MYSTERY

The ancient meaning of the word *mystery* is related to the cults of Babylon and Rome, and to imparting of the knowledge of these secrets as in the modern lodges or fraternal orders where secrets are considered essential. The popular use of the word applies it to that which is mysterious or unknowable.

The New Testament use of the term relates it to some work or purpose of God hitherto unrevealed. It may be related to something which needs to be understood but must have a key (Rev. 1:20). The word is employed in the New Testament twenty-seven times excluding 1 Corinthians 2:1 (where see R.V. margin). Paul used it twenty-one times himself. The "mysteries" comprise practically all the added truth found in the New Testament supplementing that of the Old Testament, apart from its history (Deut. 29:29).

The New Testament mysteries are not indeed secrets to be withheld, but to be published (1 Cor. 4:1). "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:16), said Paul, in contrast to the anathema falling upon the member of a lodge or cult who divulges their secrets.

N

NAME

Bible names usually have a significant meaning and often represent the precise character of the person named, as in the case of Jacob (Gen. 27:36).

The names of God declare His character: *El* or *Elohim* meaning ‘the strong one and the covenant-keeping one’ *Jehovah*, ‘the self-existing one or the God of redemption’; *Adonai*, ‘master.’ There are about four hundred different names and titles of Deity in the Old Testament. *Lord*, when referring to Christ, intimates His Deity and eternal being. The name *Jesus* points to His humanity. *Christ* refers to the anointed one who was expected throughout the Old Testament. No names are given for the Holy Spirit. There are, however, about forty-four descriptive titles used of Him.

The name may even represent the person (Matt. 10:22; 19:29; John 20:31; Acts 5:41). To believe on Christ’s name means to believe on Him and to be saved through His name. Works wrought in His name are done by His immediate power (Acts 16:18; 19:11–17; cf. Luke 24:47). Prayer in His name is as though Christ Himself spoke through the believer (John 14:14; 16:23; cf. Rom. 10:13).

NATURAL MAN

The Greek word—ψυχικός—for *natural man* is used six times in the New Testament. In 1 Corinthians 15:44, 46 reference is made to a *psuchikos* body, an organism adapted to the soul, in contrast to a *pneumatikos* body, an organism adapted to the spirit. In 1 Corinthians 2:14, James 3:15, and Jude 1:19 the whole self is in view or the natural man’s limitations are indicated by means of this terminology. One of the designations used by Paul for the unregenerate indeed is to be found in this term (1 Cor. 2:14). They are described accordingly as unchanged from their original fallen and depraved state. Distinctions must be drawn between the natural man and the spiritual as well as between the natural and the carnal. (See Flesh.)

NUMBERS

From all indications certain numbers are significant as they have been occasionally used in Scripture. *One* denotes unity (Eph. 4:3–6). *Two* denotes diversity or difference one from another —“two witnesses,” “doubletongued” (1 Tim. 3:8; Rev. 11:3), etc. *Three* relates to things sacred and things of heaven, as for example three heavens and three persons of the Godhead (Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 12:2). It is one of the numbers suggesting completeness. *Four* speaks of the earth and creative works; for instance, the four points of the compass, the four phases of the moon, the four seasons, and the four corners of the earth (Rev. 7:1; 20:8). *Five* appears to be of divine grace (5 offerings of Lev. 1–7). *Six* is a human number, as may be seen from the six days of creation, man’s work week of six days, or 666 in Revelation 13:18. *Seven* is the second number to suggest fullness or completion (not, perfection), e.g., Revelation 1:4. Its multiples (also its half) are: 7×2 or 14, which intimates

genealogy (Matt. 1:17); 70 (Luke 10:1); 70×7 (Matt. 18:22); 77 (Gen. 4:24); 7×7 or 49, which led to the year of jubilee (Lev. 25:8 ff.); 3½, which is also expressed by the phraseology “a time, and times, and half a time” (Rev. 11:9; 12:14). Seven appears in all parts of divine revelation—with special significance in Genesis 36 times, in Exodus 17 times, in Leviticus 20 times, in Numbers 23 times, in Deuteronomy 14 times, in John 7 times, in Ephesians 9 times, and in Revelation 29 times. *Eight* may be the number of resurrection, of the putting off of the flesh by circumcision (Gen. 17:12; Matt. 28:1). *Nine* seems to be the number suggesting finality of judgment or 3×3 (Gen. 17:1). *Ten* is the third number to intimate completeness and indeed is the beginning of a new series of numerals (Matt. 25:1). *Eleven* signifies disorder, because it stands for 12 minus 1 (Acts 1:26). *Twelve* is the fourth and last number of completeness. It indicates election, e.g., 12 tribes, 12 apostles, 12×2 or 24, which yields the number of elders seated round about the throne (Gen. 49:28; Matt. 10:2; Rev. 4:4). *Thirteen* is perhaps the number of calamity (Gen. 14:4). The number 2520 is the most remarkable number of all to be considered. It is the product of the four completeness numbers (3, 7, 10, 12) taken together, and the lowest common denominator for all ten digits, as it can be divided by all or any of them. It indeed is a most complete chronological number, being 7×360 (Dan. 9:25).

O

OBEDIENCE

Old Testament obedience was directed, speaking doctrinally and in general, to God (cf. Abraham, Gen. 22:18; Saul, 1 Sam. 15:22; 28:18). It was a national issue with Israel (Isa. 1:19; Zech. 6:15).

Certain distinctions occur in the New Testament statement of the doctrine. First, there is the personal obedience of Christ to the Father (Phil. 2:8)—a great Bible theme—which served as a test of His true humanity (Heb. 5:8). In the accomplishing of salvation Christ's obedience is also prominent (Rom. 5:12–21). "Children of obedience" (1 Pet. 1:14, R.V.) are such because they stand in the obedience of the Last Adam; "children of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2) are such because they have to do with the disobedience of the first Adam. It is necessary for the unsaved to be obedient to the gospel (Acts 5:32; 2 Thess. 1:8) if they would be redeemed. Christians are to be obedient both before God and man (Acts 5:29; 1 Pet. 1:22). Children are to be subservient to parents (Eph. 6:1; Col. 3:20). Servants are to obey their masters (Col. 3:22) and wives to submit to husbands (Eph. 5:22). No word is addressed to unregenerate people regarding obedience to God, apart from the gospel. Obedience for the Christian is equivalent to abiding in Christ (John 15:10).

OMNIPOTENCE

Omnipotence is an attribute belonging to God alone. It speaks of His unlimited power (Gen. 18:14; Ps. 115:3; 135:6; Isa. 43:13; Jer. 32:17; Matt. 19:26; Mark 10:27; Luke 1:37; 18:27).

The Greek term παντοκράτωρ, used ten times, is translated *omnipotent* only once (Rev. 19:6; cf. 2 Cor. 6:18; Rev. 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7, 14; 19:15; 21:22, where the translation is *Almighty*). In the Old Testament the wording *El Shaddai* meaning 'the Almighty God' is used forty-seven times (Gen. 17:1). God's limitless power is exercised under the control of His holy will. He may be expected to do, and for moral reasons will do, only that which is in harmony with His character. He will not do wrong nor act foolishly (Gen. 1:1–3; 17:1; 18:14; Isa. 44:24; Matt. 3:9; 19:26; Rom. 4:17; 2 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 1:11, 19–21; 3:20; Heb. 1:3). Note all passages wherein the word *able* appears, for example, "God is able" (2 Cor. 9:8). God can do all that He wills to perform, but He may not will all that He can do.

OMNIPRESENCE

Though not a Biblical word, *omnipresence* suggests quite well how God fills the scene personally everywhere, not merely with His power or authority (1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chron. 2:6; Ps. 139:12; Isa. 66:1; Acts 17:28). This particular doctrine indicates that the whole of God is in every place, which cannot be pantheism and its denying the personality of God. There is also a more localized conception of the Godhead—for instance, "Our Father which art in heaven," "And is set down at the right hand of the throne of God," "An habitation of God through the Spirit" (Matt. 6:9; Eph. 2:22; Col. 3:1; Heb. 12:2; cf. Ps. 113:5; 123:1; Rom. 10:6–7). God was especially in Christ (2 Cor. 5:19).

The Son indwells the believer (John 14:20; Col. 1:27); the Spirit dwells within the believer (1 Cor. 6:19); the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are all in an undiminished and an undivided sense indwelling every believer (Rom. 8:9; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 4:6).

OMNISCIENCE

Omniscience, again, is not a Bible word, though it customarily will refer to the fact that God knows to an infinite degree and eternally all that is knowable whether actual or possible. God's actual knowledge may be specified in the following passages of Scripture: Psalm 33:13–15; 139:2; 147:4; Isaiah 44:28; 46:9–10; Malachi 3:16; Matthew 6:8; 10:29–30; Acts 2:23; 15:8; Hebrews 4:3. God's knowledge of things ideally possible is to be seen in Isaiah 48:18 and Matthew 11:21. His knowledge is eternal (Acts 15:18), incomprehensible (Ps. 139:6), and all-wise (Ps. 104:24; Eph. 3:10).

There are three aspects to divine knowledge: (a) self-knowledge, which includes all things, even Himself; (b) omniscience, which includes all things in creation whether ideally possible or real; and (c) foreknowledge, which relates only to things divinely determined or foreseen.

The knowledge of God is not subject to increase or decrease, nor subject to reason, is not distressed by regretting, memory, or foreboding. As an anthropomorphism, God is represented as attaining to knowledge and as repenting (Gen. 6:6; 11:5).

Omniscience is the cognition linked with omnipresence. The practical value thereof is important: (a) to those in testing and trial, (b) to those who are tempted to sin in secret, for it is all known by God, and (c) from the infinite resources of God to supply the lack of wisdom in man's case (Ps. 19:12; 51:6; 139:23–24; James 1:5).

ONLY-BEGOTTEN

The Greek term for *only-begotten*, μονογενής, is used nine times altogether in the New Testament (Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38), on five occasions of Christ (John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9) and once of Isaac (Heb. 11:17).

When used of Christ two ideas inhere: (a) that He is the Son of the Father and (b) that He ranks in a unique way as such. He is a Son of His as none other could be because the only one begotten as He was, or while in the perfected state that He enjoys eternally. Christians are not begotten on the same plane (Heb. 1:6). He is unique in that He alone can be the full revealer of the Father to men (John 1:14–18) and the Mediator between God and men (John 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9).

The only begotten Son is that association in the Godhead which can be best illustrated to man by the relationship of father and son. Certain theories are to be rejected, namely, that Christ is a begotten Son because of the incarnation, that Christ became a begotten Son by the resurrection, that Christ is the begotten Son only by title, or that He can be the begotten Son by official position. He is the first of those begotten by God and therefore pre-eminent or before all others who ever will be begotten.

ORDAIN

'Ordain' is the English translation of ten Greek words: διατάσσω (1 Cor. 7:17), *to arrange throughout, arrange fully in order*; καθίστημι (Titus 1:5; Heb. 5:1; 8:3), *to set down, constitute*; κατασκευάζω (Heb. 9:6), *to prepare fully*; κρίνω (Acts 16:4), *to separate, come to a decision*; ὁρίζω (Acts 10:42; 17:31), *to determine*; ποιέω (Mark 3:14), *to make*; προορίζω (1 Cor. 2:7), *to predetermine, mark out before*; τάσσω (Acts 13:48; Rom. 13:1), *to appoint*; τίθημι (John 15:16; 1 Tim. 2:7), *to lay, place*; χειροτονέω (Acts 14:23), *to hold out the hand as in voting*.

In ecclesiastical usage it refers to setting men apart unto a particular service (Mark 3:14; John 15:16; Acts 6:1–6; 13:2, 4; Gal. 1:1; 1 Tim. 4:14; Titus 1:5).

The Bible does not teach that ordination by men is an indispensable provision affording divine grace. The authority to ordain men seems vested in the company which carries on the ministry (Acts 1:15–26; 6:1–6). There is always grave danger that men will assume more at such a point than the Scriptures allow. That ordinances are in the sole care of ordained men is an attempt to safeguard these ordinances, of course, but there is no authority for it in the New Testament (1 Cor. 14:26).

ORDINANCE

'Ordinance' is the rendering of five words in the Greek New Testament: διαταγή—*a disposing in order* (Rom. 13:2; cf. Acts 7:53).

δικαίωμα—*legal statutes* (Luke 1:6, Heb. 9:1; cf. Rom. 1:32; 2:26; 5:16–18; 8:4; Heb. 9:10; Rev. 15:4; 19:8).

δόγμα—*an opinion* (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14; cf. Luke 2:1; Acts 16:4; 17:7).

κτίσις—*a founding* (1 Pet. 2:13; cf. Mark 10:6). Sixteen times it is used to signfy *creature* or *creation*, inculding Hebrews 9:11.

παράδοσις—*delivery instruction* (1 Cur. 11:2; cf. Matt. 15:2). The word is translated thirteen times as *tradition*.

There are certain actions ordained and commanded of God as well as there are traditions of men which have been imposed as binding. The term *ordinance*, or *ordinances*, however, is limited by ecclesiastical usage to marriage, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. (See each of these doctrines at the proper place.)

P

PARACLETE

Paraclete is an untranslated Greek word peculiar in the New Testament to John. It refers to the work of the Spirit (John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7), when translated *Comforter*, and also to the personal work of Christ in heaven (see 1 John 2:1, where it is translated *advocate*). The literal meaning of the verb root is ‘to call to one, call for.’ Once it is used in the LXX when Job speaks of “miserable comforters” (Job 16:2).

There are three significant meanings in the word: (1) legal advocate, (2) intercessor, and (3) helper in general. The first and second are found in the work of Christ the Advocate, while the last is discernible in the work of the Holy Spirit. See Advocacy.

PARADISE

In Greek the meaning of the term *paradise* is ‘garden’ or ‘park,’ and so it can be used of Eden in the LXX (cf. Gen. 13:10; Isa. 51:3; Ezek. 28:13; 31:8–9). The word is found three times in the New Testament (Luke 23:43; 2 Cor. 12:4; Rev. 2:7).

The Jewish teaching made paradise that part of hades which was reserved for the blessed. An illustration of this belief is given by Christ in the account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31).

Paradise is now, since the resurrection of Christ (Eph. 4:8–10), removed from hades and located where Christ sits enthroned (2 Cor. 12:4), the third heaven. Revelation 2:7 promises, as opposed to the theory that would deny consciousness to the departed at present: “To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.” The wresting of Scripture by the advocates of soul sleeping is well illustrated in their treatment of the doctrine of paradise (e.g., a verse like Luke 23:43).

For the present abode of the spirits of departed believers, see 2 Corinthians 5:8 and Philippians 1:23. For the present abode of the bodies of departed believers, see Romans 8:23; 1 Corinthians 15:35–57; Philippians 3:20–21. Sheol as declared in Old Testament speech and hades as in New Testament represent the abode of the departed spirits of unregenerate mankind.

When stoned to death at Lystra, though the time element cannot be finally established, Paul was caught up to paradise—the third heaven, but afterwards was not permitted to recount what he saw or heard. Nevertheless he wrote this much about it: “To depart and to be with Christ … is far better” (Phil. 1:23).

PAROUSIA

Parousia is a Greek word for the 'coming' of someone or 'being present by reason of coming' (cf. 2 Cor. 7:6–7; Phil. 2:12). It is not restricted to either form of Christ's appearing but is used both of His return for and with His saints (cf. Matt. 24:3 with 1 Cor. 15:23). It is used twenty-four times in the New Testament. Other terms to be distinguished from it are: *apokalupsis*—'manifestation' or 'revelation' (used eighteen times in the New Testament, five at least referring to Christ's return, e.g., 1 Cor. 1:7; 2 Thess. 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:7); *epiphania*—'appearance' (used six times and always of Christ's first or second coming—2 Thess. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 1:10; 4:1, 8; Titus 2:13); *Day of the Lord*—signifying the time of His judgments at the second corning (2 Thess. 2:2, R.V.).

PAULINE THEOLOGY

Pauline theology is a modern classification in theological study, usually made in contrast to that of Christ, John, or Peter.

Paul was the divinely chosen agent to develop the Christian system for New Testament readers since previously it had appeared only in part with the teachings of Christ. To the Apostle was given two distinct revelations: (1) that of the way of salvation and of life under grace (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, p. 2291; cf. Gal. 1:11–12) and (2) that of the doctrine of the Church, which is Christ's Body (Eph. 3:1–6). These two bodies of truth include the great New Testament message which is Christianity, something Paul termed "my gospel" (Rom. 2:16). For a time he stood alone in the defense of the new system of Christianity (Gal. 2:11–14).

PEACE

Peace is the opposite of anxiety in the heart and of either discord or enmity between individuals and nations. Four aspects of peace should be considered: **1. With God** (Rom. 5:1). That means the believer is now and forever on a peace footing in his relation to God, because he was justified. This aspect of peace is never an experience. It is wholly positional.

2. Of God (Phil. 4:7; Col. 3:15; cf. Heb. 13:20). Referring not to position but to an experience, Christ said: "My peace I give unto you" (John 14:27). Here is inwrought peace, part of the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22).

3. In the Coming Kingdom (Isa. 9:6–7). The two great kingdom words for Israel are *righteousness* and *peace*. Note in proof of this statement the whole Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:1–7:27).

4. In One Body. The agelong enmity between Jew and Gentile likened to a middle wall of partition is broken down when Jews and Gentiles are joined now to each other in one Body, the Church (Eph. 2:14–18; Col. 1:20).

5. In General. Observe the following points: (a) There can be no peace in this Christ-rejecting world (Isa. 57:20–21). (b) 1 Thessalonians 5:3 indicates that the nations will have reached a time of temporary truce or peace before Christ comes. (c) No strife is to characterize the coming kingdom

reign of the Prince of Peace, for peacefulness shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea (Isa. 11:9). At that time a blessing is to be pronounced upon all who are peacemakers (Matt. 5:9).

PERFECTION

This subject should be considered under seven aspects.

1. In the Old Testament (Gen. 6:9; Job 1:1, 8). Israel as a nation might be required to be perfect (Deut. 18:13). Men likewise were said to be perfect relatively (Ps. 37:37). (See the doctrines of The Just and Justification.) Old Testament saints are seen in heaven as "spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. 12:22–24). Paul was blameless before the law (Phil. 3:6).

2. Progressive. New Testament saints may progress relative to spiritual maturity, which refers to being more or less full grown and not to sinless perfection (1 Cor. 2:6; cf. 13:11; 14:20; Phil. 3:15; 2 Tim. 3:17).

3. And the Flesh. "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" (Gal. 3:3).

4. In Some Particular. (a) Obeying God (Col. 4:12). (b) Imitating God (Matt. 5:48). (c) Service (Heb. 13:21). (d) Patience (James 1:4).

5. Positional. Positional perfection is due to the believer's standing in Christ (Heb. 10:14). In this respect the believer is seen to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, indeed as perfect as Christ Himself, but it is altogether due to the fact that he is in Christ and partaking of what Christ is, not to any perfection of his own.

6. Ultimate (Individual). Scripture contemplates that at some future time the believer will be conformed to the image of Christ (Col. 1:28; cf. vs. 22; Phil. 3:12; 1 Thess. 3:13; 1 Pet. 5:10).

7. Ultimate (Corporate). The whole body of believers will be perfected as such (John 17:23; Eph. 4:12–13; 5:27; Jude 1:24; Rev. 14:5).

Scripture gives no basis for the extreme doctrines of personal holiness or sinless perfection advocated by some Christians.

POWER

The natural divisions of this subject are:

1. Of God. (a) Over all spiritual beings and realms as Creator, Preserver, and Consummator. (b) Over physical realms likewise in respect to creation, cohesion, and consummation (Col. 1:16–17). The Old Testament name of *El Shaddai* reveals God as the "Strong One" become the Strength-Giver and Satisfier of His people (Gen. 17:1); by this means He would incite man's confidence and reliance upon Himself.

2. Of Angelic Hosts. The angelic beings are referred to in the Scripture as principalities and powers. Illustrations of Satan's might (second only to the divine) may be observed in Job, chapters 1–2, and Isaiah 14:12–17.

3. Of Nature. The power of nature is to be seen in the wind, tide, sun, beasts, ability in all lower forms of life to grow, to form life or reproduce (Gen. 1:22).

Two important Greek words for *power* are found in the Scriptures. The first, δύναμις, is used 130 times by the New Testament, and from it the following English words are derived: dynamic, dynasty, dyne, dynamometer, dynamite, dynamo, etc. It connotes any power at work (Rev. 5:12). The second word, ἐξουσία, employed 104 times by the apostolic writers, has reference to the power of choice or liberty of doing as one pleases, physical and mental power, the ability or strength with which one is endued which he either possesses or exercises, the power of authority and right, the power of rule or government (e.g., Matt. 28:18).

4. Of Man. The realization of power for a believer may be noted in five different respects, pertaining to (1) victory over inherent sin (Gal. 5:16), (2) manifestation of Christ's virtues (Gal. 5:22–23), (3) service (Phil. 2:13), (4) God (Gen. 32:28), and (5) people unto the glory of God (Ex. 3:10). Cf. 2 Corinthians 11:13–15; 2 Thessalonians 2:8–10.

PRAISE

Praise is a word used in the Old Testament about 300 times and in the New Testament about 34 times. This term indeed has the same root as *price*, meaning to ascribe value and worth to another. It far exceeds mere gratitude for any blessings received (e.g., Rev. 4:11; 5:12).

Praise is a great Old Testament theme, especially in the psalms. Laudation of God is found alse in the following New Tesatment passages: John 9:24; 12:43; Ephesians 1:6, 12, 14; Philippians 1:11; 4:8; Hebrews 2:12 (cf. Psalms 22:22); 1 Peter 4:11. Praise is sometimes applied to men (Matt. 6:1–4; John 12:43; 1 Cor. 4:5; Gal. 1:10).

The Bible is the one and only book of inspired praise. Praise accordingly is made therein a duty (Ps. 50:23).

There is a progressive order climbling from (a) thanksgiving to (b) adoration and finally to (c) worship, which last-named is expressed not only verbally as appreciation but also bodily as dedication (Rom. 12:1).

PRAYER

Six aspects of prayer are to be considerd here:

1. In the Old Testament. Prayer in the Old Testament was based on the divine covenants and on the character of God, hence its phraseology "according to thy word" or "for thy great name's sake" (Gen. 18:23–32; Ex. 32:11–14; 1 Kings 8:22–53; Neh. 9:4–38; Dan. 9:4–19). Prayer followed blood sacrifice usally (Heb. 9:7).

2. For and in the Kingdom. This aspect of prayer is based on God the Father's care, though still very largely conditioned on human merit (Ps. 72:15; Matt. 6:5–15; 7:7–11).

3. Under Grace. The basis now is that of the believer's position and privilege in christ. It is offered in the name (i.e., as vitally linked with the Person) of Christ (John 14:14; 16:23–24). Prayer under grace proves to be a ministry of the believer in his priestly office. The Believer is seen thus to be in partnership with Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 1:9). The "greater works" of John 14:12–14 are accomplished by the new partnership of Christ with the believer. Christ in fulfillment of this alliance accomplishes the "greater works," as the believer in fulfillment of his responsibility does the praying (John 14:14). The supreme objective in all such work and prayer is "that the Father may be glorified in the Son" (John 14:13). Here the sole condition for prayer to be answered is praying in "my name." This is the new grace ground of prayer. It means praying from the vantage ground of the believer's position in Christ. He may of course make a foolish and unworthy prayer from that ground, but he never departs from the ground. The words *in my name* may signify that in this partnership Christ identifies Himself as the real one who is petitioning. It is as though He signed the petition along with the believer. John 15:7 declares that as the Word of Christ abides in the believer, and as the believer is obedient to that Word, which connotes abiding in Christ (John 15:10), he may "ask what he will" (cf. two reasons for unanswered prayer given in James 4:2–3). The all-inclusive "whatsoever" (John 14:13) should be considered in its relation to the name through which prayer is offered, that is, it must designate whatsoever may be agreeable and suitable to Christ.

There is a divine order prescribed for prayer under grace. This is set forth by the words: "In that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you" (John 16:23). Also, judging from another Scripture, prayer is to be offered in the Holy Spirit (Jude 1:20). By use of the phrase "in that day," then, reference is made to the time immediately after Christ's resurrection and the Day of Pentecost, or the dawning of the new age of grace. In other words, this is the prescribed arrangement of prayer for the day in which Christians live and it is distinctly declared that in the present time they are not to pray directly to Christ, but to the Father in the prevailing name of Christ with assurance that the Father will answer their prayer. Praying to the Father in the name of the Son and in the power of the Holy Spirit is an order which has not been arbitrarily imposed. The reason for this order is quite obvious. To pray to Christ would mean to abandon His mediation; it would not be praying *through* Him but rather *to* Him, thereby sacrificing the most vital feature of prayer under grace—prayer *in His name*. It is equally out of order to pray to the Holy Spirit for by so doing Christians imply that they do not need His help; instead of proceeding by His help, they would be ignoring the need of Him.

It is not difficult to adjust one's self to these requirements and to be intelligent in the order of prayer. Let it be restated that prayer in the present dispensation is to the Father and in the name of the Son and the power of the Holy Spirit.

4. By Chirst. Christ prayed, and properly so (Heb. 5:7), directly to the Father without mediation or dependence upon the Holy Spirit, so far as any revelation on the subject goes.

5. By the Spirit. In Romans 8:26–27 and concerning the Spirit's help in intercession, it is observed how when praying (even for others) one cannot know all that may be involved: "We know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit … maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." It is probably true that He "maketh intercession" not only directly to the Father, but also through the believer by inspiring and enlightening him respecting that for which he should pray.

6. By Moses and Paul. The prayers of Moses for Israel and of Paul (e.g., Eph. 3:14–21) for the saints of this age should be studied carefully.

PREACHING

Preaching is referred to 20 times in the Old Testament and 250 times in the New Testament. It may be defined as that service wherein man is entrusted with the proclamation of God's message to men. It is the present-day method, with its ramifications, of completing "all that Jesus began both to do and teach" (Acts 1:1).

Ephesians 4:11 contemplates several distinct forms of preaching in this age: *apostle* (ἀπόστολος, used 80 times), *prophet* (προφήτης, used 160 times), *evangelist* (εὐαγγελιστής, used 3 times), *pastor* (or shepherd, ποιμήν, used 17 times), and *teacher* (διδάσκαλος, used 60 times). *Pastor* and *teacher*, however, seem to designate one and the same ministry.

There are various gospels or messages in Scripture, of course: (1) that of the kingdom (Matt. 4:23 ff.), (2) of God (Rom. 1:1, 15), (3) of Christ (Rom. 1:16; 15:19 ff.), (4) of peace (Rom. 10:15), (5) of grace (Acts 20:24), (6) of salvation (Eph. 1:13), and (7) one called "everlasting" (Rev. 14:6).

There are six words in the New Testament meaning to *speak, preach,* or *proclaim*: (1) διαγγέλλω (Luke 9:60); (2) διαλέγομαι (Acts 17:2); (3) εὐαγγελίζω (Acts 8:40); (4) καταγγέλλω (Acts 15:36); (5) κηρύσσω (Rom. 10:8); (6) λαλέω (Matt. 10:19; in all, used 210 times), the more general words being λαλέω, 'to speak'; κηρύσσω, 'to herald'; and εὐαγγελίζω, 'to evangelize.' In contradistinction, according to their distinctive natures, the kingdom gospel is heralded (κηρύσσω); the good news of salvation preached (εὐαγγελίζω).

According to Ephesians 4:12 all believers are called upon to "preach" or deliver the good news somehow. It is "the work of the ministry," to be sure, for which the pastor and teacher is meant to equip them (John 17:18; 2 Cor. 5:18–20).

PREDESTINATION

In its doctrinal significance, predestination is almost identical with foreordination (see at the proper place). Predestination accordingly speaks of the divine purpose as related to men and angels. God's decrees, however, relate to all things, material and immaterial. Sin then is decreed, the saved one's destiny is predestinated. The word *predestinate* means 'to mark off,' but the doctrine relates only to certain functions of the divine purpose. Salvation is according to election. Certain things that belong to such as may be saved are predestined (Rom. 8:29–30; Eph. 1:4–5, 9; 3:11; cf. Acts 4:28). Note the absence of all conditional features here. Predestination is more of persons than their actions, and not merely of persons as such but their destiny.

Predestination witnesses to divine certainty but not compulsion. There obviously are different ways of making things certain. It may be done by moral influence or by control of the human will. God chooses to accomplish His purpose by guiding and inclining human wills. This truth should prevent misrepresentations of predestination. Two Greek words are translated *predestinate*: προορίζω

(cf. the derivative *horizon*—'that which lies beyond or before,' also a word like *provide*; see Acts 4:28; Rom. 8:29–30; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:5, 11) and προγίνωσκω, 'to know beforehand' (Acts 2:23; 26:5; Rom. 8:29; 11:2; 1 Pet. 1:2, 20; 2 Pet. 3:17).

Predestination is in harmony with all Scripture, decrees, election, covenants, and human experience. It is more than almightiness or resistless divine will. God weighs every moral feature of every problem. Predestination in consequence is always agreeable to the holy nature of God.

Since predestination is never said to control the destiny of the unsaved, any suggestion that its provisions are for the unsaved must be resisted.

PRIESTHOOD

The priest is man's representative before God as the prophet is God's representative sent to man.

1. In the Old Testament. (a) The patriarch was priest over his household (Gen. 8:20; 14:17–20; Job 1:15). (b) Melchizedek as a priest became the type of Christ's priesthood both in person and order (Gen. 14:17–20; Ps. 110:1–4; Heb. 6:20–7:28). Israel was in no way prepared to recognize the priesthood of a Gentile like Melchizedek. (c) Aaron and his sons offered both atoning sacrifices and intercession. Aaron is a type of Christ and His priesthood in service, as Christ offered Himself to God (cf. Heb. 8:3) and carried His own blood into the heavenly sanctuary on high. This is an important point in the message of the letter to the Hebrews.

2. For Chirst. This aspect of the doctrine must contemplate Christ's service here on earth both in sacrifice and intercession and also His present priesthood in heaven. In baptism He was evidently set apart by John under a special, divinely arranged provision (Heb. 5:1–2; 7:23–25; 9:24). Hebrews 5:1–2 declares the full qualifications of a high priest. Observe how and in what particulars Christ fulfilled these. No priest of Israel was ever to come from the tribe of Judah and no high priest would have consecrated a priest out of any family but Levi's. John the Baptist, of course, was a priest in his own right and divinely appointed to consecrate Christ though He did come from the tribe of Judah.

3. In the New Testament (1 Pet. 2:5, 9; Rev. 1:6). As the Old Testament high priest is a type of Christ, so the Old Testament priest is a type of the believer. The priest of both Testaments is (1) born to his office, (2) properly inducted into service by a full bath, (3) serving under divine appointment. Israel had a priesthood in one family only; all the Church is a priesthood.

The New Testament priest offers no efficacious sacrifices, but is unceasingly responsible in matters of worship, sacrifice, and intercession (Rom. 12:1–2, etc.). A distinction must be observed between the priestly office of the believer which all share alike and equally, on the one hand, and gifts for service which differ among Christians though to each believer some gift is given, on the other (1 Cor. 12:4).

PROPHECY

Prophecy is a distinct and unique feature of revelation wholly foreign to human ability. It amounts to history being prewritten, therefore must prove a great phenomenon. Its fulfillment in the

past is unquestionable, standing as indisputable evidence for inspiration.

1. As Prediction. Predictive prophecy is to be distinguished from preaching or forthtelling, itself a kind of prophetic ministry.

2. Its Extent. Predictive prophecy occupies almost one quarter of the text of Scripture. It reaches out indeed to practically all aspects of human life and history. The main classifications are: (a) that which is fulfilled and unfulfilled; (b) that of the Old Testament and the New Testament; (c) that concerning Israel, Gentiles, and the Church; (d) that concerning Christ in His first advent and His second advent (the latter extending over about eight times more Scripture than the former); (e) that before, during, and after the Jewish exile; (f) messages to the northern kingdom and the southern kingdom.

3. In the Ministry of Christ. The unique prophetic ministry of Christ is the consummation of all prophecy, for He came as the greatest Prophet, Priest, and King. He at last fulfilled Deuteronomy 18:15 (the student is urged to compare all New Testament references to this passage).

4. Its Study. The study of prophecy is especially anticipated in this age; it will, however, be understood only by the enabling power of the Holy Spirit (John 16:13).

PROPITIATION

The Greek words employed in the doctrine of propitiation are: ἱλασμός, signifying that which Christ became for the sinner (1 John 2:2; 4:10), ἱλαστήριον, the place of propitiation (Rom. 3:25; Heb. 9:5), ἵλεως (Matt. 16:22; Heb. 8:12), and ἱλάσκομαι (Luke 18:13; Heb. 2:17).

'Ιλάσκομαι indicates that God has become *gracious, reconciled*. In profane Greek the word means “to render propitious by prayer and sacrifice.” But from the Biblical standpoint God is not of Himself alienated from man. His sentiment does not, therefore, need to be changed. Still, in order that He may not for righteousness’ sake be necessitated to comport Himself otherwise, an infinite expiation is necessary, which to be sure He Himself in His love institutes and gives. Man, all exposed to wrath, could neither venture nor find an expiation. But then God, in finding it, anticipates and meets the demands of His own righteousness. Nothing happens to change God, as in the heathen view. Therefore it is never read that God must be reconciled. Rather something happens to man, who now escapes the wrath to come. A call for mere mercy would require use of the cry ’Ελέησον. When guilt and its punishment need to be acknowledged, however, the word ἱλάσκομαι is used (Luke 18:13; Heb. 2:17).

Christ became the Propitiator and thus the Father is propitiated. The terminology in Hebrews 9:5 for *mercy seat* corresponds to the LXX translation of the word, namely, ἱλαστήριον.

1. In the Old Testament The mercy seat is a throne of grace because of there being propitiation. Sacrificial blood sprinkled on the lid of the ark, where Jehovah’s presence was to be found, changed what would otherwise be a scene of awful judgment to one filled with mercy, making it in a measure the mercy seat. However, animal blood was efficacious only to the extent that it provided a just ground on which God could pass over the sins until Christ should come and shed His

own blood for them. God was propitiated aforetime merely to the extent of deferring judgment. For this measure of grace nevertheless it was reasonable to pray (cf. Luke 18:13).

2. In the New Testament. Christ by having His own blood sprinkled, as it were, over His body at Golgotha, becomes the Mercy Seat in reality. He is the Propitiator and has made propitiation by so answering the just demands of God's holiness against sin that heaven is rendered propitious. This fact of propitiation existing is to be believed. Certainly the adjustment is not to be asked for if it has already been accomplished. The flood-gates of divine mercy are open, the flow coming however only through that channel which Christ as Propitiator is.

Propitiation is the Godward side of the work of Christ on the cross. The death of Christ for the sin of the world changed the whole position of mankind in its relation to God, for He recognizes what Christ did in behalf of the world whether man enters into it or not. God is never said to be reconciled, but His attitude toward the world is altered when the world's relation to Him becomes radically changed through the death of Christ.

God is propitious toward the unsaved and toward the sinning saint: "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our's only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2). Attention should be called to the fact that God saves a sinner or restores a saint without striking a blow or even offering a word of criticism. It is too often supposed that human repentance and sorrow soften the heart of God and render Him propitious. This cannnot be true. It is the legal fact that Christ has borne all sin which renders God propitious.

The most determining truth to which all gospel preaching should be harmonized is that God is propitious; thus all the burden is taken off sinner or Christian, only leaving him to believe that through Christ's bearing his sin God is propitious.

The publican went up to the temple to pray after having presented his sacrifice, which was the custom (Luke 18:13). The Authorized Version reports him to have said: "God be merciful to me a sinner." What he really prayed was (R.V. marg.): "God, be thou propitiated to me the sinner." He did not ask for mercy as though he must persuade God to be propitious, but in full harmony with the relationship existing between the Old Testament covenant people and God, and on the ground of his offering or sacrifice, he did ask God to be propitious on that special basis. Such a prayer ever since Christ has died is wholly wrong. In the present age of grace one need not ask God merely to be merciful toward sin, for that He cannot be, and furthermore since Christ's death has rendered God propitious there is no occasion even to ask God to be propitiated. In fact, to do so becomes rank unbelief and unbelief can save no one. The mercy seat in the Old Testament could be made a ἱλαστήριον by sacrifice (Heb. 9:5), but the blood-sprinkled body of Christ on the cross has long ago become the mercy seat for the sinner once and for all. It is there accordingly that God in righteousness can meet the sinner with salvation and restore the saint to communion. The mercy seat becomes a perpetual throne of grace. What otherwise would be an awful judgment throne is changed to one of infinite mercy.

PROVIDENCE

The Greek word for *providence* is πρόνοια, translated thus but one time in Scripture (Acts 24:2) and then of a Gentile king. The theological term suggests (cf. *provide*) the directing care of God over

things animate and inanimate—embracing things both good and evil—especially over those who are yielded to His will.

Providence is the divine outworking of all decrees, the object being the final manifestation of God's glory. He directs all things perfectly, no doubt, yet without compelling the human will. He works in man the desire to do His will (Phil. 2:13). The doctrine accordingly is full of comfort. Providence should be distinguished of course from mere preservation.

PUNISHMENT

1. Future. Future, eternal punishment must have an adequate cause or reason therefore. The Bible is the only authority on this determining theme. It declares that sin is infinite because of being against God. His character is outraged by it and His authority resisted.

The doctrine of punishment, then, contends that men exist forever and must because of the unavoidable divine judgment against them for sin (in its every form) forever be separated from God in a state which is conscious torment. Some have speculated on what that torment is. It has been asserted that it is (a) remorse due to failure to secure the blessings of heaven when they were offered, (b) suffering of the soul which can best be described to the human mind by the figures employed in the Scriptures—a lake of fire, a bottomless pit, or a worm that does not die, (c) a literal fire, pit, and undying worm.

The doctrine is more emphasized by Christ than by any other in the Bible. He taught that, apart from His own saving power, men die in their sins (John 8:24) and are raised again to judgment (John 5:28–29; cf. Matt. 5:22, 29–30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15, 33; 25:41, 46; Luke 12:5).

In the Old Testament the Hebrew word *sheol* (sometimes translated "grave," "pit," and "hell"), like the New Testament Greek work *hades* (translated "hell," and "grave"), refers to the place of departed spirits, and three shades of meaning are given to it: (1) the grave where activity ceases (Ps. 88:3), (2) the end of life so far as mere human knowledge can go (Eccles. 9:5, 10), (3) a place of conscious sorrow (2 Sam. 22:6; Ps. 9:17; 18:5; 116:3).

In the New Testament the Greek words γέεννα, ἅιδης, and τάρταρος (this term in verbal form) are translated "hell." Γέεννα is a name which speaks of human sacrifice and suffering (Matt. 5:29), ἅιδης indicates the place of departed spirits (Luke 16:23), while τάρταρος refers to the lowest abyss, and to it the wicked spirits are consigned (2 Pet. 2:4).

Additional English words concerned with this theme to be found in the New Testament are: (1) "perdition," meaning utter loss and ruin (1 Tim. 6:9); (2) "damnation," which is often more accurately translated *judgment* or *condemnation* (Matt. 23:14); (3) "torment," which speaks of physical pain (Luke 16:28); "the second death," which is synonymous with the "lake of fire" (Rev. 20:14); "everlasting fire" (Matt. 18:8) and "everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46). The Greek for *everlasting*—more often translated *eternal*—is αἰώνιος; although it may be used to indicate mere ages of time, implying an end or termination, this word is almost universally found in the New Testament to express that which is eternal. The new life which the believer has received is forty-seven times said to be "eternal" or "everlasting." Mention is likewise made of the "eternal Spirit," the "everlasting God," "eternal salvation," "eternal redemption," "eternal glory," "everlasting kingdom,"

and the “everlasting gospel.” Seven times this word is used in connection with the destiny of the wicked (Matt. 18:8; 25:41, 46; Mark 3:29; 2 Thess. 1:9; Heb. 6:2; Jude 1:7).

Some assert that αἰώνιος is limited in duration when referring to the suffering of the lost; but, if this were true, every promise for the believer and the very existence of God would doubtless have to be limited as well. See Hades.

2. PRESENT. (a) God punishes nations (note e.g., Egypt, Ex. 7–12) and (b) He punishes individuals as He may decree it necessary (Acts 12:23). The saints, for instance, are both chastened and scourged (Heb. 12:6).

R

RECONCILIATION

The chief Greek words concerned with reconciliation are: καταλλαγή (Rom. 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor. 5:18–19), καταλλάσσω (Rom. 5:10; 1 Cor. 7:11; 2 Cor. 5:18–20), and ἱλάσκομαι (Heb. 2:17). Reconciliation means that someone or something is thoroughly changed and adjusted to something which is a standard, as a watch may be adjusted to a chronometer. The doctrine may be considered in as many as three aspects: **1. Old Testament Use.** In the Old Testament reconciliation speaks of atonement or a covering for sin (Lev. 8:15).

2. Of the Whole World to God (2 Cor. 5:19). The need of this adjustment is expressed in Romans 5:6–11, where the doctrine with its universal scope appears. Note four expressions in use there: *ungodly, without strength, sinners, enemies*.

By the death of Christ on its behalf, the whole world is thoroughly changed in its relation to God. But God is never said to be reconciled to man. The world is so altered in its position respecting the holy judgments of God through the cross of Christ that God is not now imputing their sin unto them. The world is thus rendered savable.

3. Of Each Individual (2 Cor. 5:20). Distinguish three changes connected with reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5:17–20: (a) that which is positional or structural, wherein a soul is seen to be in Christ (vs. 17), (b) that of a general relationship, or the basis on which salvation may be offered to all mankind (vs. 19), and (c) that which is a mental attitude or the trust of the individual heart when one sees and accepts the value in the death of Christ for him (vs. 20). Consider likewise the passages: Matthew 5:24; 1 Corinthians 7:11; Ephesians 2:16; Colossians 1:21.

Since the position of the world before God is completely changed through the death of Christ, God's own attitude toward man cannot longer be the same. He is prepared to deal with souls now in the light of what Christ has accomplished. This seems to be a change in God, of course, but it is not a reconciliation. God, on the contrary, believes completely in the thing which Christ has done and accepts it, so as to continue being just, although able thereby to justify any sinner who accepts the Savior as his reconciliation.

REDEMPTION

The doctrine of redemption is set forth by the precise meaning of the original words: (1) λυτρόω, λύτρον, λύτρωσις. This word root in all three forms is used eight times and only of the one who *received* redemption (cf. Luke 1:68—"redeemed his people"). (2) ἀγοράζω, used thirty-one times, meaning to be in the 'agora' or place of assembly and market, hence to buy for one's self by a *price* freely paid (cf. Rev. 5:9—"… hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation"). (3) ἐξαγοράζω, used four times, meaning to purchase *out* of the market not to return (cf. Gal. 3:13—"redeemed us from the curse of the law"). (4) ἀπολύτρωσις, used eight times, meaning a *full* deliverance of the soul from sin and of the body from the grave (Rom. 3:24; 8:23; 1 Cor. 1:30; Eph. 1:7, 14; 4:30; Col. 1:14).

1. In the Old Testament. (a) Israel is redeemed as a nation out of Egypt (Ex. 6:6; cf. Isa. 63:4). (b) One animal should be redeemed by another (Ex. 13:13). (c) A lost estate could be redeemed by a kinsman (Lev. 25:25). This practice becomes a type of Christ's redemption. There were four requirements in the type as likewise four with the antitype: (1) A redeemer must be a near kinsman. To fulfill this Christ took upon Himself the human form, entered the race. (2) He must be able to redeem. The price of redemption must needs be paid, which in the antitype was the blood of the Son of God (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 1:18–19). (3) He must be willing to redeem (cf. Heb. 10:4–10). (4) He must be free from the calamity which occasioned the need of redemption, that is to say, he could not redeem himself. This was true of Christ, for He needed no redemption. According to the type of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, then, Christ offered sacrifice but not for Himself (Luke 1:35; Heb. 4:15).

Of the above, (1) and (2) are related more especially to Christ's humanity and (3) and (4) to His Deity.

2. In the New Testament.

a. THE NEED OF REDEMPTION. All are slaves because sold under sin (Rom. 7:14; 1 Cor. 12:2; Eph. 2:2) and helplessly condemned to die (Ezek. 18:4; John 3:18; Rom. 3:19; Gal. 3:10).

b. THE SAME PRICE FOR ALL. To redeem from sin called for death by blood-shedding. A substitute, however, may take the sinner's place. (Heb. 9:27–28).

c. NO RETURN. When spiritually redeemed, as disclosed by ἐξαγοράζω, the emancipated one never returns as such to his former slavery. The Redeemer will not sell a slave He has bought (John 10:28).

d. EMANCIPATION. So, also, the redeemed are loosed from bondage—not even bound as slaves to the Redeemer. They are set free. The Redeemer will not own a slave who is not one by choice (John 8:36; Rom. 8:19–21; Gal. 4:31; 5:13). The slave may become a willing bondslave (Ex. 21:5–6; Ps. 40:6–8; 1 Cor. 9:18–19; 2 Cor. 5:14–15).

e. THE GOSPEL APPEAL. (1) God has undertaken for the needs of lost men. (2) Christ became a kinsman redeemer. (3) Man's lost estate ends in eternal woe or the second death. (4) Christ, however, has now paid all demands against sin. (5) ’Αγοράζω—'to purchase in the market'—may become something experimental through ἐξαγοράζω and ἀπολύτρωσις. Observe that one may realize what is signified by ἐξαγοράζω only through the immediate application of redemption, which follows upon personal faith since it is *something to believe*.

REGENERATION

The Greek for *regeneration* is παλιγγενεσία (πάλιν, 'again, once more' and γένεσις, 'birth, creation').

The general use of the word (i.e., of the noun as such) is found concerning the kingdom only in Matthew 19:28 and concerning those regenerated by the Spirit only in Titus 3:5 (cf. Ezek. 37:1–10; Matt. 17:11; John 1:13; 3:6–7; Acts 3:21; Rom. 8:21; 1 Cor. 15:27; 1 Pet. 1:3, 23; 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; Rev. 21:1).

The doctrine of individual regeneration is obscure in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament it becomes definite (John 3:1–6). Regeneration proves to be the imparting of the divine nature (cf. Titus 3:5; 1 Pet. 1:23; 2:2). All believers, then, have divine sonship (Gal. 3:26, R.V.).

Five facts concerning the nature of regeneration need to be stated: (1) a new life has been thereby begotten which is eternal; (2) that life is the divine nature; (3) the believer is begotten by the Spirit; (4) God the Father becomes his legitimate Father; (5) therefore, all believers are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. On the human side, regeneration is conditioned simply on faith (John 1:12–13; Gal. 3:26).

REPENTANCE

Quite contrary to the impression which the usual theology has spread abroad is the correct definition of repentance, the usual idea being that it means sorrow or agony of heart respecting sin and wrongdoing. The true meaning of the word shows that it is a change of mind; and although there may be nothing to preclude that change being accompanied by grief, yet the sorrow itself is not repentance. Instead, it is the reversal of mind.

Another serious Arminian error respecting this doctrine occurs when repentance is added to faith or believing as a condition of salvation. It is true that repentance can very well be required as a condition of salvation, but then only because the change of mind which it is has been involved when turning from every other confidence to the one needful trust in Christ. Such turning about, of course, cannot be achieved without a change of mind. This vital newness of mind is a part of believing, after all, and therefore it may be and is used as a synonym for *believing* at times (cf. Acts 17:30; 20:21; 26:20; Rom. 2:4; 2 Tim. 2:25; 2 Pet. 3:9). Repentance nevertheless cannot be added to believing as a condition of salvation, because upwards of 150 passages of Scripture condition salvation upon believing only (cf. John 3:16; Acts 16:31). Similarly, the Gospel by John, which was written that men might believe and believing have life through Christ's name (John 20:31), does not once use the word *repentance*. In like manner, the Epistle to the Romans, written to formulate the complete statement of salvation by grace alone, does not use the term *repentance* in relation to salvation.

Again, confusion over this doctrine arises when it is not made clear that covenant people such as Israel or Christians may repent as a separate act. Throughout the time when the gospel of the kingdom was preached by John the Baptist, Christ, and the Lord's disciples, there issued a call to repentance which was for none other than the anticipated repentance of that Jewish nation, as Matthew 3:2 has indicated: "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This is not a gospel call, but one leading to restoration of a covenant people into its right and original relationship to God (cf. Matt. 4:12–17). In like manner, a Christian, once having sinned, may repent as a separate act, which is something far removed from being saved over again (cf. 2 Cor. 7:8–11).

Repentance itself is one act only and not two. This observation is well illustrated by 1 Thessalonians 1:9–10, "…how ye turned to God from idols."

RESURRECTION

The Greek for *resurrection* is ἀνάστασις, used forty-three times; note also: ἐξανάστασις of Philippians 3:11, meaning a *resurrection out from among the dead,* ἐξεγείρω (1 Cor. 6:14), and ἔγερσις (Matt. 27:53).

The doctrine is twofold, pertaining to (1) the resurrection of Christ and (2) the resurrection of humanity, including both saved and unsaved.

1. Of Christ.

a. THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE. (1) This may be found in prophecy (Ps. 16:9–10; 22:22–31; 118:22–24; David's conception can be seen in Acts 2:25–31). (2) It may also be observed in type (the two birds of Leviticus 14:4–7; the "firstfruits" of Lev. 23:10–11). (3) Christ's resurrection is not directly related to Israel's program or the earth, for it belongs only to the New Creation doctrinally (Col. 2:9–15).

b. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTEINE. (1) Resurrection for Himself was predicted by Christ (Matt. 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Luke 18:33; 24:7). (2) It was subject to absolute proof (1 Cor. 15:4–8). (3) It was an actual resurrection and therefore cannot be illustrated by eggs, bulbs, chrysalises, etc. (Luke 24:39). (4) It resulted in a new order of being quite incomparable (1 Tim. 6:16; 2 Tim. 1:10), not the mere reversal of death. (5) There are seven reasons given for the resurrection of Christ. He arose (a) because of what or who He is (Acts 2:24), (b) to fulfill prophecy (Acts 2:25–31; Rom. 1:4; cf. Jer. 33:20–21; Luke 1:31–33)—Is David's Son dead? (c) to become the Bestower of life (Rom. 7:4; 1 Cor. 15:45; cf. John 20:22), (d) to impart power (Eph. 1:19–20; cf. Matt. 28:18–20; Rom. 6:4), (e) to be Head over all things to the Church (Eph. 1:22–23), (f) on account of a justification ground being accomplished by His death (Rom. 4:25), (g) to be the First-Fruits (Phil. 3:21; cf. 1 Cor. 15:22–23). (6) The resurrection of Christ is the standard of divine power in this age (Eph. 1:19–20; cf. Israel's deliverance out of Egypt for that of the past age and out of the present dispersion for that of the kingdom, Jer. 23:7–8). (7) The Lord's Day is the commemoration of Christ's resurrection, so is observed fifty-two times each year at the beginning of each week.

2. Of Humanity.

a. THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE. Old Testament saints anticipated a resurrection of their bodies (Job 19:26; John 11:24; Heb. 6:2).

b. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE IN GENERAL. (1) Three resurrections are to occur successively in the order named (1 Cor. 15:20–24) Christ (His was fulfilled already), the saints, and "the end" (resurrection). Note the time relationships here indicated. (2) Christ taught the universality of resurrection (John 5:25–29; cf. Dan. 12:2; Matt. 11:22, 24; 12:41–42; Luke 10:14; 11:32; Acts 24:15; 1 Cor. 15:22). (3) Resurrection is not to be thought of as if the same as restoration; cf. all so-called resurrections which have been recorded in Scripture (2 Kings 4:32–35; 13:21; Matt. 9:25; Luke 7:12–15; John 11:44; Acts 9:36–41; 14:19–20). (4) The believer's body is much like seed which has been sown (1 Cor. 15:35–44). (5) There is one grand exception to the universality of death and resurrection (1 Cor. 15:51–52).

c. PRESENT PARTICIPATION. The believer has now been raised as respects his spirit (Col. 2:12; 3:1).

d. PAUL'S PREACHING. The resurrection both of Christ and believers forms a part of Paul's gospel (1 Cor. 15:1–4).

REVELATION

The Greek for *revelation* is ἀποκάλυψις (cf. the cognate verb, ἀποκαλύπτω to *reveal*). The words *revelation* and *reveal* imply an unveiling or disclosing of things unknown—a coming into view. It is reasonable to suppose that God would speak to His creatures whom He has made quite capable of such communion. He has spoken in various ways: **1. By the Creation.** This is declared in Psalm 19:1–6 and Romans 1:19–20.

2. By the Written Word. The Bible claims to be (2 Tim. 3:16), and is, God's written Word. In every particular it has proved to be His message to man. It treats faithfully and truthfully of things whether in heaven or on earth. Indeed, it discloses things otherwise unknown.

3. By the Living Word. While the written Word unveils many things, the one message to come pre-eminently through the Son (Heb. 1:1–2) is that which declares the Father. John 1:18 states that no full revelation of Him had been given until Christ came (see Logos). Christ unveiled the wisdom of God (John 7:46; 1 Cor. 1:24) and the power of God (John 3:2), but the prime message disclosed is of God's love, and that unveiled not so much in His life and work as in His death (Rom. 5:8; 1 John 3:16). This is the essential meaning of Hebrews 1:1–2 (cf. John 3:16).

4. By the Book of Revelation. The Apocalypse is so named because it is an unveiling of the Lord Jesus Christ, a revelation which the Father gave His *Son* (not, first of all, John) to show unto His servants (Rev. 1:1).

REWARDS

God offers rewards to the believer as a recognition of whatever faithfulness may be shown to Him in service. This is the counterpart to all the doctrine of grace. Having saved a soul on the basis of grace so that there is for the Christian no obligation for afterpayments or building up of merit, God recognizes an indebtedness on His part to reward believers for their service to Him. It would be quite easy for man to say: "He has done so much for me, the most I can do in return would be little enough," but what He has accomplished under grace creates no real demand or obligation of repayment whatever, else it would not be grace. What the believer has achieved for God He recognizes in faithfulness with rewards at the judgment seat of Christ (Matt 16:27; Luke 14:14; Rom. 14:10; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 5:10; Eph. 6:8; 2 Tim. 4:8; Rev. 22:12).

All condemnation in the matter of guilt is forever past for the Christian. He shall not come into judgment respecting his sin (John 3:18; 5:24; 6:37; Rom. 5:1; 8:1, R.V.; 1 Cor. 11:32), therefore the judgment seat of Christ deals wholly with the matter of service and not with the question of sin.

The following note by Dr. C. I. Scofield (*Reference Bible*, p. 1214) is clearly stated: "God, in the New Testament Scriptures, offers to the *lost*, salvation, and, for the faithful service of the *saved*, rewards. The passages are easily distinguished by remembering that salvation is invariably spoken of as a free gift (e.g. John 4:10; Rom. 6:23; Eph. 2:8, 9); while rewards are earned by works (Matt. 10:42; Luke 19:17; 1 Cor. 9:24, 25; 2 Tim. 4:7, 8; Rev. 2:10; 22:12). A further distinction is that salvation is a present possession (Luke 7:50; John 3:36; 5:24; 6:47), while rewards are a future attainment, to be given at the coming of the Lord (Matt. 16:27; 2 Tim. 4:8; Rev. 22:12)."

The two extended Scripture passages bearing on the doctrine of rewards are 1 Corinthians 3:9–15 and 9:16–27 (cf. the passages on the various crowns: 1 Cor. 9:25; Phil. 4:1; 1 Thess. 2:19; 2 Tim. 4:8; James 1:12; 1 Pet. 5:4; Rev. 2:10; 3:11).

RIGHTEOUSNESS

The Greek word for *righteousness is* δικαιοσύνη. It becomes an absolute term when applied to God. Four general aspects of righteousness are to be noted: **1. God's.** With respect to character, God is transparently holy and righteous in all His acts. When combined with love, His righteousness results in grace. God's righteousness is ever absolute and perfect to infinity: "In him is no darkness at all." God's righteousness is seen in two ways: (a) He is a righteous Person (James 1:17; 1 John 1:5) and (b) He is righteous in all His ways (Rom. 3:25–26).

2. Man's. This kind of righteousness is recognized only to show its inadequacy and ripeness for condemnation (Isa. 64:6; Rom. 3:10; 10:3; 2 Cor. 10:12).

3. Imputed. The imputed type of righteousness is not God's attribute as if that were bestowed on man, nor human goodness in any form. It is that which the believer becomes in virtue of his being in Christ. Jesus Christ represents the righteousness of God, and the believer becomes what Christ is at the moment of believing (2 Cor. 5:21). Righteousness was imputed likewise to Old Testament saints (cf. Abraham, Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3; Gal. 3:6; James 2:23).

4. Imparted. Romans 8:4 presents a righteous conduct as being possible on the part of each believer which is not the result of his own effort, but on the contrary that of the Spirit. This righteousness is produced not by the believer, then, but "in" him.

S

SABBATH

1. Meaning. The word *Sabbath* means cessation or complete rest, with no added implication relative to worship or spiritual activity. *Sabbath* is a transliteration from the Hebrew word for ‘repose.’

2. General Facts. The Sabbath originated with creation’s work being completed (Gen. 2:2–3). b. There is no mention of a seven-day week between Genesis 2 and the giving of the Law in Exodus 20. Then it was made a part of the law system with extra Sabbaths, a Sabbatic year, and a year of jubilee (cf. Gen. 7:4, 10; 8:10–12; 29:27–28, 30; Ex. 16:1–30; Neh. 9:13–14). c. Prophets gave Sabbath observance the first place in Israel’s duties (Isa. 58:13–14). They were judged for failure to keep it—even with a death penalty (Num. 15:32–36). As a nation, Israel so failed to keep the Sabbath that they were taken from the land that the land might have its Sabbath rest (Lev. 26:32–35; Ezek. 20:10–24). d. The inter-Testament period developed the synagogue which custom of meeting together introduced a form of Sabbath worship without any Old Testament authority. Traditions beside had been multiplied freely by the time of the first advent, but these Christ disregarded when the need arose (Matt. 12:1–14; Mark 2:23–3:6; Luke 6:1–11; 13:1–17; 14:1–6; John 5:1–18). e. There is no recorded observance by Christians of a Sabbath as such after Christ’s resurrection and yet no one is termed a Sabbath-breaker; rather, Sabbath observance was condemned (Gal. 4:5, 10–11; Col. 2:16). f. Prophecy anticipates the termination of Sabbath observance for a time (Hos. 2:11; 3:4–5). g. Paul recognized Christian gatherings on the first day of the week (Acts 20:7; cf. Rom. 14:5–6). h. The Sabbath is to be restored in the tribulation (Matt. 24:20) and fully re-established in the kingdom (Deut. 30:8; Isa. 66:23; Ezek. 46:1). i. The Sabbath, after all, was Jehovah’s perpetual covenant with Israel, excepting when under divine judgment (Ex. 31:16). j. It has never been given to Gentiles (Eph. 2:12; cf. 6:2–3).

SACRIFICE

In the Old Testament, sacrifices were an execution of the sentence of divine law upon the substitute. Ancient sacrifice, then, is of divine origin. In order to make it efficacious it was necessary that blood be shed (cf. Heb. 9:22).

1. Scope. There were sacrifices for the Jewish nation or congregation, for the family, and for the individual (Lev. 16).

2. Before Moses. Sacrifices were offered before the time of Moses by Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Job, and Jacob (Gen. 4:4; 8:20; 12:7; 26:25; 33:20; Ex. 12:3–11; Job 1:5; 42:7–9).

3. In the Mosaic System (Ex.—Deut.). Jewish sacrifices were always typical of Christ. Observe, for example, the five offerings of Leviticus 1:1–7:38.

4. Of Christ. The body of Christ was offered once-for-all (Heb. 10:1–12). The Father made the sacrifice (John 3:16; Rom. 8:32). Christ suffered for—ὑπέρ (Rom. 5:8), meaning 'for the benefit of'—man; also *in the stead of*—ἀντί (cf. ἀντίλυτρον, 1 Tim. 2:6)—him. The sacrifice of Christ is described as: a. Penal (2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13). b. Substitutional (Lev. 1:4; Isa. 53:5–6; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:24). c. Voluntary (Gen. 22:9, in type; John 10:18). d. Redemptive (1 Cor. 6:20; Gal. 3:13; Eph. 1:7). e. Propitiatory (Rom. 3:25; 1 John 2:2). f. Reconciling (Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18–19; Col. 1:21–22). g. Efficacious (John 12:32–33). h. Revelatory (John 3:16; 1 John 4:9–10).

5. Of Believers. The Christian's sacrifice is but one of three functions of the priest (see Priesthood). a. Dedication of self as a reasonable sacrifice (Rom. 12:1–2). As Christ was both Sacrifice and Sacrificer, so the believer-priest may freely offer himself to God. b. The sacrifice of the lips. This means the voice of praise is to be offered continually (Eph. 5:20; Heb. 13:15). c. The sacrifice of substance (Phil. 4:18). Christians will certainly give more than the Jewish tithe.

6. In the Kingdom. The anticipation of animal sacrifices in the kingdom (Ezek. 43:19–27) is naturally perplexing, yet evidently a memorial looking back to the cross (as the Lord's Supper does now) and no doubt one practice well enough adapted to an earthly people. No animal sacrifice ever has power to take away sin (Heb. 10:4).

SAINT

Saint is a word that comes from the same root in the original as *holy* and *sanctify*, referring as it does to what the believer is by virtue of his position in Christ. *Saint* is used fifty times in the Old Testament to denote Israel and sixty-two times in the New Testament to designate the believer.

The children of God are called *believers* about 50 times and *brethren* about 180 times, while the more common name of today, *Christian*, is used but 3 times in the apostolic writings.

The term never indicates personal character or worthiness. Being already set apart unto God in Christ, all Christians by so much are now saints from the moment they are saved. Sainthood, then, is not a future prospect. All believers are *saints*, positionally considered (1 Cor. 1:2, etc.).

SALVATION

The Greek for *salvation*, σωτηρία is used about fifty times in the New Testament. It refers to the estate of one who has been *made whole*.

1. Scope. The general doctrine of salvation includes the following lesser dogmas: substitution, redemption, reconciliation, propitiation, conviction, calling, election, predestination, sovereignty, free will, grace, repentance, faith, regeneration, forgiveness, justification, sanctification, preservation, and glorification.

2. The Work of God. Two Old Testament passages indicate that "salvation belongeth unto the Lord" (Ps. 3:8), "salvation is of the Lord" (Jonah 2:9). Any system which tends to combine human responsibility with this divine undertaking is wrong. Ephesians 2:8–10 relates good works to salvation wrought by grace as an effect thereof, and not a cause.

3. Three Tenses. Salvation has reference to the believer's past, present, and future. (a) The past tense, which releases from the guilt and penalty of sin, is wholly accomplished for all who believe at the time when they believe (Luke 7:50; 1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Cor. 2:15; 2 Tim. 1:9). (b) The present tense, which releases from the power of sin, is being accomplished now in those who exercise faith for it (John 17:17; Rom. 6:14; 8:2; Gal. 5:16; Phil. 2:12–13). (c) The future tense releases from the very presence of sin (Rom. 13:11; Eph. 5:25–27; Phil. 1:6; 1 Pet. 1:3–5; 1 John 3:1–2).

4. One Condition. About 115 passages condition salvation on believing alone, and about 35 simply on faith. There are certain things, however, often added by man to this one and only condition, like the following: believe and repent, believe and be baptized, believe and confess sin, believe and confess Christ publicly, believe and promise a better manner of life, believe and pray for salvation.

5. Dispensational Aspects. A study of this division of the subject is best approached by considering the revealed purposes of God in each of the various dispensations. The present age-purpose as manifested in the heavenly people, for instance, calls forth an exalted, divine undertaking not seen before on the earth (Eph. 3:1–6).

6. Relationships, Factors, and Forces. Note in particular: (a) the work of the Father in salvation, (b) the work of the Son in salvation, (c) the work of the Spirit in salvation, (d) salvation in its relation to sin, (e) Satan's opposition to salvation, (f) salvation or deliverance out of the world, (g) salvation from the flesh, and (h) salvation in relation to heaven. All these are treated fully in Soteriology (Volume III).

7. Duration. There is no salvation offered under grace which stops short of being eternal in its character. This is due to the fact that it proves to be altogether a work of God, and His purpose and power never fail (Phil. 1:6).

SANCTIFICATION

It is particularly true that Bible doctrine suffers through misunderstanding and misstatement of the revealed facts about sanctification. Since one aspect of this doctrine deals with Christian living and experience, it is the more easily perverted and its exact statement the more imperative.

1. Essentials to a Right Understanding. Three general conditions govern a right conception of this subject.

a. MUST BE RIGHTLY RELATED TO OTHER BIBLE DOCTRINES. Disproportionate emphasis on any one doctrine, or the habit of seeing all revealed truth in the light of one line of Bible teaching, leads to serious error. No person really understands a doctrine or is prepared to teach a Bible truth until he is able to see that truth in its right position, proportion, and relation to every other truth of the Word. Sanctification, like all other great doctrines of the Scriptures, represents and defines an exact field within the purpose of God. Since it aims at definite ends, it suffers as much from overstatement as from understatement. This doctrine must be considered, then, in its exact relation to all other aspects of truth.

b. CANNOT BE INTERPRETED BY EXPERIENCE. Some persons conclude they understand the doctrine of sanctification because it is their belief that they have been sanctified. Only one aspect

of sanctification out of three, however, deals with the complexity of human experience in daily life. Therefore, an analysis of some personal experience must not be substituted for all the teaching of the Word of God. Even if sanctification were limited to the field of human experience, there would never be an experience that could be proved to be its perfect example, nor would any human statement of that experience exactly describe the full measure of the divine reality. It is the function of the Bible to interpret experience rather than the function of experience to interpret the Bible. Every experience which is wrought of God will be found to be in accord with the Scriptures. If not, it should be judged as a device of Satan. To some people an uncertain experience has become more convincing than the clear teaching of the Scriptures.

c. DEPENDS FOR A RIGHT UNDERSTANDING UPON CONSIDERATION OF ALL THE SCRIPTURE. The body of Scripture presenting this doctrine is much more extensive than appears to the one who reads only the English text, for the same root (Hebrew and Greek) words which are translated "sanctify," with its various forms, are also translated by two other English words, "holy" and "saint," with all their various forms. Therefore, to discover the full scope of this doctrine from the Scriptures, one must go beyond the passages in which the one English word "sanctify" is used and include, as well, the portions wherein the terms "holy" and "saint" are employed. Very much is thus added to the field of investigation.

Observance of these three general conditions just named will avoid practically every error connected with the doctrine of sanctification.

2. Meaning of Words Involved.

a. "SANCTIFY," WITH ITS VARIOUS FORMS. This word, which is used 106 times in the Old Testament and 31 times in the New, means 'to set apart,' and then the state of being set apart. It indicates classification in matters of position and relationship. The basis of the classification is usually that the sanctified person (or thing) has been set apart, or separated, from others in his position and relationship before God, that is, from that which proves unholy. This is the general meaning of the word.

It is also important to consider that there are three things which the word *sanctification*, in its general use, does not imply: (1) The Bible use of the word does not imply past improvement in matters of holiness, for God is said Himself to be sanctified, and He has experienced no improvement in holiness.

(2) The Bible use of the word does not necessarily imply a state of sinlessness. In the Old Testament it is stated that the people washed their garments and separated themselves from some defilement and so were sanctified before God. This is far from sinlessness. Even the Corinthian Christians, who were "utterly at fault," are said to be sanctified. Many inanimate things were sanctified, and these could not even be related to the question of sin.

(3) The Bible use of the word does not necessarily imply finality. Being sanctified once did not save the Israelites from needing to be sanctified again and again. They were for the time being set apart unto God. Hence there are aspects of this truth, it will be seen, which do not imply finality.

b. "HOLY, " WITH ITS VARIOUS FORMS. This word, which is used about 400 times in the Old Testament and about 12 times of believers in the New Testament, refers to the state of being set apart, or being separate, from that which is unholy. Christ was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." Thus was He sanctified. Similarly, also, there are certain things which the word *holy* in its Biblical use does not imply: (1) No past improvement need necessarily be implied, for God is

Himself holy. It is the state itself which is indicated by this word, and not the process by which it has been attained.

(2) Sinless perfection is not necessarily implied, for one reads of a "holy nation," holy priests, "holy prophets," "holy apostles," "holy men," "holy women," "holy brethren," "holy mountain," and "holy temple." None of these was sinless before God. They were holy, nevertheless, according to some particular standard or issue that constituted the basis of their separation from others.

(3) The word does not necessarily imply finality. All these people just named were repeatedly called to higher degrees of holiness. They were set apart for some holy purpose; thus were they sanctified. Leviticus 21:8 illustrates the similarity of meaning between the words "sanctify" and "holy" as used in the Bible. Speaking of the priest, God said: "Thou shalt sanctify him therefore; for he offereth the bread of thy God: he shall be holy unto thee: for I the LORD, which sanctify you, am holy." Here the root word, employed four times, is twice translated "sanctify" and twice "holy."

c. "SAINT." This term, used of Israel about 50 times and of believers about 62 times, is applied only to living persons and relates only to their position in the reckoning of God. It is never associated with the quality of their daily life. They are saints by reason of being particularly classified and set apart in the plan and purpose of God. Being sanctified thus, they are saints. In three Epistles, according to the Authorized Version, believers are addressed as those who are "called to be saints." Such a translation is most misleading. The words "to be" should be omitted; indeed, the fact that they are italicized in the A.V. only means the translators added this expression themselves. Christians *are* saints by their present calling from God. The passages, then, do not anticipate a time when they will be saints. They are already sanctified, set apart, classified, "holy brethren," who therefore may be called saints. Sainthood is not subject to progression. Every born-again person is as much a saint the moment he is saved as he ever will be in time or eternity. The whole Church, which is Christ's Body, proves to be a called-out, separate people. They are the saints of this dispensation. According to certain usages of these words, they are all sanctified. They are all holy.

The Spirit has chosen to give believers the title of "saints" more than any other designation except one. They are called "brethren" 184 times, "saints" 62 times, and "Christians" 3 times. It would not be amiss to attempt the rescue of such a divinely emphasized but misunderstood title from its present state of disuse and ruin. Many Christians do not believe they are saints because they do not know of their position in Christ.

The right understanding of the Bible doctrine of sanctification must depend, then, upon consideration of all the passages wherein the words "sanctify," "holy," and "saint" appear. Reference to all the passages, of course, is impossible in this limited study.

3. THE MEANS.

a. GOD IS ETERNALLY SANCTIFIED. Because of infinite holiness, God Himself—Father, Son, and Spirit—is eternally sanctified. He is classified as distinct, set apart, and separate from sin. He is altogether holy. He is Himself sanctified (Lev. 21:8; John 17:19).

b. GOD SANCTIFIES PERSONS. God—Father, Son, and Spirit—is said to sanctify other persons. (1) *The Father Sanctifies*. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly" (1 Thess. 5:23). (2) *The Son Sanctifies*. "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word" (Eph. 5:26; cf. Heb. 2:11; 9:13–14; 13:12). (3) *The Spirit Sanctifies*. "Being sanctified by the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 15:16; cf. 2 Thess. 2:13). (4) *The Father Sanctified the Son*. "Whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world" (John 10:36). (5) *God Sanctified Israel*. God sanctified the priests

and people of Israel (Ex. 29:44; 31:13). (6) *Sanctification Is God's Will*. "For this is the will of God, even your sanctification" (1 Thess. 4:3).

(7) *The Believer's Sanctification Comes from God*. (a) *By Union with Christ*. "To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. 1:2); Christ has been made unto believers their sanctification (1 Cor. 1:30). (b) *By the Word of God*. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17; cf. 1 Tim. 4:5). (c) *By the Blood of Christ*. "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. 13:12; cf. 9:13–14); "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). (d) *By the Body of Christ*. "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10). The cross has separated believers from the world: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14). (e) *By the Spirit*. "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit" (2 Thess. 2:13; cf. 1 Pet. 1:2). (f) *By Choice*. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14; cf. 2 Tim. 2:21–22). (g) *By Faith*. "Sanctified by faith that is in me" (Acts 26:18).

c. GOD SANCTIFIED DAYS, PLACES, AND THINGS (Gen. 2:3; Ex. 29:43).

d. MAN CAN SANCTIFY GOD. This he may do by setting God apart in his own thought as holy. "Hallowed be thy name." "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts" (1 Pet. 3:15).

e. MAN CAN SANCTIFY HIMSELF. Many times did God call upon Israel to sanctify themselves. He likewise says to believers in this age: "Be ye holy; for I am holy." Also, "If a man therefore purge himself from these [vessels of dishonor so as to depart from iniquity], he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use" (2 Tim. 2:21). Self-sanctification, however, can only be realized by the divinely provided means. Christians are asked to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God (Rom. 12:1) . They are to "come out from among them, and be … separate" (2 Cor. 6:17). Having the Christian's promises, they are to cleanse themselves "from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness [i.e., sanctification] in the fear of God" (2 Cor. 7:1). "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16).

f. MAN CAN SANCTIFY PERSONS AND THINGS. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy" (i.e., sanctified; 1 Cor. 7:14). "And Moses sanctified the people." "So they sanctified the house of the LORD."

g. ONE THING CAN SANCTIFY ANOTHER. "For whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? … For whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" (Matt. 23:17, 19).

From a very limited consideration of the Scriptures on the subject of sanctification and holiness, it is evident that the root meaning of the word is to set apart unto a holy purpose. The one set apart is sometimes cleansed and sometimes not. Sometimes this one can partake of the character of holiness and sometimes, as in the case of an inanimate thing, it cannot. Yet a thing which of itself can be neither holy nor unholy is just as much sanctified when set apart unto God as the person whose moral character is subject to transformation. It must also be evident that where these moral qualities exist cleansing and purification are sometimes required in sanctification, but not always.

4. Three Aspects. Though the exact meaning of the words "sanctify," "holy," and "saint" is unchanged, there is a far deeper reality indicated by their use in the New Testament than is indicated by their employment in the Old. After all, the Old Testament is but a "shadow of good things to come." The New Testament revelation, then, may be considered in three divisions:

a. POSITIONAL. This is a sanctification, holiness, and sainthood which comes to the believer by the operation of God through offering of the body and shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who are saved have been redeemed and cleansed in His precious blood, forgiven all trespasses, made righteous through the new headship in Him, justified, and purified. They now are the sons of God. All of this indicates a distinct classification and separation, deep and eternal, achieved through the saving grace of Christ. It is based on facts of position which are true of every Christian. Hence, every believer is now said to be sanctified positionally, holy, and by so much a saint before God. This position bears no relationship to the believer's daily experience more than that it should inspire him to holy living. His position in Christ is, to be sure, according to the Scriptures, the greatest possible incentive to holiness of life.

The great doctrinal Epistles observe this order in teaching the truth. They first state the marvels of saving grace and then conclude with an appeal for a life corresponding to the divinely wrought position (cf. Rom. 12:1; Eph. 4:1; Col. 3:1). Christians are not now accepted in themselves; they are accepted in the Beloved. They are not now righteous in themselves; He has been made unto them righteousness. They are not now redeemed in themselves; He has been made unto them redemption. They are not now positionally sanctified by their daily walk; He has been made unto them a sanctification like that. Positional sanctification is as perfect as He is perfect. As much as He is set apart, believers, since they are found to be in Him, are set apart. Positional sanctification is as complete for the weakest saint as it is for the strongest. It depends only on one's union with and position in Christ. All believers are classified as "the saints." So, also, they are classed as the "sanctified" (cf. Acts 20:32; 1 Cor. 1:2; 6:11; Heb. 10:10, 14; Jude 1:1). The proof that imperfect believers are nevertheless positionally sanctified and therefore saints is discovered in 1 Corinthians. Corinthian believers were unholy in life (e.g., 1 Cor. 5:1–2; 6:1–8), but they are twice said to have been sanctified (1 Cor. 1:2; 6:11).

By their position, then, Christians are rightly called "holy brethren" and "saints." They have been "sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10), and are new men by reason of now being "created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:24). Positional sanctification and positional holiness are "true" sanctification and holiness. In his position in Christ the Christian stands righteous and accepted before God forever. Compared to this, no other aspect of the present truth can merit an equal recognition. But let no person go on from here to conclude that he is holy, or sanctified, in life because Christians are now said to be holy, or sanctified, in position.

b. EXPERIMENTAL. While all believers are said to be sanctified every whit positionally, there is never a reference in any of these Scriptures to their daily lives. Such an aspect of sanctification and holiness is found in another and entirely different body of truth which may be termed *experimental Sanctification*. As positional sanctification is absolutely disassociated from the daily life, so experimental sanctification is absolutely unrelated to position in Christ. Experimental sanctification instead may depend (1) on some degree of yieldedness to God, (2) on some degree of separation from sin, or (3) on some degree of Christian growth to which the believer has already attained.

(1) *Result of Yieldedness to God*. Whole self-dedication to God is one's reasonable service: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service"

(Rom. 12:1). By so doing the Christian is classified and set apart unto God through his own choice. There is an element of finality and completeness possible in this. Within the sphere of his own knowledge of himself, the believer may definitely choose the mind and will of God as the rule for his life. This yielding to the will of God may be accordingly complete and final. Herein is self-determined separation unto God, an important aspect of experimental sanctification. “Now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness” (or, sanctification; Rom. 6:22).

Sanctification cannot be experienced as a matter of feeling or emotion any more than justification or forgiveness can. A person may nevertheless be at peace and full of joy because he *believes* these things to be true in his life. So, also, by yielding unto God a new infilling of the Spirit may be made possible which will result in some blessedness in life hitherto unknown. This felicity might come either suddenly or gradually. In any case it is not the sanctification itself that is experienced: it is rather the blessing of the Spirit made possible through sanctification or a deeper life of separation unto God. Experimental sanctification works in such a way as to have its effect upon the daily life, and by so much acts in contrast to positions which are in no way related to daily living.

(2) *Result of Freedom from Sin*. The Bible takes full acount of the many sins of Christians. It does not teach that only sinless people are saved, or kept saved; on the contrary, there is faithful consideration of, and full provision made for, the sins of saints. These provisions are both preventive and curative. The question of sin in the believer is taken up exhaustively by 1 John. One passage (2:1–2) may be taken as a key to the Epistle. It begins: “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not.” This much relates to the prevention of sin in the Christian. It continues: “And if any [Christian] man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins.” This much refers to the cure of sin in Christians. Much Scripture indeed is written “that we be not sinning,” but in addition believers are told that if they still fall into sin they have abundant provision from God for its cure. The things which are written are not set down to encourage any believer to sin; they however are written “that we be not sinning” longer. “Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid.” He alone can forbid, and if requested He will forbid—such are the marvelous provisions in grace for eternal keeping of the child of God.

It may be concluded from these and many other Scriptures that a son of God need not sin. To that end the Savior has died (Rom. 6:1–14). To that end Christians have a message written them (1 John 2:1–2). To that end they are indwelt by the Spirit of God (Gal. 5:16). It is the purpose of the Father that His children be free from sin in order that He may have fellowship with them, for “truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.” The basis upon which Christians may have fellowship with the Father and His Son is specified: they must walk in the light as God is in the light (1 John 1:7), which means to live by the power of the Spirit and instantly to confess every known sin. Because of the Advocate’s defense of him and because of the believer’s confession of sin, God is free to forgive and cleanse from all unrighteousness. Christians then must not say they have no sin nature (1:8). This would be to deceive themselves. Such ones must not say, either, that they have not sinned (1:10). This would be to make Him and His testimony to what is in man untrue. It does not become a Christian to boast of himself, but instead every true victory should be acknowledged to the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Has any child of God reached complete deliverance from sin? This question should never be confused with the facts concerning positional sanctification, nor with the truths connected with sanctification through yieldedness to God. The answer to this query may be stated as follows: While

the believer is definitely trusting the sufficiency of the Spirit and fulfilling every condition for enablement, he will be divinely kept from sinning (Rom. 6:14; 8:2; Gal. 5:16). That statement is not based upon any personal experience; it rests on the Word of God. The Christian never reaches a place where he cannot sin. On the other hand, the Scriptures plainly teach that, in spite of the fallen nature, there is deliverance for the believer from bond-servitude to sin through union with Christ in His death and resurrection (Rom. 6:1–10) and through the power of the indwelling Spirit to enable (Rom. 8:2; Gal. 5:16). This victory will be realized just so long as it is claimed by faith. Such is the divinely provided preventative for sinning.

The old nature, with its incurable disposition to sin, remains in every believer so long as he is in his present body. He is therefore disposed to sin. The sin nature itself is never said to have died. It was crucified, put to death, and buried with Christ, but since this death was accomplished two thousand years ago the reference must be to a divine judgment against the nature which was gained by Christ when He "died unto sin." There is no Bible teaching to the effect that some Christians have died to sin and others have not. The passages involved must include *all* saved persons (Gal. 5:24; Col. 3:3). All believers have died unto sin in Christ's sacrifice, but not all have claimed the riches which were provided for them by that death. Saved people are not asked to die experimentally or to re-enact His death; they are urged only to "reckon" themselves to be dead indeed unto sin. This is the human responsibility (Rom. 6:1–14).

If through weakness, willfullness, or ignorance the Christian does sin, there is a cure provided. On the human side there must be a genuine confession and repentance of heart (2 Cor. 7:8–11; 1 John 1:9). On the divine side there is "an advocate with the Father," and the Father "is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Experiences of failure and defeat should be growing less as the believer increasingly discovers the marvels of God's power and grace and the utter helplessness of his own strength. Every restoration, forgiveness, and cleansing is a renewal of experimental sanctification.

(3) *Result of Christian Growth*. Christians are immature in wisdom, knowledge, experience, and grace. In all such realms they are appointed to grow, and their growth should be manifest. They are to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Beholding the glory of the Lord as in a glass, they are "changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." This transformation will have the effect of setting them more and more apart to God. They will, to that very extent, be more sanctified.

A Christian may be "blameless," though it could not be truthfully said of him that he is "faultless." The child laboring to form his first letters in a copybook may be blameless in the work he does, but the work is certainly not faultless. A believer may be walking in the full measure of what is his understanding today, yet he must know he is not now living in the added light and experience that will be his tomorrow through growth. There is a relative perfection, then, within imperfection. Christians who are quite incomplete, quite immature, and quite given to sin may nonetheless "abide" in the Vine. They may have fellowship with the Father and with His Son. There is also imperfection within perfection. Those saved ones who really are incomplete, immature, and given to sin, are even now positionally sanctified and complete "in Him"—the Lord Jesus Christ.

Christian growth and experimental sanctification are not the same. for one is a cause and the other its effect. The Christian will be more and more set apart as he grows into the image of Christ by the Spirit. To state that he will be more experimentally sanctified as he grows in grace and the

knowledge of his Lord and Savior Jesus Christ does not necessarily question his present purity or victory in daily life; it is only to declare that he will be more set apart as he develops in the likeness of his Lord. This is to consider experimental sanctification in the broadest and most general meaning of the word.

c. ULTIMATE. The ultimate aspect of sanctification, which is related to the saved one's final perfection, will be his in the glory. By His grace and transforming power God will have so changed every child of Hisin spirit, soul, and body—that each will be "like him" and "conformed to the image of His Son." He will then present them "faultless" before the presence of His glory. His Son's Bride will be free from every "spot or wrinkle." It therefore becomes all Christians to "abstain from all appearance of evil. And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

5. THREE AGENTS. Three agents of sanctification are emphasized in Scripture: (a) the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Thess. 2:13; 1 Pet. 1:2), (b) the Son (Heb. 10:10), and (c) the Truth of God (John 17:17; Eph. 5:26).

SATAN

1. HIS PERSONALITY. As in the case with Christ, the knowledge of Satan depends wholly on what the Scriptures declare. No more or better evidence even there will exist for belief in the personality of one than for the other.

2. HIS POWER. (a) As created his might was second only to God's. (Ezek. 28:11–16). (b) After his moral fall (cf. Job 2:7; Isa. 14:12–17; Luke 4:6; 22:31, R.V.; 1 Cor. 5:5; Heb. 2:14) and even after his judgment in the cross (John 16:11; Col. 2:15) he continues to reign as a usurper (2 Cor. 4:4). Consider here all passages throughout Scripture on Satan's temptations and solicitations to evil.

3. HIS WORK. (a) Relative to God, his evil works are still permitted. (b) Relative to demons, they must do his will. (c) Relative to the unsaved, he is in authority over them (Isa. 14:17; 2 Cor. 4:3–4; Eph. 2:2; Col. 1:13; 1 John 5:19, R.V.). (d) Relative to the saved, he comes in conflict with them (Eph. 6:11–18). (e) Relative to truth, he is a liar (John 8:44) and author of "the lie."

4. HIS CAREER. (a) Past. (1) Satan experienced a moral fall (Isa. 14:12–17; Ezek. 28:15; 1 Tim. 3:6). (2) Satan's judgment was predicted in Eden (Gen. 3:15). (3) His judgment was accomplished at the cross (John 12:31–33).

(b) Present. (1) He is reigning as a usurper today (2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; Rev. 2:13). (2) He gains the name *accuser of the brethren* for what he is doing now (Rev. 12:10). (3) He is father in a spiritual sense to all who accept his philosophy of independence from God (John 8:44; Eph. 2:2).

(c) Future. (1) He is one day to be cast out of heaven (Rev. 12:7–12; cf. Isa. 14:12; Luke 10:18) . (2) He is to be confined to the abyss for one thousand years (Rev. 20:1–3, 7). (3) When released from the abyss, he will lead armies against God (Rev. 20:8–9). (4) His final doom is the lake of fire (Rev. 20:10).

SECURITY

Security as a doctrine comprehends only the continuation of salvation for those who are saved. It should be distinguished accordingly from the doctrine of assurance. Also, it has no relation to the unregenerate person or mere professor.

While Arminians make much of Christian experience as the proof of insecurity, they do employ a few Scriptures in addition. These are subject to the following classification: a. Passages dispensationally misapplied: Ezekiel 33:7–8; Matthew 18:23–35; 24:13. b. Passages related to false teachers of the last days of the Church: 1 Timothy 4:1–3; 2 Peter 2:1–22; Jude 1:17–19. c. Passages related to no more than moral reformation: Luke 11:24–26, for example. d. Passages related to profession which is proved to be such by its fruits: John 8:31; 15:6; 1 Corinthians 15:1–2; Hebrews 3:6, 14; James 2:14–26; 2 Peter 1:10; 1 John 3:10. e. Passages containing admonition of various kinds: Matthew 25:1–13; Hebrews 6:4–9; 10:26–31. f. Passages related to the loss of rewards, walking in the dark, and chastisement: John 15:2; 1 Corinthians 3:15; 9:27; 11:27–32; Colossians 1:21–23; 1 John 1:5–9; 5:16. g. Passages related to falling from grace: Galatians 5:4, for instance.

The positive doctrine of security is based upon twelve undertakings of God for His people, four of which are related to the Father, four to the Son, and four to the Spirit.

1. Undertakings Related to the Father: (a) the sovereign purpose or covenant of God, which is unconditional (cf. John 3:16; 5:24; 6:37), (b) the infinite power of God set free to save and keep (cf. John 10:29; Rom. 4:21; 8:31, 38–39; 14:4; Eph. 1:19–21; 3:20; Phil. 3:21; 2 Tim. 1:12; Heb. 7:25; Jude 1:24), (c) the infinite love of God (cf. Rom. 5:7–10; Eph. 1:4), and (d) the influence on the Father of the prayer of the Son of God (cf. John 17:9–12, 15, 20).

2. Undertakings Related to the Son: (a) His substitutionary death (cf. Rom. 8:1; 1 John 2:2), (b) His resurrection, securing a resurrection unto life for believers (John 3:16; 10:28; Eph. 2:6), (c) His advocacy in heaven (cf. Rom. 8:34; Heb. 9:24; 1 John 2:1–2), (d) His shepherdhood and intercession (cf. John 17:1–26; Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:23–25).

3. Undertakings Related to the Spirit: (a) regeneration (partaking of the divine nature is entrance into that which cannot be removed; cf. John 1:13; 3:3–6; Titus 3:4–6; 1 Pet. 1:23; 2 Pet. 1:4; 1 John 3:9), (b) indwelling (He is given to abide forever and certainly by His presence the believer will be preserved; cf. John 7:37–39; Rom. 5:5; 8:9; 1 Cor. 2:12; 6:19; 1 John 2:27), (c) baptism (by which the believer is joined to Christ so as to share eternally in the New Creation glory and blessing; cf. 1 Cor. 6:17; 12:13; Gal. 3:27), and (d) sealing (Eph. 1:13–14; 4:30).

Anyone of the twelve undertakings is sufficient to guarantee eternal security to the believer. There is no true distinction indeed between salvation and safekeeping, for God offers no salvation at the present time which is not eternal. When rightly understood, the effect of this doctrine of security will be such as to promote a holy life (cf. 1 John 2:1).

SEPARATION

Separation as a doctrine represents the human side of sanctification. Compare the meaning of the related terms *consecration* and *dedication*. Separation is *from* something *unto* something, consequently in doctrine it means going from evil *unto* Christ (not, unto right conduct merely).

1. Old Testament Teaching. Two examples come to mind here. Israel as a nation was separated from Egypt by the exodus. Abraham as an individual was separated from his homeland.

2. New Testament Teaching. The study of this doctrine in the New Testament may be divided as follows:

a. POSITIONAL (John 17:14, 16, 21–23; Rom. 6:1–11; Gal. 6:14–15). The believer has been positionally set apart by virtue of being in Christ.

b. EXPERIMENTAL. (1) From evil. (a) Evil things (2 Cor. 6:14–18) must be left behind by Christians. They will not be taken out from the conditions of the *cosmos* world, but kept safely therein (John 17:15). (b) Likewise the believer must avoid unholy partnerships (2 Tim. 2:20–21; 2 John 1:9–11). God cannot bless both parties in an unequal partnership. (2) Unto God. This step ought to be taken by all believers through self-dedication.

3. The Divine Side. For His part, God encourages separation by promising special felicity to the faithful (Ps. 50:7–15; 2 Cor. 6:17–18; Heb. 12:14–17).

SIN

1. Definition. Sin is that which proves unlike the character of God. Three theories should be noted as inadequate because they define evil as no more than: (a) violation of divine law, (b) finiteness, or (c) selfishness.

2. Origin. Being the opposite of virtue, wickedness was ever ideally existing wherever virtue might be found. It could have no expression, of course, until beings capable of sin were created, hence in due course the sin of angels and later of men.

3. Divine Permission. The following statements should be considered first when pondering the question of why God ever permitted sin to be expressed.

a. There is no revelation in answer to this question so far as it relates to the angels. b. There is indeed but little revelation on the subject relative to men. The varied suggestions listed below, however, may be studied:

(1) Sin was allowed to intrude so as to secure a race possessed of that virtue which is due to a free-will decision for good rather than evil. God knows perfectly all things, but man must learn by means of experience or revelation (Gen. 3:22). Christ accordingly is said, on the human side, to have learned by experience (Heb. 2:10; 5:8). How, then, can man come to the possession of knowledge which sees a difference between good and evil? He evidently must learn what God knows in order to apprehend. How can man know what God recognizes about sin and its character without the appearing of sin? Is not this manifestation of evil a necessity if the divine ideal which man represents is to be realized? To what lengths of sin and its consequences must humanity go, however, for this end to be realized? Must evil still be condemned by God and judged? Should it be excused on the ground that God must permit it for a purpose of His, it no longer demonstrates the infinite character of evil; hence the full expression of sin is demanded and its eternal punishment as well.

(2) Holy angels may benefit from the tragedy of sin to be observed on the earth (Eph. 3:10–11; Heb. 12:1; 1 Pet. 1:12).

(3) The claims of evil principles demand experimental testing rather than mere denunciation from God, in order for every mouth to be stopped (cf. Rom. 3:19).

(4) Divine hatred of sin must be revealed (Rom. 9:22).

(5) To display the riches of divine grace in all the ages to come (Eph. 2:7–8; cf. Luke 7:47 as an illustration), sin had to come into manifestation.

c. What, then, is the moral relation which God sustained to the permission of sin? Evidently He must allow sin to be expressed that man, His unique creation, may become what God intended him to be.

d. What, consequently, is the moral relation of man to the evil which God has permitted? It must be to him as wicked as revelation and experience disclose it to be.

4. Important Facts. a. God's own character is holy and everyone of His ways perfect (1 John 1:5).

b. Sin is exceedingly sinful. It proves infinite in its evil character since it is committed against the infinite God. Note here in proof: (1) Satan's first sin and its effects, (2) Adam's first sin and its effects, and (3) the infinite sacrifice of Christ as the requirement to cure sin.

c. God's purpose is not to avoid sin, but to secure blood-cleansed sinners in the glory.

5. Divine Judgment. God's condemnation of evil covers four universal aspects thereof: a. Imputed sin with its penalty of death, which comes directly to each individual from God because of participation in Adam's sin (Rom. 5:12–21). This type of sin comes immediately to every individual and is the only cause for the universality of physical death.

b. The sin nature. Transmitted sin and its effects as manifest in a fallen nature, spiritual death, and depravity, are received mediately from Adam through physical generation.

c. The estate under sin. Herein God, for purposes of pure grace, refuses to receive any merit from man as a contribution to his salvation (Rom. 3:9; 11:32; Gal. 3:22). This aspect of sin is limited to one age only, the present era.

d. Personal sin. This kind of evil is cured by blood sacrifice alone. Three general divisions of the theme may be observed: (1) sins done *aforetime* or before the cross and *at this time* (Rom. 3:25–26), (2) sins of the unsaved and of the saved, (3) Christ's death *for* sins and His dying *unto* sin (Rom. 6:10; 1 Pet. 3:18).

Seven ways of divine dealing with the guilt of personal sin are to be noted: (1) it is removed from the condemned as far as the east is from the west (Ps. 103:12), (2) cast behind His back (Isa. 38:17), (3) sought for and not found (Jer. 50:20), (4) cast into the depths of the sea (Mic. 7:19), (5) forgiven, including all past, present, and future conduct (Col. 2:13), (6) remembered in heaven no more (Heb. 10:17), (7) removed by cleansing (1 John 1:7).

SONSHIP

1. Several factors appear when considering the doctrine of sonship. Sonship involves an actual begetting on the part of parents, resulting in legitimate sonship and legitimate parenthood if done lawfully. Note the latitude in Old Testament use of *son*.

2. Sonship represents that into which one enters when he is saved and admitted to the family of God (John 1:12–13; 3:5; Rom. 8:16–17, 29; Gal. 3:26; 2 Pet. 1:4). This is likewise a legitimate and actual generation.

3. Sonship may apply at times to no more than the creation (Ex. 4:22; 2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 103:13; Mal. 2:10; Luke 3:38; Acts 17:29).

4. Observe, too, the five sonships of Christ. He was Son of God from all eternity, but He became Son of man by incarnation (John 20:17).

a. Son of God. This sonship declares Him the only begotten who is the unique Son, the first-begotten from all eternity (Matt. 16:16).

b. The Son of Adam, the Son of man. The human aspect of Christ's sonship is revealed here (Matt. 8:20).

c. The Son of Abraham. This sonship relates Him to the Abrahamic covenant (Matt. 1:1) .

d. The Son of David. Thus is Christ related to the Davidic covenant (Matt. 21:9).

e. The Son of Mary. This sonship relates to the incarnation (Matt. 1:25).

SOUL AND SPIRIT

The truth respecting the immaterial part of man has to do with soul and spirit.

1. ORIGIN. Three theories may be considered here:

a. Pre-existence. Transmigration of souls lies at the bottom of this view.

b. Creation. Soul and spirit of man are created at birth according to this position.

c. Traducian. Soul and spirit are generated the same as the body, this interpretation maintains.

2. DISTINCTIONS. *Soul* connotes that in the immaterial part of man which is related to life, action, emotion. *Spirit* is that part within related to worship, communion, divine influence.

a. Often interchangeable, as in the case of σῶμα and σάρξ too, πνεῦμα and ψυχή may be used thus.

(1) The same function may be ascribed to each (cf. Mark 8:12; John 11:33 and 13:21 with Matt. 26:38 and John 12:27; 1 Cor. 16:18 and 2 Cor. 7:13 with Matt. 11:29; 2 Cor. 7:1 with 1 Pet. 2:11; 1 Thess. 5:23 with Heb. 10:39; James 5:20 with 1 Cor. 5:5 and 1 Pet. 4:5).

(2) The departed are sometimes mentioned as *soul* and sometimes as *spirit* (Gen. 35:18; 1 Kings 17:21; John 10:17; Acts 2:27, 31; 20:10; Rev. 6:9; Rev. 20:4 with Matt. 27:50; John 19:30; Acts 5:5, 10; Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 3:18).

(3) God is said to be *soul* (Isa. 42:1; Jer. 9:9; Amos 6:8, Hebrew; Matt. 12:18; Heb. 10:38) and *spirit* (John 4:24).

b. *Soul* and *spirit* as synonymous terms are not always interchangeable. The soul is said to be lost, for example, but not the spirit. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit," not "soul." Note likewise *psuchikos* in 1 Cor. 2:14 and *pneumatikos* in 1 Cor. 2:15 (cf. 15:44; also, Jude 1:19 where "sensual" is from ψυχικός, defined as "having not the Spirit" or πνεῦμα).

c. When no technical distinctions are in view the Bible is dichotomous, but otherwise it is trichotomous (cf. Matt. 10:28; Acts 2:31; Rom. 8:10; 1 Cor. 5:3; 6:20; 7:34; Eph. 4:4; James 2:26; 1 Pet. 2:11).

SPIRIT, THE HOLY

The Holy Spirit is a designation applied to the third (equal) Person in the Trinity. Four general divisions for the doctrine of the Spirit vary according to time periods:

(1) The Old Testament. Characterized by sovereignty, the first period begins with the opening of Genesis. A very wide range of activity is indicated by this characterization. (2) Christ's days of ministry. Characterized as progressive, the Spirit's operations in this period may properly be so described because He was now working together with and through Christ. (3) The present age. Now He is indwelling and ministering to the Church in various ways. He became resident in the world on the Day of Pentecost. He began to form the Church at the same time and filled subsequently all who were prepared for that climactic blessing. Seven different ministries of the Spirit in the present dispensation are to be noted: restraining (2 Thess. 2:7), convicting (John 16:8), regenerating (John 3:5), indwelling or anointing (1 John 2:27), baptizing (1 Cor. 12:13), sealing (Eph. 1:13), and filling (Eph. 5:18). Several details may be recalled concerning the filling of the Spirit from Pneumatology: (a) the seven manifestations which constitute the filling, (b) the three conditions upon which one may be filled, and (c) the Old Testament type to be seen in Abraham's servant (Gen. 24:1–67). (4) The kingdom age (Acts 2:16–21; cf. Joel 2:28–32), wherein His ministry will be characterized by widespread witnessing.

SPIRITUALITY

The Greek for "he that is spiritual" —πνευματικός—is found twentyfive times in the New Testament. As related to man, spirituality represents that manner of life which is wrought *in* (not, *by*) the believer by the unhindered, indwelling Spirit of God (Rom. 8:4).

Πνευματικός is to be contrasted with ψυχικός (6 times this term has been used), meaning the natural, unregenerate, soulish (i.e., "sensual," James 3:15 or "having not the Spirit," Jude 1:19) man; and with σαρκικός (used 11 times), meaning one whose life is characterized by emphasis on the σάρξ.

A Christian may be either σαρκικός or πνευματικός, but not ψυχικός any more. From the ψυχικός state he has been saved by Christ; from the σαρκικός state he may be delivered by dependence on,

and right relation to, the indwelling Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14, ψυχικός, 2:15–16, πνευματικός, 3:1–4, σαρκικός).

An illustration of these spiritual truths may be found in 1 Corinthians 1:10–15:57. 1:10–11:34 has to do with the σαρκικός while 12:1–15:57 deals with the πνευματικός (cf. 12:1). In chapter 12 the term πνευματικός concerns things like (1) baptism (vss. 12–13) and (2) gifts conveyed by the Spirit (vs. 4), which gifts are bestowed in sovereign grace, and all equally honorable because given by God and energized by Him.

STANDING AND STATE

The two doctrines of Christian standing and daily life or state merge into one important truth, hence may be treated here together.

Standing, as distinguished from state or daily contact with Christ, is a reference to Christian position—the unchangeable and perfect work of God for the believer, while *state* refers to the changing and imperfect condition of his soul from moment to moment. Faith secures standing, but adherence to all the laws governing a spiritual life must secure daily benefits for the soul.

For Scriptures relating to the believer's standing consult: John 1:12; Romans 5:1–2; 8:17; 1 Corinthians 6:19; 12:13; Ephesians 1:3, 6, 11, 13; 2:4–6; 5:30; Colossians 2:10; Hebrews 10:19; 1 Peter 1:4–5; 2:9; 1 John 3:2; 5:1, 13; Revelation 1:5–6. Compare 1 Corinthians 1:2–9 as a reference to standing with 1:11; 3:1–4; 4:18; and 5:2, where state is revealed; 1 Corinthians 6:11 with 6:7; 1 Corinthians 6:15a with 6:15b; 1 Corinthians 16:23 with 16:17; Colossians 1:12–13 with 3:8–9a.

All that enters into the believer's experience after he is saved—divine training and development—is to the end that he may be more conformed in his state to what he possesses in standing from the moment he is saved.

STEWARDSHIP

Stewardship is a New Testament doctrine governing benevolence, and stands in sharp contrast to the Old Testament plan of tithing while equally differentiated from mere random giving. The doctrine of stewardship directs a Christian in matters of receiving, earning, and spending. It is an essential outworking of the principles of grace in contrast to those of law. Grace begets a family relationship in which all that is done by God to His child or by the child to God will be motivated only by love. The elements of bargain and trade, earnings and wages, or supposed just dues in return for service, are excluded when love constitutes the sole motive. The subject may be divided then as follows:

1. Three Greek Words. Bond servants in the Grecian home might be honored with high responsibilities, but they were never free from slavery, nor did they ever possess anything of their own. Three New Testament words for servant responsibility are:

a. παιδαγωγός (Gal. 3:24–25). This was a slave charged, not with the education, but the training and discipline of children of his master.

b. ἐπίτροπος (Matt. 20:8; Luke 8:3; Gal. 4:2); compare ἐπίσκοπος (Acts 20:28), a slave charged with the oversight of all his master's estate.

c. οἰκονομία (Luke 16:2–4; cf. *dispensation* in 1 Cor. 9:17; Eph. 1:10; 3:2; Col. 1:25). Compare also, οἰκόνομος (Luke 12:42; 16:1, 3, 8; Rom. 16:23; 1 Cor. 4:1–2; Gal. 4:2; Titus 1:7; 1 Pet. 4:10), a slave charged with the pecuniary affairs of his master.

There were stewards in the Old Testament (Gen. 15:2), but these did not represent the ideal of Old Testament benevolence (Gen. 24:2; 39:4). The tither of the Old Testament, having paid his tenth, was in sole authority over the remaining nine-tenths. The child of God under grace is a bondslave dispensing his Master's goods—"Ye are not your own" and "What hast thou that thou didst not receive?" (1 Cor. 4:7; 6:19–20; 1 Pet. 1:18).

2. The Divine Example.

a. THE FATHER (John 3:16; Rom. 6:23; 8:32).

b. THE SON (John 6:32–33; 10:28; 15:13; Acts 20:35; 2 Cor. 8:2). Never is the divine giving an example of tithing or partial giving.

3. New Testament Giving. Christ gave unstintingly (2 Cor. 8:9). The believer should be generous in the same way (2 Cor. 9:8). Such giving should be wrought by the Spirit, not legally or out of necessity —"for God loveth a cheerful [Greek, 'hilarious'] giver" (vs. 7). This is not difficult to do when it has been accepted and realized that all money is His and that the steward but administers the financial affairs of his Master. Note the motives implied in Ephesians 4:28 and 1 John 3:17.

4. Personal Aspects.

a. ACQUIRING MONEY. (1) The human consideration —"The labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke 10:7; 1 Tim. 5:18); "Be not slothful in business" (Rom. 12:11). (2) The divine consideration —"Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31). Regardless of channels or agencies through which money is received, all the benefit comes directly from Him (1 Sam. 2:7; 1 Kings 3:11–13; Phil. 4:13–19; 1 Tim. 6:6–8; Heb. 13:5).

b. DISPENSING MONEY. The Spirit directs everything, even the use of money for one's personal needs or keeping it for some future need. Be led, then, of the Spirit. It is no longer to be a question like, What can I spare? but like, What is His will? The steward must decide for himself as led of the Spirit, and not by reason of solicitation or outside influence. To be a "hilarious" giver is indeed altogether possible (2 Cor. 9:7).

5. Problems in Finance.

a. SECURING FUNDS. Some counsel ought to be given. (1) The principle adopted may be one of solicitation or of "silent faith." (2) If solicitors are used, have due regard for the individual donor's rights to give or withhold as led by the Spirit. (3) In the method which chooses to receive offerings danger will not be absent.

(4) As God hath prospered him, the believer should be told to share (1 Cor. 16:2).

b. DISPOSING OF FUNDS. A great trust is committed to the believers who dispose of funds.

6. Danger of Riches. Those who long to be rich, lusting for possessions (Luke 12:16–21; 16:19–31; 18:18–30; 1 Tim. 6:6–10; James 5:1–6), run into serious danger. Compare other motives for seeking money such as to provide for others or to provide for self when pressed with large responsibilities.

7. True Riches. Note the following Scriptures on this point: Luke 12:21; 2 Corinthians 8:9; Ephesians 1:7; 3:16; 1 Timothy 6:18; James 2:5; Revelation 3:18. The central passage on New Testament stewardship is 2 Corinthians 8 and 9.

STONE

Stone is a symbol used of Christ. It may be applied to Him in three ways, as—

1. Related to the Gentiles in final judgment (Dan. 2:34).

2. Related to the Church by reason of being (a) her Foundation (1 Cor. 3:11) and (b) Chief Cornerstone (Eph. 2:20–22; 1 Pet. 2:4–5).

3. Related to Israel (Isa. 8:14–15; Matt. 21:44; Rom. 9:32–33; 1 Cor. 1:23; 1 Pet. 2:8). Note then in general: Since Christ did not come at first in the guise of an earthly king, He became a stumbling stone to Israel; the Church is built upon Christ as her foundation and cornerstone; the Gentiles will be broken by Christ in judgment. Past, present, and future aspects of the symbolism become apparent here.

SUBSTITUTION

Substitution is not a Biblical term (cf. Trinity, incarnation, etc.), but a Biblical doctrine nonetheless.

1. Old Testament Type. a. In general, every animal sacrifice offered during Old Testament times substituted for the offender. All this was accordingly a type of Christ dying in the room and stead of the sinner.

b. The sweet savor and non-sweet savor offerings of Leviticus, chapters 1–5, indicate that two accomplishments are to be noticed in Christ's substitution:

(1) The non-sweet savor oblations were, first, the sin offering and, second, the trespass offering. In these the perfection of the offering itself had to be insisted upon since Christ the Antitype is perfect in Himself, but of course, at the same time, the offering is invested with the sin of the offerer. They are called non-sweet savor offerings since God cannot look upon sin with allowance whatsoever. In fulfilling this type of sacrifice Christ cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46).

(2) Sweet savor offerings were three in number: first, the burnt offering, second, the meal offering, and third, the peace offering. In these were depicted an aspect of Christ's death which was a delight to His Father, as it has been suggested in Hebrews 9:14: He "offered himself without spot to God." Here is substitution in the sense that God requires of the believer, not merely that he should

have *no sins* (as typified by the non-sweet savor offerings), but that he indeed should have done *all good*. These three offerings, consequently, suggest how the perfection of Christ may be accepted of God for a Christian. They are sweet to God since only Christ's perfections are in view, and manifestly as such they could apply to the elect alone.

2. New Testment Doctrine. Again the same twofold conception obtains. The Scriptures state the doctrine fully.

a. Sweet savor (Phil. 2:8; Heb. 9:11–14; 10:5–7).

b. Non-sweet savor (Rom. 3:23–26; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:24; 3:18; cf. Ps. 22:1; Matt. 27:46).

3. Determining Prepositions. a. The Greek ὑπέρ often has a restricted meaning, as *for another's good, in another's behalf* (cf. Luke 22:19–20; John 10:15; Rom. 5:8; Gal. 3:13; 1 Tim. 2:6; Titus 2:14; Heb. 2:9; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18; 4:1) . Actual substitution is not included at bottom in the word, but from usage it doubtless came to be so intended anyway.

b. ἀντί. Here the thought of substitution is clear (Matt. 20:28; Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Tim. 6:2; Heb. 12:2, 16; 1 Pet. 3:9).

SUFFERING

The doctrine of suffering divides naturally into two sections, one for each Testament. In the Old Testament division appear two main points: the sufferings of Christ as seen in type and prophecy and the sufferings of godly men as seen in the book of Job pre-eminently.

The Book of Job, earliest of all the books of the Bible perhaps to be written, is devoted to the knotty problem of suffering. Any little child who has had the advantage of discipline can tell why bad people suffer, but to tell why a good person suffers is a far different matter. Job did not suffer because he was sinful. This contention was the wrong interpretation placed on his sufferings by the three friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, their contention being that he was afflicted as a punishment for evil in conduct. When job's sufferings were completed, Jehovah refused to have anything to do with the three friends until the patriarch lovingly offered sacrifices for them. Jehovah's declaration made it plain that they had not spoken the thing which was right (Job 42:7). In the light of the obvious fact that much interpretation of Job's affliction by the commentators has been to present him as an evil person needing to be punished, one wonders who will offer sacrifices for the commentators. It should not be forgotten that, at least three times, Jehovah testified to the spiritual maturity or perfection of His servant Job (1:1, 8; 2:3). To him therefore was given the high privilege of defending the worthiness of God apart from all benefits, as against the presumptuous claims of Satan to the contrary. Beginning with chapter 32, furthermore, in the progress of all the discussion presented, a young man named Elihu interrupts to set forth his theory that suffering is educational or a discipline; by it a good man, he said, may become a better man. Apparently this was quite all that Job ever recognized in the value of his suffering (Job 42:5–6). Right here the patriarch, to be sure, very closely approaches the New Testament doctrine of suffering, which may be divided as follows:

1. The sufferings of Christ were infinite. They came from two sources. a. What Christ suffered from the Father, in which no other can share (2 Cor. 5:21). b. What Christ suffered from men, in which others may share (John 15:18–20).

2. The believer may suffer with Christ (Matt. 10:25; John 15:18–19; Acts 9:15–16; Rom. 8:16–18; 9:1–3; Phil. 2:5–11; Col. 1:24; 2 Tim. 2:11–12; 1 Pet. 4:12–16). In Romans 9:1–3 suffering with Christ is seen to be a sharing of His burden for lost men. Suffering with Him proves a natural phase of a Christian's life and experience, for he is sojourning in an enemy's land, is called to be a witness against its sin, and is summoned to labor that souls may be saved from its evil and darkness. "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John 15:18–19). To those who did not believe on Him, on the other hand, it was said: "The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil" (John 7:7). "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" (Matt. 10:25). "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world" (John 17:18). "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy" (1 Pet. 4:12–13).

So, also, as can be learned from these passages too, suffering with Christ here is the only possible path into the reward of being glorified together with Him over there. This does not mean working to earn salvation, for salvation cannot be gained by any degree of human suffering. It is rather that effort for which the glorious crown and reward will be given to the faithful because of their copartnership with Christ. Such a truth is brought out by the following passage: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:5–11).

Here it is implied, as the Apostle continues, that the believer should allow the mind of Christ to be reproduced in him by the power of God (Phil. 2:13), for the seven successive steps in the path of Christ from His native place in the glory to the felon's death on the cross were doubtless reviewed by Paul in order that such steps may be admitted in the Christian's life, as one who is to be "as his Lord" even in this world. It is also implied that, simply because of close relation to Jesus in suffering, there will be an identity with Him in all His glory. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:16–18). "It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: if we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us" (2 Tim. 2:11–12).

Suffering was the ministry to which Paul was appointed by the Lord through the disciple Ananias, when the Lord commanded him to visit Paul: "Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake" (Acts 9:15–16).

Hence it may be concluded that, while all the mystery of suffering is not explained and probably cannot be, it is an essential part of the believer's life and union with Christ in this world and likewise of identification with Him in the glory.

3. The believer may suffer because of having to be chastened of the Father. This may be something

a. Preventative (2 Cor. 12:1–10; cf. Rom. 8:34).

b. Corrective (Heb. 12:3–15), having as possible results both holiness and the peaceable fruit of righteousness (cf. also John 15:2; 1 Cor. 11:29–32; 1 John 5:16).

c. Educational. Christians may be enlarged in their spiritual life by suffering (John 15:2). Even though a Son, Christ learned obedience by the things which He suffered (Heb. 5:8).

T

TABERNACLE AND TEMPLE

1. The Tabernacle. Moses' tabernacle presents the most exhaustive single item of Old Testament typology. Therefore, it figures largely in New Testament interpretation (cf. Heb. 9–10) with special reference to Christ and every feature of it important. Indeed it presents inexhaustible material for study as a type.

2. The Temple. a. No typology of the temple is expounded in the New Testament other than the following intimations or usage: (1) *Temple,* or as some would translate—*sanctuary,* is used of the temple in Jerusalem (Matt. 23:16, etc.).

(2) *Temple* is also an expression used for the believer's body (1 Cor. 3:16–17; 6:19).

(3) The local church likewise is construed as a temple of God (2 Cor. 6:16).

(4) The true Church too is so reckoned (Eph. 2:21).

b. *Hieron* is distinguished from *naos* as a word for 'temple' as grounds are distinct from a residence built on them (John 2:14–15; cf. vss. 19–21).

c. The following data should also be observed:

(1) The Mosaic tabernacle (translated *temple,* 1 Sam. 1:9; 3:3) lasted around 500 years, right up to the time of the first Jewish temple which it replaced.

(2) Solomon's temple (1 Kings 6:1–38) lasted nearly 400 years and was destroyed finally by Nebuchadnezzar.

(3) Zerubbabel's temple (Ezra 6:15–18) lasted about 500 years and then was destroyed by Antiochus Epiphanes.

(4) Herod's Temple (John 2:19) was forty-six years in building and lasted eighty-five years. It was destroyed by Titus the Roman.

(5) The temple of God (2 Thess. 2:4) is to be built by Jews of the end times and occupied by the "man of sin."

(6) The millennial temple (Ezek. 40–44) is to be set up by the returning Messiah.

(7) The heavenly temple (Rev. 21:3, 22) is nothing but the presence of God in new Jerusalem.

(8) The human body (John 2:19–21; 1 Cor. 3:16–17; 6:19) is accounted a veritable temple.

(9) The living stones (Eph. 2:19–22) which believers are accounted forms a temple.

TEMPTATION

The Greek πειράζω means *to test* or *to make trial*, and is used about fifty times in the New Testament. It may signify probing to ascertain character and virtue (Matt. 6:13; Luke 4:2; John 6:6; 2 Cor. 13:5) or to reveal weakness and evil (Gal. 6:1). God cannot be tempted in the way of evil (note the negative compound *apeirastos* of James 1:13). The general classifications of testing in the Bible are: **1. Of Men.** a. Temptations may prove a solicitation to evil (1 Cor. 7:5; 10:13; Gal. 6:1; 1 Thess. 3:5; 1 Tim. 6:9; James 1:14).

b. Testing may also come in the direction of virtue itself (Gen. 22:1; Matt. 6:13; 26:41; Gal. 4:14; Heb. 11:37; James 1:2, 12; 1 Pet. 1:6; 2 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 3:10) .

2. Of God. Scripture has declared it twenty-seven times that God was put to the test. God is not tempted by solicitation to evil (James 1:13), but He may be tried as happened in Acts 15:10 and as Christ was tested (which it will be shown was not to find evil in Him, but to prove His virtue).

a. God the Father (Matt. 4:7; Acts 15:10).

b. God the Son (Luke 4:1–13; Heb. 2:18; 4:15; cf. John 14:30).

c. God the Spirit (Acts 5:9).

3. Of Christ. a. Here it is necessary to distinguish between "able not to sin" and "not able to sin." Impeccability means the latter. Christ alone among men was not able to sin.

b. Christ was theanthropic, possessing both human and divine natures. The divine nature, to be sure, is neither peccable nor temptable (James 1:13). Some teach accordingly that the impeccability was due to His omnipotence and omniscience, or having infinite power and wisdom to maintain holiness. In other words, He was not able to sin because of the divine nature.

c. His other nature, by reason of being human, was both peccable and temptable, even apart from the influence of a fallen, sin nature which He necessarily did not share with the race (Heb. 4:15); but of course what His human nature might have produced had it been alone and unsupported by the divine is only conjecture. The human element in Christ certainly was never separated from the divine; still, the divine proved ever the dominant factor in His theanthropic being. He was not a man, then, to whom the divine nature had been added. He rather was God, who took upon Him by incarnation the form of a man. He became thereafter an indivisible Person. Whatever either nature did, His whole being did. No other such person ever existed and there will never be another. Because of the presence of His divine nature with manhood, then, He is incomparable. He could not be rendered peccable by the presence of His human nature: instead He was an impeccable, theanthropic Person. Had His humanity sinned, God would have sinned. A wire may be bent when alone, but not after it is welded into an unbendable bar of steel. His humanity could not contradict or dishonor His Deity.

d. If He, nevertheless in virtue of being both divine and human, was at the same time both omnipotent and impotent, omniscient and ignorant, infinite and finite, unlimited and limited, could it not be truthfully said that He was both impeccable and peccable? As human, it may be replied, He could be impotent, ignorant, finite, and limited without compromising Deity in the matter of sin; but He could hardly be peccable without so doing. And actually He did suffer weakness, pain, hunger, thirst, weariness, and even death, but without compromising Deity in sin.

e. An impeccable person can be tempted in the same sense that an unconquerable city may be attacked. Christ was tempted, but through it only proved to everyone His impeccability. Being God,

after all, He *could not* sin (cf. John 14:30).

f. If peccable on earth, He would be peccable also in heaven (Heb. 13:8). How well, then, would the Christian's standing and security be grounded?

THRONE

The word *throne* comes from θρόνος (used fifty times) and from βῆμα (appearing once, Acts 12:21). For the other passages with βῆμα see Matthew 27:19; John 19:13; Acts 18:12, 16–17; 25:6, 10, 17; Romans 14:10; 2 Corinthians 5:10, all of which render it "judgment seat." Compare κριτήριον in James 2:6—"tribunal of judgment."

The various thrones of Scripture to be distinguished are those— **1. Of God** (Matt. 5:34; Acts 7:49; Rev. 4:2). His government is like a mountain eminence (Isa. 2:2). There Christ is seated for the present (Heb. 8:1; Rev. 3:21).

2. Of David (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:36; Luke 1:32). This is the earthly throne to which Christ has fallen heir and on which He will yet be seated (Ps. 2:6). Note its literal, earthly, and eternal character in Scripture. A throne of glory it is for Him (Matt. 19:28; 25:31). The Church will be seated with Christ on His throne (Rev. 3:21) .

3. Of Christian Appraisal. This judgment seat of Christ (Rom. 14:10; 1 Cor. 3:9–15; 2 Cor. 5:10) is needed to appraise the service which believers have rendered.

4. Of Final Judgment (Rev. 20:11–15).

5. Of Satan (Rev. 2:13—'seat' renders θρόνος; cf. Matt. 12:26; Col. 1:16). Note that Satan has an earthly throne.

6. Of the Twelve Apostles (Luke 22:30).

7. Of the Nations (Luke 1:52).

8. Of Grace (Heb. 4:16).

9. Of the Church (Rev. 4:4).

TITHING

(See STEWARDSHIP)

Tithing, or giving to God a tenth, is one practice antedating the law and still to this day a common usage.

1. Before Moses (Gen. 14:17–20; cf. Heb. 7:1–10).

2. In the Law. The tithe became, in the main, God's method of support for the Levites and priests. Tradition added much more to the law of tithing than it required originally (Matt. 23:23; Luke

11:42).

3. In Contrast to Grace. Under grace, benevolence will function "not of necessity" or because of any law requirement; rather does the Christian make his contribution "as he purposeth in his heart" (2 Cor. 9:7) and "as God hath prospered" (1 Cor. 16:2). Not all giving which avoids the mere tithe, however, is grace giving.

TONGUES

The doctrine of languages or tongues has several divisions, as follows: **1. Babel.** The first, universal language of man was confounded at Babel, from which event human languages sprang (Gen. 11:1–9). As another miraculous demonstration of His presence and power much later, God bestowed the gift of tongues, which appeared in the early church as recorded by the New Testament. The gift of tongues, however, the great Apostle predicted would cease (1 Cor. 13:8; cf. Mark 16:17; Acts 10:44–46; 11:15; 19:6; 1 Cor. 12–14).

2. Regulations for Glossolalia. The divine directions given for the use of tongues are seven: a. Tongues must be addressed to God (1 Cor. 14:2, 28).

b. The utterance must be prayer (1 Cor. 14:14).

c. The element of thanksgiving must be present (1 Cor. 14:15–17).

d. Tongues can be understood only by interpretation (1 Cor. 14:2, 5–6).

e. One must interpret—the complementary gift—if there is to be any use of the tongues gift (1 Cor. 14:28).

f. Only two at most at one service may exercise the gift (1 Cor. 14:27).

g. Women are to keep silent in church (1 Cor. 14:34).

During the history of the church there have been sporadic outbursts of a type of movement purporting to speak in tongues. This form of supernatural phenomena has sometimes been employed in order to establish serious error or false doctrine. It is so used by some, doubtless, at the present time.

3. Pentecost. At Pentecost God had assembled Jews from all countries under heaven, for them to hear the gospel in their own tongue. The implication is that they returned to their own countries, bearing the message heard, thus obviating the long delay which a missionary's experience in learning the language of the people to whom he goes would have caused. It was in the power of God to reverse the experience of Babel, which He evidently did for a time in Jerusalem this day. Tongue gifts appeared in connection with the giving of the gospel to the Jews on Pentecost at Jerusalem (Acts 2:1–21), later at Samaria (Acts 8:14–17), and finally in giving the message to the Gentiles at Cornelius' house (Acts 10:44–48).

4. Of Angels. The Apostle speaks of the tongues of angels, of which, naturally, nothing can be known (1 Cor. 13:1) .

TRANSFIGURATION

The word for *transfigure*—μεταμορφόομαι—is used both of Christ and Christians.

1. Of Christ. Jesus Christ's transfiguration is reported in each Synoptic Gospel (Matt. 17:1–13; Mark 9:2–13; Luke 9:28–36). Related to the prophetic office of Christ as it is, every report of this transfiguring records the command from heaven, "Hear ye him."

2. Its Meaning. The record of Christ's transfiguration is preceded every time by the words: "There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. 16:28). Note as agreeable to this word Peter's interpretation of the meaning of the transfiguration episode (2 Peter 1:16–18). The elements of the Messianic kingdom were surely present for the transfiguration: (a) a glorified Christ, (b) glorified saints like Moses and Elijah—one having left the earth by death and one by the process of translation earlier, (c) Jews still on the earth but enjoying all the light of the glory—as seen in the three disciples.

3. Its Purpose. As the kingdom preaching was coming to its end because of the rejection and imminent death of the King, it became necessary to encourage the disciples in the expectation that the Messianic kingdom would yet be set up according to covenant promise, later if not at once. The transfiguration bore out this certainty.

4. Of the Saints. The word *transfigure* is used twice as an appeal to believers (Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 3:18). How is it to be distinguished from the word "transform"? A thing may be transformed by a light shining on it from without, of course, but a transfiguration is the shining forth of a light from within. The first appeal to believers, then, is for them to let the light of the divine nature shine forth unhindered (see Christology) from within, now that they have become partakers thereof. In the 2 Corinthians passage is revealed the nature of the divinely wrought change being enjoined.

TRIBULATION

The Greek for *tribulation*—θλίψις—is used forty-two times in the New Testament. It has been translated by the words *tribulation* (21 times), *affliction* (17 times), *anguish* (1 time), *burden* (1 time), and *trouble* (3 times). There are two common meanings for the term: (1) trial of any kind and (2) the (great) tribulation. The tribulation indeed is one of the major highways of prophecy, which may be traced through Scripture as follows: Deuteronomy 4:29–30; Jeremiah 30:4–7; Daniel 12:1; Matthew 24:9–26; 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12; Revelation 3:10; 6:1–19:6. See also Psalm 2:5; Isaiah 2:10–22; 13:9–16; 24:21–23; 26:20–21; 34:1–17; 43:1–6; 49:15–24; Jeremiah 25:29–38; Ezekiel 30:3; Amos 5:18–20; Obadiah 1:15–21; Zephaniah 1:7–18; Zechariah 12:1–14; 14:1–4; Malachi 4:1–4.

The great tribulation is the period known as Daniel's seventieth week (Dan. 9:24–27), the order of events being the same in Daniel as in Matthew 24 and in 2 Thessalonians 2. The final week or heptad is seven years in duration, which is proved by the fact that it was exactly 69×7 years between the order to rebuild Jerusalem and the cutting off of Messiah. This remaining seventieth "week" of years belongs to Israel's age and will be characterized by the same general conditions as obtained in the past Jewish age. The time is to be shortened a little (Matt. 24:22). It is known as "the time of Jacob's trouble" (Jer. 30:4–7) out of which Israel will be saved.

The great tribulation is the time of God's unavoidable judgments on a Christ-rejecting world (Ps. 2:5). It is characterized by: 1. The removal of the Holy Spirit together with the Church from the earth (2 Thess. 2:7).

2. The casting of Satan into, thus restricting him to, the earth (Rev. 12:9–12).

3. The development of sin which was hitherto restrained (2 Thess. 2:11).

4. The rule of the man of sin (John 5:43).

5. Termination by the second coming of Christ, the battle of Armageddon, and the smiting stone of Daniel 2.

TRINITY

The word *Trinity* is not a Bible term, though unquestionably a Bible truth. As a doctrine it divides thus: **1. In the Old Testament.** The emphasis of the Old Testament is upon divine unity. But even there a divine plurality may be seen in the meaning of *Elohim* (cf. Deut. 6:4), a plurality of persons and unity of essence.

2. In the New Testament. The New Testament lays its emphasis upon the individual Persons of the Trinity and their separate responsibilities for the purposes of redemption, yet here too there are occasional references to divine oneness of essence (cf. Matt. 28:19).

TYPES

The word *type* may be defined as "a divinely purposed illustration of some truth" (*Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 4), accordingly a prophetic act, institution, person, thing, or ceremonial. The words for *type* are: **1.** τύπος, meaning "a blow, or the imprint thus made which may serve as a pattern." Note the various translations of this word root: a. *Ensample* (1 Cor. 10:11; Phil. 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:7; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1 Pet. 5:3).

b. *Example* (1 Cor. 10:6; 1 Tim. 4:12; Heb. 8:5).

c. *Figure* (Acts 7:43; Rom. 5:14).

d. *Pattern* (Titus 2:7).

e. *Print* (of the nails, John 20:25).

2. ὑπόδειγμα. This word has the same resultant meaning in general as τύπος (John 13:15; Heb. 4:11; 8:5; 9:23; James 5:10; 2 Pet. 2:6).

3. Doctrinal Import. (a) The great field of truth involved in types is full of instruction. (b) There must, however, be careful recognition of what makes something a true type. Only that so treated in the Bible can be received as typical beyond all question. Some things only illustrate truth,

but do not foreshadow or serve as a type. Compare all that is mere congruity, analogy, or a parallel of truth.

4. Various Classifications. A type may be: a. A person (Rom. 5:14), as Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, Sarah, Ishmael, Isaac, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon.

b. An event (1 Cor. 10:11), as the preservation of Noah and his sons, redemption from Egypt, the Passover memorial, the exodus, the passage through the Red Sea, the finding of manna, securing the water drawn from the rock, lifting up the brazen serpent, and all the sacrifices blessed of God.

c. A thing of some kind (Heb. 10:20), as the tabernacle, the laver, the lamb of sacrifice, Jordan, a city like Babylon, or a nation like Egypt.

d. An institution (Heb. 9:11), as the Sabbath, animal sacrifice, Melchizedek priesthood, David's kingdom.

e. A ceremonial (1 Cor. 5:7), like all Old Testament appointments for the service of God.

5. Important Distinctions. Careful distinctions must be drawn so as to avoid mere flights of fancy. a. Types are found in the Old Testament, and there mostly in the Pentateuch, they cover the wide range of truth and subjects named above.

b. Strictly speaking, a type is that which has been so indicated in the Bible. 1 Corinthians 10:11, however, is of great import in this connection.

c. Types are one of three binding factors to link together the two Testaments: (1) types, (2) prophecies, and (3) continuity of truth.

d. Types are predictions because they foreshadow what was future at the time of the Old Testament.

e. Types are as much inspired as any of the Scriptures and are intended of God for either admonition or instruction.

f. Christ is the outstanding antitype in all typology.

W

WILL

Will is that faculty in a rational, conscious being by which he has power to choose a course of action and continue in it. Consideration should be given to two general divisions of the Bible doctrine.

1. Of God. The will of God is either what may be called directive or permissive.

a. Directive. This form of the divine will includes within its scope the doctrines of decree, election, predestination, and foreordination.

b. Permissive. In the permissive will of God He is seen allowing man his own choice of that which might be a mere second-best or even of what might be evil ways.

God's will is the standard with which to measure all that is esteemed right in motive, design, and execution. Man's highest end is realized when he conforms to God's will. Even Christ came not to do His own will, but only the will of the Father. There is nothing higher for man than to find and do the will of God. Heaven always has a specific purpose for the bringing of each person into the world, and that purpose comprehends every moment of life.

2. Of Man. The major distinction between Calvinistic and Arminian systems of theology appears in their diverse understanding of man's will.

a. The will of man is but an instrument created by God and designed by Him for the execution of His own ends. The human will, accordingly, serves the divine purpose rather than hinders it.

b. The will is looked upon at times, on the human side, as sovereign and wholly accountable (John 7:17; cf. 6:44). For the exercise of the human will in the matter of salvation note Revelation 22:11, and for the use of the will in dedication, Romans 6:13. The will then is subject to various influences.

c. On the divine side, man's power to will is looked upon as under superior control, with the saved under the sovereign control of God (Phil. 2:13) and the unsaved under like control of Satan (Eph. 2:2).

3. General Facts. Three facts of a general nature ought to be observed. a. There is little reference to the will of angels outside Satan (cf. Jude 1:6, 9).

b. Satan's initial sin is well summarized under five "I will's" (Isa. 14:13–14).

c. There are seven "I will's" of Jehovah in the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 17:1–8), as elsewhere in the pledges made by God.

WOMAN

The origin of woman is given in Genesis 1:27 and 2:21–22, the reason for her creation in Genesis 2:18.

1. Relation to Man. Woman is included in the doctrine of man in the generic sense, and furthermore both sinned in Adam's fall. She is not to be considered as less important than man, but only as a different form of human creation from him.

2. In the Old Testament. Israel's women were honored above those of other nations, as may be learned from the commandment "Honour thy … mother." Considerable significance attaches to the great characters and names of Old Testament women like Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, Esther, Ruth.

3. In the New Testament. According to the New Testament the woman's place in relation to man calls for precise adjustment and recognition. Woman, as her position has been defined by the Scriptures, is in great peril when out of her sphere, which never becomes that of leadership. Some outstanding New Testament women are: Elizabeth, Mary the mother of Christ, the other Marys, Lydia, Priscilla, etc.

WORLD

The English terminology *world* is a translation of four widely differing ideas in the Greek original:

1. Κόσμος, meaning order and arrangement as in contrast to chaos (cf. how creation was perfect once but ere long became chaotic, Isa. 24:1; Jer. 4:23). Though the Septuagint uses κόσμος for each of several Hebrew words, there is nothing strictly equivalent to the Greek term. It seems to be a new conception for world in the apostolic Word, employed with new force. It is conceived of now as separate from God, though orderly by way of arrangement.

a. Use in Peter. The Apostle Peter refers to the world in its past, present, and future, using this terminology: (1) "the world that then was" (2 Pet. 3:5–6) before the flood, (2) "the heavens and the earth, which are now" (2 Pet. 3:7), (3) "new heavens and a new earth" (2 Pet. 3:13; cf. Isa. 64:22; 65:17; Rev. 21:1).

b. General Meaning. At least three general senses attach to this expression. (1) The material earth as a creation of God (Acts 17:24). (2) The inhabitants of the world. These are the ones whom God loved and for whom Christ died (John 3:16). (3) The institutions of men as set up independent of God and headed by Satan, that is, the satanic system organized upon principles of self, greed, armament, and commercialism. This is the world that God does not love and the believer is warned against loving (1 John 2:15–17). The word *kosmos* is used 176 times in all.

2. Οἰκουμένη, meaning the inhabited world, in contrast to that part of the globe which is uninhabited or barbarian. Here accordingly is the field of prophetic meaning and kingdom preaching (Matt. 24:14). The word is used fifteen times.

3. Αἰών (Matt. 12:32; 13:22, 39–40, 49; 21:19; 24:3; 28:20), meaning an age or period of time. This term originally indicated the span of man's life on the earth, later on any period of time, and even unbounded time, whether past or future. Its first New Testament connotation is of a definite

period designed, adjusted, and executed by God, i.e., a dispensation (Heb. 11:3). God framed the ages (cf. Heb. 1:2). Note also αἰώνιοις as used in the phrases “since the world began” (Rom. 16:25) and “before the world began” (2 Tim. 1:9; Titus 1:2). This third expression for *world* is used about 100 times.

4. Γῆ, meaning earth or land (Matt. 6:10; 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 2:14), should also be considered. This term is used many times.

Z

ZION

Zion was the ancient Jebusite stronghold in Jerusalem (see Jerusalem). It has a threefold significance in the Bible, including this original significance.

1. David's City. In the Old Testament the use of the term has reference to Israel and Jerusalem, the city of David (1 Chron. 11:5; Ps. 2:6; Isa. 2:3).

2. Heavenly City. The New Testament use has reference not only again to Israel (Rom. 11:26–27) but also to the new Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22–24). Into the latter the Church will be received.

3. Millennial City. The word as used in the following Scriptures has reference to the capital of the future kingdom age: Isaiah 1:27; 2:3; 4:1–6; Joel 3:16; Zechariah 1:16–17; 8:3–8; Romans 11:26.

Volume Eight

Biograhical Sketch & Index Acknowledgment

Grateful appreciation is extended for permission to use quotations from books copyrighted by the publishers and authors listed below: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc.—*The New Century Dictionary.*

John W. Bradbury—contribution written especially for this work.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.—*Encyclopaedia Britannica.*

Dr. E. Schuyler English—*Studies in the Gospel according to Matthew.*

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.—*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia.*

Funk & Wagnalls Co.—*New Standard Dictionary.*

Dr. Norman B. Harrison, The Harrison Service—*His Love.*

Loizeaux Brothers, Inc.—*Notes on Genesis,* by C. H. Mackintosh; *Notes on Exodus,* by C. H. Mackintosh; *Notes on Leviticus,* by C. H. Mackintosh; *Synopsis of the Books of the Bible,* by J. N. Darby; *Lectures on Daniel,* by H. A. Ironside; *Lectures on Revelation,* by H. A. Ironside; *Notes on Proverbs,* by H. A. Ironside; *Notes on the Minor Prophets,* by H. A. Ironside.

Moody Press—*Isaac and Rebekah,* by George E. Guille; *Scofield Correspondence Course.*

Dr. William R. Newell—*Romans Verse by Verse.*

Erling C. Olsen—*Meditations in the Psalms, Walks with Our Lord through John's Gospel.*

Our Hope—*Angels of God*, by A. C. Gaebelein; *Studies in Zechariah*, by A. C. Gaebelein; *Satan, His Person, His Work and His Destiny*, by F. C. Jennings; *Imperialism and Christ*, by Ford C. Ottman; *Unfolding the Ages*, by Ford C. Ottman.

Oxford University Press—*Biblical Doctrines*, by B. B. Warfield; *Christology and Criticism*, by B. B. Warfield; *Revelation and Inspiration*, by B. B. Warfield; *Studies in Theology*, by B. B. Warfield.

Fleming H. Revell Co.—*Christian Worker's Commentary*, by James M. Gray.

Charles Scribner's Sons—*The Sermon on the Mount*, by Martin Dibelius.

The Sunday School Times Co.—*The Sunday School Times.*

Dr. John F. Walvoord—*Outline of Christology; The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.*

Zondervan Publishing House—*The Critical and Explanatory Commentary*, by Jamieson, Fausset & Brown.

In the preparation of the indexes, the author was assisted by Mr. John A. Witmer, A.M., Th. M.

Table of Contents

Biographical Sketch Table of Contents, Volume I Table of Contents, Volume II Table of Contents,

Volume III Table of Contents, Volume IV

Table of Contents, Volume V

Table of Contents, Volume VI Author Index

Subject Index

Biographical Sketch

Biographical Sketch of the Author

By
C. F. Lincoln, A.M., TH.D.

Treasurer and Professor of English Bible
Dallas Theological Seminary The Reverend Lewis Sperry Chafer, D.D., Litt.D., was born at Rock Creek, Ashtabula County, Ohio, on February 27, 1871. He was reared in a devout Christian home, his immediate ancestors having been faithful ministers of the gospel.

His father, the Reverend Thomas Franklin Chafer, was graduated during the presidency of Jacob Tuckerman from Farmer's College, College Hill, Cincinnati, and from Auburn Theological Seminary with the class of 1864. He was born in the year 1829 and died during the fifty-third year of his life, in 1882, when Dr. Chafer was eleven years of age. William Chafer, the father of Thomas Franklin Chafer, and the paternal grandfather of Dr. Chafer, was born in York, England, and moved to the United States in the year 1837, when his son Thomas was eight years of age. He took up residence in the state of Kentucky and was long dedicated to farming in that section of the country.

Dr. Chafer's mother was Lois Lomira Sperry. She was born at Rock Creek, Ohio, on June 3, 1836, and died in the fall of the year 1915 at the age of seventy-nine when Dr. Chafer was forty-four years of age. Her father, Asa Sperry, was a licensed Welsh Wesleyan preacher, though he was a harness-maker by trade. Ann Sperry, of Irish descent, was the maternal grandmother of Dr. Chafer.

As a boy, Dr. Chafer attended the public schools of Rock Creek until he attained the age of twelve years. After that, from 1885 to 1888, he attended New Lyme Institute of New Lyme, Ohio. There was an orchestra or choral society at that institution and as a young student he was there first introduced to the serious study of music, in which art he became remarkably proficient. Later, when his widowed mother had removed to Oberlin, Ohio, for the education of her three children, as a young man Dr. Chafer attended Oberlin College and Conservatory of Music from 1889 to 1892. It was at Oberlin that Dr. Chafer met Ella Loraine Case, a devoted student of music and a deeply spiritual-minded young lady who later

became his beloved wife and faithful lifelong companion and coworker. At this time Dr. Chafer began travelling as a gospel singer with Evangelist Arthur T. Reed. This ministry continued for a period of about seven years, though during that time he was engaged to direct gospel music for other evangelists also. On April 22, 1896, Dr. Chafer was united in marriage to Miss Case whose home was in Ellington, Chautauqua County, New York. She at once took an active part in the ministry to which her husband was devoted, laboring with him as soloist and accompanist at the piano; in both of these services she was exceptionally gifted and thoroughly trained. In 1897, the year following his marriage, Dr. Chafer began his service as an evangelist, ministering in this work until the year 1914 both by preaching and singing. In the year 1900 Dr. Chafer was ordained to the gospel ministry by a Council of Congregational Ministers in the First Congregational Church of Buffalo. In 1903, due to his having taken up residence in East Northfield, Massachusetts, his ministerial relationship was removed to the Presbytery of Troy, New York. At that time Dr. C. I. Scofield was pastor of the Congregational Church of Northfield, which had been organized by D. L. Moody, and there was cemented between the two men a closeness of fellowship in the gospel that grew into an intimate companionship in the teaching ministry which lasted until Dr. Scofield's death in 1921. When Dr. Chafer moved to East Northfield he began at once his service as music leader, along with Ira Sankey, D. B. Towner, George Stebbins, and others, in the great Moody Summer Bible Conferences. Mrs. Chafer was official organist for the conferences. In the winter Dr. Chafer travelled out of Northfield in an ever widening evangelistic ministry, and his service in the Summer Conferences brought him into close touch with most of the great conservative Bible teachers of that period. In the year 1906 Dr. Chafer moved his ministerial relationship from the Troy Presbytery to that of the Orange Presbytery of North Carolina, and in the year 1916 he himself took up residence in East Orange, New Jersey. Some time after this, after a remarkable spiritual experience in the study of Dr. Scofield in Dallas, Texas, he definitely dedicated his life to an exacting study of the Bible. After an exceedingly fruitful Bible-teaching ministry which took him on repeated occasions to nearly every state in the union, Dr. Chafer removed to Dallas, Texas, in the year 1922, for the principal purpose of establishing the Dallas Theological Seminary. In the year 1924 the school

was founded with the cooperation and advice of Dr. A. B. Winchester of Toronto, and Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas of Philadelphia. Dr. Chafer was President of the Seminary from its beginning until the time of his death.

Dr. Chafer travelled in the ministry of Bible teaching in England, Scotland, Ireland, Belgium, and elsewhere. He always had a great missionary vision and served on various mission boards and visited mission fields in Europe, Mexico, and all of Central America where his counsel and ministry of Bible teaching and evangelistic service were of wonderful benefit to the missionaries and to the national churches.

Dr. Chafer was the author of many pamphlets and magazine articles and of the following books on Bible themes and doctrines: *Satan*, 1909; *True Evangelism*, 1911; *The Kingdom in History and Prophecy*, 1915; *Salvation*, 1916; *He That Is Spiritual*, 1918; *Grace*, 1922; *Major Bible Themes*, 1926; and *The Ephesian Letter*, 1935. These books have been before the Christian public in all English-speaking lands for many years and are still in constant and almost undiminished demand. Multiplied thousands have been blessed in spirit, instructed in the grace of God, and confirmed in the faith and in the assurance of salvation by the clear and forceful teaching set down by his able pen. A number of his books have been, or are being, translated on mission fields into several languages; thus a fruitful world-wide ministry has resulted.

From 1940 to 1952 Dr. Chafer was editor of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the oldest theological quarterly in America.

The discipline and training which Dr. Chafer received as a background for the writing of this extensive work on Systematic Theology was that of many years of faithful study. In his early years he was known among Bible teachers as especially given to doctrine and was invited on several occasions to become teacher of Bible doctrine in leading institutes of this country.

When he undertook the professorship of Systematic Theology in the Seminary in Dallas, Texas, he at once gave himself to ceaseless study and reading in that division of ministerial training. He secured and became familiar with an exceedingly large library on Systematic Theology. The exercise of teaching this vast field of truth for many years required him to answer practically every question which students of serious mind could ask.

Dr. Chafer himself said that “the very fact that I did not study a prescribed course in theology made it possible for me to approach the subject with an unprejudiced mind and to be concerned only with what the Bible actually teaches.” This independent research has resulted in this work which is unabridged, Calvinistic, premillennial, and dispensational.

In fulfillment of Ephesians 4:8, 11, God gave a beloved “teacher” unto the Church. We are sure that through this treatise on Theology God’s purpose in such a gift, as expressed in verses 12–16, will be further fulfilled to the people of God for immense blessing in “the body of Christ.”

Dr. Chafer suffered a heart attack in California in the year 1935. Although that stroke was severe, by observing a careful regimen in his convalescence he recovered and gained strength for an active ministry until 1945 when again he was stricken in California. From this attack he did not have a full recovery, but after a period of time he was able to continue his classroom and platform ministry. A third attack in 1948 further weakened him, but he still continued his public work in a limited way until almost the close of his life.

In May, 1952, after his classes were finished at the Seminary he covered the cities in Pennsylvania known as the Harrisburg Circuit of Bible conferences and spoke at commencement and baccalaureate services at Grace Theological Seminary and Columbia Bible College. It seemed to us who were close to him that this pressing schedule with its nighttime train transfers and closely dated speaking engagements overtaxed his scant strength and carried him beyond the point of possible return to his normal ministry.

However, Dr. Chafer had often manifested that he desired to remain active in the Lord’s work until the end. In June, 1952, following his custom in the summer, travelling alone he went to California to visit with friends and to minister with alumni of the Seminary. He reached Seattle and there, after an illness of about eight weeks, he died peacefully on August 22 in the home of his very dear friends, Mr. and Mrs. Robert O. Fleming. A long life of service had come to a close and the servant had gone into the presence of his waiting Lord.

Dallas, November 1953

Author Index

A

Abbott, E. A.:
IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Alexander, A. B. D., “Logos,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: III, 13; V, 10.

Alexander, W. Lindsay, A System of Biblical Theology; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1888: I, 6, 261, 267 f., 272, 284—citation of Calvin; I, 284 f.—citation of Swift; I, 285—citation of Pye Smith; I, 285—citation of Nicene Creed; I, 285—citation of Athanasian Creed; I, 285 f., 323—citation of Socinus; II, 215 f., 216—citation of Milton; II, 221, 221 f.—citations of Aristotle, Plutarch, Kant, Hahn; III, 13 ff., 68-72, 195, 198—citation of Owen; III, 199—citation of Owen; III, 212.

Alford, Henry, New Testament for English Readers; Lee and Shepard, Boston, 1872: I, xii, 254 f.; II, 3, 69, 70, 72—citation of Chrysostom; II, 82 f.; III, 114 f.—citation of Delitzsch; III, 248, 325—citation of Chrysostom; III, 325 f.—citation of De Wette; IV, 362—cited by Thiessen; IV, 369 f.—cited by Thiessen; V, 10, 11, 27, 34 f., 60, 127, 196, 200 f., 210, 221 f., 271 f.; VI, 43, 143, 230.

Anderson, Sir Robert, The Coming Prince, 2nd ed.; Pickering & Inglis, London, 1909: IV, 128, 130, 289, 338—cited by Thiessen.

Angus-Green, Cyclopedic Handbook of the Bible:
VII, 204 (twice), 205 (twice)—cited by Rollin T. Chafer.

Anselm, Cur Deus Homo:
III, 137—cited by Dale.

Aristotle:
I, 291—cited by Cooke; II, 221 f.—cited by Alexander; II, 294 f.

Atwood, John M., “Universalist Church,” Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed., New York: IV, 422.
Auberlen, C. A.:
II, 185—cited by Laidlaw; IV, 278—cited by Peters; V, 316—cited by Peters.

Augustine:
I, 6—cited by Shedd; I, 229—cited by Shedd; I, 282—cited by Harris; I, 284—cited by Scofield; II, 29—cited by Gerhart; II, 31 f.—cited by Gerhart; II, 212 f.; III, 57—cited by Shedd.

B

Barclay, Robert, Apology:
I, 13.

Bardesanes:
IV, 121.

Barnabas:
IV, 121.

Barnes, Albert:
IV, 262—cited by Peters; V, 374—cited by Peters.

Baur:
III, 145 f.—cited by Miley.

Bavinck, Herman, “The Fall,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 149 f.
Baxter, Richard:
I, 289—cited by Watson.

Beecher, Henry Ward:
V, 287—cited by Peters.

Bengel:
IV, 278—cited by Brookes, in turn by Peters.

Besser:
II, 308—cited by Riddle.

Binney, Thomas:
III, 365 f.

Boettner, Loraine, The Inspiration of the Scriptures: VI, 58—cited by Walvoord.

Bowne:
I, 150 f.—cited by Miley; I, 201 f.—cited by Miley.

Bradbury, John W.:
VI, 147 f.

Brewster, D.:
I, 289.

Briggs, C. A.:
IV, 283—cited by Peters.

Brookes, James H.:
III, 305—The Truth (Vol. XIII); IV, 278—citation of Bengel, in turn cited by Peters.

Brown, Jamieson & Fausset, The Critical and Explanatory Commentary; Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1934: II, 301 f., 308 ff.; VI, 67.

Bruce, A. B., The Humiliation of Christ:
I, 379—cited by Feinberg; I, 380—cited by Feinberg.

Bruch, J. F.:
I, 214—cited by Van Oosterzee.

Bull:
II, 19—cited by Gaebelein.

Bullinger, E. W., Companion Bible; Oxford University Press, London, 1910: VI, 28.

——,A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, 6th rev. ed.; Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1914: VII,

180, 180 f., 181 f.
Bush:
V, 375—cited by Peters.

Bushnell, Horace:
I, 309 f.—cited by Harris; VII, 198—cited by Hamilton.

Butler:
I, 76 f.—cited by Manly; II, 212—cited by Watson.

Buttmann-Thayer:
IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Buxtorf:
I, 265—cited by Watson; I, 268—cited by Watson.

C

Calvin, John:
I, 131—cited by Strong; I, 284—cited by Alexander; II, 283—cited by Shedd; III, 69—cited by Alexander; IV, 278—cited by Peters; IV, 279—cited by Haldeman; VI, 115—cited by Walvoord.

Carlyle, Thomas:
I, 176—cited by Strong; II, 280—cited by Shedd.

Carson, Alexander:
I, 83—cited by Manly.

Carver, William Owen, “Atonement,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 27.
Castenove:
I, 32—cited by Rogers.

Cellerier, J. E.:
VII, 204 (twice), 205—cited by Rollin T. Chafer.

Chafer, Rollin Thomas, The Science of Biblical Hermeneutics; Bibliotheca Sacra, Dallas, 1938: V, 349 f.; VII, 203 ff.

Chalmers, Thomas, Natural Theology:
I, 182.

——, Institutes of Theology, Thomas Constable & Co., Edinburgh, 1852: II, 221.

Channing, William Ellery:
I, 274; III, 62 f. —cited by Stock.

Charles:
IV, 362—cited by Thiessen.

Charnocke:
I, 193—cited by Shedd.

Chrysostom:
II, 72—cited by Alford; III, 325—cited by Alford.

Cicero:
I, 154—cited by Cooke; I, 292—cited by Cooke.

Clarke, Adam:
I, 195—cited by Cooke.

Clarke, Samuel:
I, 134, 161—cited by Dick; I, 220 f.—cited by Dick.

Clarke, William Newton, An Outline of Christian Theology; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1898: V, 283 f., 284 ff.

Clement of Alexandria:
IV, 121.

Cocceius, Johannes:
V, 286, 288; VII, 96.

Cook, Joseph:
I, 284—cited by Strong.

Cooke, R. J.:
VII, 198—cited by Hamilton.

Cooke, William, Christian Theology; Partridge and Oakey, London, 1848: II, 4 f., 12 f., 15, 16, 21 f., 37—citation of Plutarch; II, 74 f., 97—citation of Plutarch; V, 14 ff., 20; VI, 12–16, 26.
——, The Deity, 2nd ed.; Hamilton, Adams & Co., London, 1892: I, 137 f., 146—citation of Wollaston; I, 154—citation of Cicero; I, 154 f., 174—citation of “Veids”; I, 174—citation of Lucan; I, 174—citation of Seneca; I, 174—citation of Mason Good; I, 175, 175 f., 180 f.—citation of King; I, 195—citation of Adam Clarke; I, 196—citation of Edwards; I, 197—citation of Mohammedan proverb; I, 198—citation of Seneca; I, 198, 290—citation of Feltham; I, 291—citation of Aristotle; I, 292—citation of Cicero.
Coquerel, M.:
I, 273—cited by Rice.

Cowper, William:
VI, 126.

Crawford, T. J., The Doctrine of Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement; William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1871: III, 63 ff.
Cremer, A. H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek, 2nd ed.; English translation by W. Urwick; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1872: I, 79.
Crisp:
III, 70 f.—cited by Alexander from Williams.

Cudworth:
I, 145 f.—cited by Watson.

Cumming, J. Elder:
VI, 19 f.—cited by Walvoord.

Cunningham, William, Historical Theology, 3rd ed.; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1870: I, 387—citation of Westminster Confession; I, 387 f.; III, 269, 270, 271, 277 f., 284 f.
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage:
IV, 120.

D

Dabney, R. L.:
IV, 256.

Dale, James W., Christic and Patristic Baptism; William Rutter & Co., Philadelphia, 1874: III, 41 f., 381 ff., 383 f.; V, 71 f .

——, Johannic Baptism; Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work, Philadelphia, 1871: V, 59—citation of Gregory Thaumaturgus; V, 68—citation of R. Wilson; V, 69.

——, Classic Baptism; William Rutter & Co., Philadelphia, 1867: VI, 139.

——:
VI, 149 f.—cited by Unger; VII, 32, 33.

Dale, R. W., The Atonement; Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1875: III, 44—citation of Turretin; III, 132 f., 136—citation of Epistle to Diognetus; III, 136 f. —citation of Gregory Nazianzen; III, 137—citation of Anselm; III, 138—citation of Luther; III, 152 f.

Darby, J. N., Synopsis of the Books of the Bible; Loizeaux Bros., New York: III, 123.

Davidson, A. B., Theology of the Old Testament; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1904: I, 260, 406—cited by Warfield; V, 45—cited by Walvoord.

Dawson:
II, 140 f.—cited by Miley.

Delitzsch, Franz:
I, 265—cited by Oehler; II, 136—cited by Laidlaw; III, 114 f.—cited by Alford.

Denney, James:
I, 402 f.—cited by Warfield; II, 288 f.—cited by Thomas; V, 243—cited by Harrison.

——, The Atonement and the Modern Mind; A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1903: III, 43 f.

De Wette:
III, 325 f.—cited by Alford.

Dibelius, Martin, The Sermon on the Mount; Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1940: V, 102, 113.

Dick, John, Lectures on Theology; Applegate & Co., Cincinnati, 1864: I, 16, 16 f., 49—citations of Plato and Socrates; I, 161, 219, 220, 220 f.—citation of Samuel Clarke; I, 221 f., 242 f., 252, 283—cited by Wardlaw; I, 371; III, 300 f.

Dietrich:
I, 265—cited by Oehler.

Dillmann:
VII, 159—cited by Hodge.

Dods, Marcus:
III, 159 f.—cited by Warfield.

Doederlein, John C.:
I, 288—cited by Harris.

Dorner, I. A., History of Protestant Theology; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1871: I, 377; II, 9; IV, 256.

Drummond, Henry, Addresses; Donohue, Henneberg & Co., Chicago: VII, 230.

Dunelm, Handley:
See H. C. G. Moule.

Dwight, Timothy, Theology:
I, 144—cited by Watson; II, 221, 293.

E

Edwards, Jonathan:
I, 196—cited by Cooke; II, 164—cited by Watson; II, 170—cited by Laidlaw; III, 71 f.—cited by Alexander.

English, E. Schuyler, Studies in the Gospel according to Matthew; Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1935: V, 106.

Eusebius:
IV, 120.

Everett, Theism and the Christian Faith:
I, 132.

F

Fairbairn, A. M., Christ in Modern Theology; Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1902: II, 267.

Fairbairn, Patrick, The Typology of Scripture; Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1900: I, xxix; III, 116.

Fairchild, Edmund B.:
VI, 149—cited by Unger.

Fausset, Jamieson & Brown, The Critical and Explanatory Commentary; Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1934: II, 301 f., 308 ff.; VI, 67.

Feinberg, Charles Lee, Bibliotheca Sacra; Dallas:
I, 379 ff., 394 f., 396.

Feltham, Owen:
I, 290—cited by Cooke.

Fenelon, Archbishop Francis S.:
VII, 190—cited by Marsh.

Fichte, I. H.:
I, 137—cited by Harris.

Fisher, George Park, The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief, rev. ed.; Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1902: I, 165 f.

Flammarion, Camille:
II, 6—cited by Gaebelein.

Foster:
III, 158—cited by Warfield.

Foster, John:
I, 164—cited by Miley.

Foster, R. S.:
I, 159.

Fremantle:
III, 161—cited by Warfield.

G

Gaebelein, Arno C., Angels of God; Our Hope, New York, 1924: II, 3, 6—citation of Flammarion; II, 7, 14, 19—citation of Bull.

——, Annotated Bible; Our Hope, New York:
IV, 57 f.

——, Studies in Zechariah; Francis E. Fitch, New York: V, 186 f.

Gaussen, S. R. L., Theopneusty; John S. Taylor & Co., New York, 1842: VI, 30 f.

Gerhart, E. V., Institutes of the Christian Religion; Vol. I published by A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1891; Vol. II published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1891: II, 7—citation of Hooker; II, 9, 10—citation of Martensen; II, 25—citation of von Gerlach; II, 25 f., 29—citation of Augustine; II, 29 f.—citation of Hooker; II, 30—citation of Hooker; II, 31, 31 f.—citation of Augustine; II, 33—citation of Meyer; 11, 34 f., 83—citation of Pope & Moulton; II, 112.

Gieseler:
I, 283—cited by Harris.

Godet:
I, 205—cited by Vincent; IV, 89—cited by Thomas; VII, 159—cited by Hodge.

Goff, John, How Was Jesus Baptized and Why?:
V, 64.

Good, Mason:
I, 174—cited by Cooke.

Gordon, A. J., The Ministry of the Spirit; American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1894: VI, 10 ff.

Gore, Charles, The Incarnation of the Son of God; Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1891: I, 349 f.

Govett, R., Exposition of the Gospel of St. John; Bemrose & Sons, London: V, 10 f., 35 f., 196.

Grant, F. W., The Numerical Bible; Loizeaux Bros., New York: II, 307; III, 185; IV, 58 f.; V, 264 ff., 268.

Graves, Richard:
I, 280—cited by Watson.

Gray, James M., Christian Workers Commentary; Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1915: VI, 67.
Gregory Nazianzen:
III, 136 f.—cited by Dale.

Green, W. H.:
II, 139—cited by Miley; II, 141—cited by Hodge.

Greene, Samuel, Present Day Tracts—Christology, “The Divinity of Jesus Christ”
I, 345.

Guille, George E., Isaac and Rebekah; Bible Institute Colportage Assn., Chicago, 1914: VI, 55.

H

Hagenbach:
IV, 261—cited by Peters.

Hahn, G. L.:
II, 222—cited by Alexander.

Haldeman, I. M., History of Doctrine of Our Lord’s Return; I. M. Haldeman, First Baptist Church, New York: IV, 275 ff., 278—citation of Luther; IV, 279—citation of Calvin, Knox, Latimer.
——:
IV, 278—cited by Unger.

Hall, Robert, sermon on “The Spirituality of the Divine Nature”: I, 182.
Hamilton:
I, 138.

Hamilton, Alan Herbert, Bibliotheca Sacra; Dallas: VII, 197 f., 198 f.
Hampden:
I, 22 f.—cited by Rogers.

Harnack, Adolf:
V, 53—cited by Warfield.

Harris, Samuel, God the Creator and Lord of All; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Vol. I, 1896, Vol. II, 1897:
I, 184—citation of Voltaire; I, 216 f., 282—citation of Augustine; I, 282 f.—citation of Tertullian; I, 283—citation of Athanasian Creed; I, 283—citation of Gieseler; I, 283—citation of Westminster Larger Catechism; I, 283, 286—citation of Neander; I, 286 f.—citation of Orr; I, 288—citation of South; I, 288—citation of Doederlein; I, 309 f.—citation of Bushnell; I, 376 f.

——, The Philosophical Basis of Theism. rev. ed.; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1883: I, 133 f., 137—citation of Fichte.
——, The Self-Revelation of God; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1892: I, 133, 159 f.
Harrison, Everett F., Christian Doctrine of Resurrection, 1938, unpublished: V, 241, 241 f.
Harrison, Norman B., His Love; The Harrison Service, Minneapolis: VI, 203.
Hawes, E. E.:
VI, 150—cited by Unger.

Hawthorne, R. R., Bibliotheca Sacra; Dallas:
VI, 70.

Heard, J. B.:
II, 147—cited by Laidlaw.

Henry, Matthew, Commentary; Fleming H. Revell Co., New York: II, 202; VI, 27, 68.
Hesiod:
II, 5—cited by Cooke.

Hibbard, F. G.:
VII, 198—cited by Hamilton.

Hodge, A. A., Outlines of Theology; A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1878: I, 156, 164, 172, 213 f., 255, 316—citation of Nicene Creed; II,

141—citation of Green; III, 211 f.; V, 27 f.
Hodge, Charles A., Systematic Theology; Charles Scribner & Co., New York, 1872: I, 6, 67, 143 f., 160, 284; II, 175 ff.; III, 178, 180 f., 330; IV, 255; V, 85.
——, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1854: II, 302.
——, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians; Robert Carter and Bros., New York, 1856: V, 218 f.
——:
II, 312—cited by Schaff; II, 309—cited by Jamieson, Fausset & Brown; VI, 115—cited by Walvoord.

Hodge, Caspar Wistar, “Foreknow, Foreknowledge,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 158 f., 159 f.
Hogg, C. F., and W. E. Vine, Epistle to the Galatians; Pickering & Inglis, London, 1922: V, 213, 213f.
Hooker, Richard:
II, 7—cited by Gerhart; II, 29 f.—cited by Gerhart; II, 30—cited by Gerhart; IV, 259—cited by Peters.
Horsley, Samuel:
II, 204—cited by Watson.

Hort, and Westcott:
I, 87—cited by Manly.

Howe, John:
I, 147—cited by Watson; I, 147 ff.—cited by Watson; I, 210—cited by Watson; I, 236 f.—cited by Shedd; II, 162—cited by Watson.

Hutchinson, John, Lectures on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1887: V, 36 ff.
Huxley, Julian S., “Evolution,” Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed., New York: I, 167, 168.
——:
I, 169—cited by Hodge.

I

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch:
IV, 121.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons:
IV, 121, 259 f.—cited by Peters from Neander.

Ironside, H. A., Lectures on Daniel; Loizeaux Bros., New York, 1920: IV, 335 f., 348—cited by Thiessen; V, 294 f.
——, Lectures on Revelation; Loizeaux Bros., New York, 1919: IV, 55 f.
——, Notes on the Minor Prophets; Loizeaux Bros., New York: V, 187.
——, Notes on the Proverbs; Loizeaux Bros., New York, 1907: V, 270 f.

J

Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, The Critical and Explanatory Commentary; Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1934: II, 301 f., 308 ff.; VI, 67.
Janet, Paul:
I, 152—cited by Miley; I, 152 f.—cited by Miley; I, 157—cited by Miley.

Jennings, F. C., Satan; A. C. Gaebelein, New York: II, 44, 55 f., 97 f.
Justin Martyr:
IV, 121.

K

Kant, Immanuel:
II, 222—cited by Alexander; II, 295; VII, 91.

Keith, Sir Arthur, “Evolution of Man,” Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed., New York: II, 132 ff.
Kelly, William, Lectures Introductory to the Study of the Minor Prophets, 5th ed.; A. S. Rouse, London, 1906: VI, 63.

Kelly, William, Lectures on the New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; A. S. Rouse, London, 1867: VI, 39.
Kennett:
IV, 82 f.—cited by Thomas.

Keyser, Leander, A System of Natural Theism, 2nd ed., rev., 1927, The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.
I, 166.

King, William:
I, 180 f.—cited by Cooke; II, 208 f.—cited by Watson.

Knox, John:
IV, 279—cited by Haldeman.

Kuyper, A.:
VI, 69—cited by Walvoord.

L

Laidlaw, R. A., Bible Doctrine of Man; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1879: II, 127—citation of Row; II, 136—citation of MacDonald; II, 136—citation of Delitzsch; II, 137, 147, 147 f., 155 f., 166—citation of Müller; II, 169 f., 170—citation of Oehler; II, 170—citation of Edwards; II, 170 ff., 185—citation of Auberlen; II, 185 ff., 191 f.
Lange:
I, 256—cited by Van Oosterzee; I, 374—cited by Peters.

Larkin, Clarence, The Spirit World; Clarence Larkin Estate, Philadelphia, 1921: II, 114 f., 115 ff., 117.
Latimer:
IV, 279—cited by Haldeman.

Lawson:
I, 135 footnote—cited by Watson.

Leland:
I, 143—cited by Watson.

Lepsius:
I, 395.

Lewis, Charles Lee:
II, 127 f.—citation of M. F. Maury.

Lightfoot, J. B., Epistle to the Philippians; Macmillan and Co., New York, 1890: V, 38.
——, Epistle to the Colossians; Macmillan and Co., New York, 1886: V, 10, 24.
Lindsay, James, “Biblical Theology,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: I, 4.
Locke:
I, 147—cited by Watson.

Lockhart, Clinton:
VII, 204—cited by Rollin T. Chafer.

Lucan:
I, 174—cited by Cooke.

Luering, H. L. E., “Blood and Water,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 54 f.
Luther, Martin, Commentary on Galatians; Robert Carter & Bros., New York, 1860: V, 214 f.
——:
III, 138—cited by Dale; IV, 260—cited by Peters; IV, 278—cited by Peters from Walch and by Haldeman.

M

Mabie, Henry C., The Meaning and Message of the Cross, 2nd ed.; Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1906: II, 271; III, 44—citation of Dale; III, 45, 46 f., 59 f.
MacDonald:
II, 136—cited by Laidlaw.

Mackintosh, C. H., Notes on Genesis, 4th Amer. ed.; Loizeaux Bros., New York, 1879: VI, 53 f., 67.
——, Notes on Exodus; Loizeaux Bros., New York:
III, 119 f., 120 f.

Mackintosh, C. H., Notes on Leviticus; Loizeaux Bros., New York, 1879: III, 39 f.; V, 267 f.; VI, 48.
Maclaren, Alexander:
III, 379—cited by Pierson.

Manly, Basil, Bible Doctrine of Inspiration; A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1888: I, 72—citation of Olshausen; I, 75, 75—citation of Schaff; I, 76, 76 f.—citation of Butler; I, 83—citation of Carson; I, 87—citation of Westcott & Hort; I, 87 f.—citation of Schaff.

Marais, J. I., "Psychology," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: II, 126 f., 185.
——, "Soul," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: II, 182 ff.
——, "Spirit," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: II, 184 f.
Marett, Ralph Ranulph, "Anthropology," Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed.; New York: II, 126.
Marsh, F. E., Emblems of the Holy Spirit, late ed.; Pickering & Inglis, London, 1923: VI, 52; VII, 190—citation of Fenelon.
Martensen, H. L., Christian Dogmatics, translated by Wm. Urwick; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1866: V, 76 f.
——:
II, 9 f.—cited by Gerhart; II, 10—cited by Gerhart.

Masterman, E. W. G., "Jerusalem," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 208.
Mather, Cotton:
IV, 280—cited by Peters.

Matheson, George:
II, 283 f.—cited by Thomas.

Matthews, Burt L.:
III, 294.

Mauro, Philip, God's Gift and Our Response; Pickering & Inglis, Glasgow: VI, 186.
Maury, Matthew Fontaine:
II, 127 f.—cited by Lewis.

McConnell, Francis J., "Sin," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: II, 241 f.
McFarland, J. T.:
VII, 198—cited by Hamilton.

McTaggart, J. M. E., Some Dogmas on Religion:
II, 92.

Medley, Samuel:
V, 3.

Melanchthon:
II, 288—cited by Müller; IV, 262 f.—cited by Peters.

Meyer, H. A. W., Commentary on the New Testament (at John 11:49–52); T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1876: V, 195.
——:
II, 33—cited by Gerhart; II, 347—cited by Moule; VII, 159—cited by Hodge.

Middleton:
III, 382 f.—cited by Dale.

Miley, John, Systematic Theology (II Volumes); The Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1892, 1894: I, 150 f.—citation of Bowne; I, 152—citation of Janet; I, 152, 152 f.—citation of Janet; I, 157—citation of Janet; I, 164—citation of John Foster; I, 170, 186, 201—citation of Miller; I, 201 f.—citation of Bowne; I, 218, 316, 387—citation of Schaff; I, 388 f.; II, 138 f., 139 ff.—citation of Dawson; III, 146—citation of Baur; III, 146–52.
Miller, Hugh:

I, 201—cited by Miley.

Milton, John:
II, 8—cited by Strong; II, 216—cited by Alexander.

Mivart, George, Lessons from Nature:
II, 147 f.

Moffat:
IV, 362—cited by Thiessen; IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Moorehead:
IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Morgan, G. Campbell, The Spirit of God; Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1890: VI, 150.

Moule, H. C. G., Cambridge Bible, Romans; Cambridge University Press, 1908: II, 274, 304 f., 346, 347; IV, 88 f.

——, Cambridge Bible, Colossians and Philemon; Cambridge University Press, 1906: IV, 95 f.

——, Outlines of Christian Doctrine, 2nd rev. ed.:
VI, 294.

——, “Faith,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 147 f.

——:
I, 227; VII, 189.

Moulton and Pope:
II, 83—cited by Gerhart.

Müller, Julius, The Christian Doctrine of Sin; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868: II, 225, 237–41, 258 f., 266, 284, 288—citation of Melanchthon; II, 290 f.

——:
II, 166—cited by Laidlaw; II, 363—cited by Shedd; IV, 279—cited by Peters.

Müller, Max:
IV, 420—cited by New Standard Dictionary.

N

Nares, Edward:
I, 322 f.—cited by Watson.

Neander:
I, 286—cited by Harris; IV, 259 f.—cited by Peters; V, 85—cited by Peters; V, 374.

Newell, W. R., Romans Verse by Verse; Grace Publications, Inc., Chicago, 1938: VI, 44 f.

Newton, Isaac:
I, 135 footnote—cited by Watson; I, 183 f.—cited by Watson.

Nitzsch:
IV, 425—cited by Van Oosterzee.

Nuelson, John L., “Regeneration,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VI, 36.

O

Oehler, Gustav Friedrich, Old Testament Theology; Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1883: I, 263, 405; II, 167, 170—cited by Laidlaw.

Olsen, Erling C., Meditations in the Psalms (II Volumes); Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1939: V, 237, 269.

——, Walks with Our Lord through John’s Gospel; Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1939: V, 192 f.

Olshausen:
I, 71 f.—cited by Manly.

Orr, James, “Criticism of the Bible,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 103 f.

——:
I, 286 f.—cited by Harris.

Ottman, Ford C., Imperialism and Christ; Charles C. Cook, New York, 1912: V, 328, 329–32.

——, Unfolding of the Ages; Baker & Taylor Co., New York, 1905: IV, 354–57, 371; V, 310–314.
Ovid:
II, 194—cited by Vincent.

Owen, John:
I, 400—cited by Watson; III, 69 ff.—cited by Alexander; III, 198—cited by Alexander; III, 199—cited by Alexander.

P

Paley, William:
I, 146 f.—cited by Watson; I, 153 f.—cited by Watson.

Parker, Theodore:
I, 36—cited by Rogers.

Pearson, John:
I, 400 f.—cited by Watson.

Peter, Bishop of Alexandria:
IV, 120.

Peters, George N. H., The Theocratic Kingdom (III Volumes); Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1884: IV, 258, 259—citation of Rothe; IV, 259 f., 261—citation of Hagenbach; IV, 262 f., 270 f.—citation of Justin Martyr; IV, 271–74, 275—citation of Whitby; IV, 278—citations of Brookes and Auberlen, Luther, Calvin; IV, 279—citation of Augsburg Confession from Müller; IV, 280—citation of Cotton Mather; IV, 283—citation of Briggs; IV, 283 f., 324 f.; V, 85—citation of Neander; V, 91 ff., 281, 287—citation of Beecher; V, 354 f., 374 ff.
Pierson, Arthur T.:
III, 379 f.

Pinches, T. G., International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 29.
Plato:

I, 49—cited by Dick; I, 150—cited by Bowne; I, 162; II, 194—cited by Vincent.

Plummer:
IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Plutarch:
II, 37—cited by Cooke; II, 97—cited by Cooke; II, 222—cited by Alexander.

Pope, and Moulton:
II, 83—cited by Gerhart.

Priestley, Joseph:
I, 277—cited by Watson; I, 278—cited by Watson; I, 320.

Princell, J. G., Parables of Christ; unpublished ms.: V, 168.
Pythagoras:
I, 150—cited by Bowne.

R

Ramsey, Chevalier:
I, 195—cited by Watson.

Randles, Marshall, Substitution:
III, 200.

Rees, T., “God,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 174 f., 207.
Rice, W. A., Crusaders of the Twentieth Century:
I, 273—citation of Coquerel; I, 287—citation of Koran; I, 287.

Riddle, M. B., International Revision Commentary, edited by Philip Schaff, Romans; Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1883: II, 301, 308—citation of Besser; II, 310 ff.
Rishell, C. W.:
VII, 198—cited by Hamilton.

Roach, Morris H., The Personality of God; unpublished dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1933: I, 223 f.
Robertson, A. T.:
VII, 37.

Robinson, Greek and English Lexicon of New Testament, new ed.: I, 79.
Rogers, Henry, Superhuman Origin of the Bible, 5th ed.; Hodder & Stoughton, London: I, 23—citation of Hampden; I, 32—citation of Castenove; I, 36—citation of Parker.
——:
III, 66—cited by Stock.

Rossetti:
II, 4—cited by Strong.

Rothe, Richard:
I, 65—cited by Warfield; IV, 259—cited by Peters; V, 316—cited by Peters as quoted by Auberlen.

Row, C. A.:
II, 127—cited by Laidlaw.

S

Sanger, James Mortimer, The Redeemed, Who Are They?: III, 189.
Schaff, Philip:
I, 75—cited by Manly; I, 87 f.—cited by Manly; II, 83—cited by Gerhart.

——, Creeds of Christendom; Harper & Bros., New York, 1919: I, 387.
Schleiermacher:
I, 70.

Schmiedel:
I, 345 f.—cited by Warfield.

Scofield, C. I., Scofield Reference Bible; Oxford University Press, New York: I, 268 f., 284; II, 17 f., 18 f., 156 f.; III, 28, 32, 75 f., 93 ff., 122 f., 250, 302 f.; IV, 4, 38, 60, 130 f., 286., 293, 311 f., 316, 357 f., 377, 397

f., 413 f.; V, 43 f.— cited by Walvoord; V, 54 f., 88, 103, 127 f., 178, 181, 197, 226 f., 236, 303; VI, 86, 201 f.; VII, 11, 30, 58 f., 62, 114 f., 175 f., 177, 269.

——, Correspondence Course; Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago: I, 284—citation of Augustine; IV, 149 f., 151 f.

Seneca:
I, 174—cited by Cooke; I, 198—cited by Cooke.

Shedd, W. G. T., Dogmatic Theology (III Volumes), T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1889: I, 6, 159 (twice), 193—citation of Charnocke; I, 236 f.—citation of Howe; I, 393 f.; II, 174, 177, 211 f., 212 f.—citation of Augustine; II, 219, 280, 283, 285 f., 286 ff., 363—citations of Müller and Twesten; III, 59, 179 f., 182, 203 f.; VI, 115—cited by Walvoord; VI, 119—cited by Walvoord.

Sherlock, William:
I, 280 f.—cited by Watson.

Simpson, Carnegie:
II, 271—cited by Mabie.

Smeaton, George, The Doctrine of the Atonement; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868: III, 40 f.

Smith, J. Denham, The Brides of Scripture, 3rd ed.; Pickering & Inglis, Glasgow: IV, 138 f., 141.

Smith, J. Pye, First Lines of Theology:
II, 221.

——:
I, 285—cited by Alexander; I, 299—cited by Watson; III, 153—cited by Dale.

Socinus, Faustus:
I, 323—cited by Alexander.

Socrates:
I, 49—cited by Dick.

South, Robert:
I, 288—cited by Harris.

Stearns:
II, 297—cited by Thomas.

Stephenson:
V, 374—cited by Peters.

Stock, John, Revealed Theology:
III, 62 f.—citation of Channing; III, 66—citation of Henry Rogers.

Storr:
V, 375 f.—cited by Peters.

Strong, Augustus H., Systematic Theology; A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1899: I, 6, 131—citation of Calvin; I, 157 f., 176—citation of Carlyle; I, 218 f., 283 f., 284—citation of Joseph Cook; I, 381—cited by Feinberg; II, 4, 8—citation of Milton; II, 17, 195 ff., 259; III, 68, 176 f.
Stuart:
I, 65—cited by Warfield.

Sunday School Times (The), Philadelphia:
VII, 197.

Sweet, Louis Matthews, “Satan,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: II, 37.
——, “Genealogy of Christ,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 166 f.
Swift:
I, 284 f.—cited by Alexander.

T

Taylor, Frederick G., “The Two Advents of the Saviour,” The Sunday School Times; Philadelphia: IV, 307 ff.
Tennant, Frank Robert, “Agnosticism,” Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed.; New York: I, 165.
Terry, M. S.:
VII, 205—cited by Rollin T. Chafer.

Tertullian:
I, 282 f.—cited by Harris; IV, 120 f.

Thaumaturgus, Gregory:
V, 59—cited by Dale.

Thayer, J. H.:
VI, 21—cited by Walvoord.

Thayer-Grimm, Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh: I, 79.
——:
IV, 151—cited by Scofield; IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Theodorus Mopsuestenus:
I, 182—cited by Cooke.

Thiessen, Henry C., Bibliotheca Sacra; Dallas:
IV, 338, 348 f., 361 ff., 369 ff.

Thomas, W. H. Griffith, Principles of Theology; Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1930: I, 6, 131, 182, 302; II, 254 f., 283 f.—citation of Matheson; II, 288, 288 f.—citation of Denney; II, 297—citation of Stearns; II, 356; IV, 89—citation of Godet; VI, 8 f.
——, Commentary on Romans; The Religious Tract Society, London: II, 300, 306.
——, “Resurrection of Christ,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: IV, 82 f.
Tregelles:
IV, 348—cited by Thiessen.

Trench, R. C., Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord, 2nd Amer. ed.; D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1857: V, 174 ff.
——, Notes on the Parables of Our Lord, 9th ed.; D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1856: V, 167.
——, Synonyms of the Greek New Testament; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., London, 1880: III, 56.
Trumbull, Henry Clay, The Blood Covenant; Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1885: VII, 54.

Tulloch:
IV, 262—cited by Peters.

Turretin, Francis:
III, 44—cited by Dale.

Twesten, Augustus D.:
II, 363—cited by Shedd.

Tyndale:
I, 79.

U

Unger, Merrill F., Bibliotheca Sacra; Dallas:
VI, 65, 148 ff., 159 ff.

V

Valentine, Milton, Christian Theology (II Volumes); Lutheran Publishing Society, Philadelphia, 1906: I, 160; VI, 115—cited by Walvoord.

Van Oosterzee, J. J., Christian Dogmatics; Scribner, Armstrong & Co., New York, 1874: I, 182 f., 214—citation of Bruch; I, 256—citation of Lange; I, 314 f., 381—cited by Feinberg; IV, 423-26.

Van Valkenburg:
V, 375—cited by Peters.

Venema, Hermannus, Institutes of Theology (translated by Alex. W. Brown); T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1850: I, 277, 290, 301.

Verne, Jules:
V, 286.

Vincent, Marvin R., Word Studies in the New Testament (IV Volumes); Scribner’s, New York, 1887–1890: I, xii, xiii, 204 f., 205—citation of Godet; I, 254; II, 194—citations of Plato and Ovid; IV, 38 f., 129; V, 10, 11; VI, 38.

Voltaire:
I, 184—cited by Harris.

Vondel, J., Lucifer (translated by Leonard Charles Van Noppen); Continental Publishing Co., New York, 1898: II, 200 ff.
Von Gerlach, Otto:
II, 25—cited by Gerhart.

W

Walch:
IV, 278—cited by Peters.

Waller, C. H., The Authoritative Inspiration of Holy Scripture; Blackie & Son, London, 1887: I, 99 f., footnote.
Walvoord, John F., Outline of Christology; unpublished: V, 12, 31, 43 f., 44 f.
——, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, 1943: VI, 19 ff., 49 f., 57–60, 60 ff., 69—citation of A. Kuyper; VI, 75-79, 114-121, 135 f., 218 ff.
Wardlaw, Ralph, Theology (II Volumes); Adams and Charles Black, Edinburgh, 1856: I, 283—citation of Dick; I, 313 f., 315; III, 269, 286 f.
Warfield, Benjamin B., Bibliotheca Sacra; Oberlin: I, 62, 70 f.
——, Biblical Doctrines; Oxford University Press, New York, 1929: I, 371 f., 375, 385 f., 402 f.—citation of Denney; I, 403, 409 f.; IV, 255 f.
Warfield, Benjamin B., Christology and Criticism; Oxford University Press, New York, 1929: I, 345 f., 395 f.; V, 51 ff.
——, New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge; Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1908: III, 139 f.; IV, 421 f.
——, “Person of Christ,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: I, 325, 326 f.; V, 39-42.
——, Princeton Review; Princeton:
VI, 251 f.

——, Revelation and Inspiration; Oxford University Press, New York, 1927: I, 53, 65—citation of Rothe; I, 65—citation of Stuart; I, 80; IV,

281 f.
——, Studies in Theology; Oxford University Press, New York, 1932: III, 155-64.
——:
I, 79; VI, 58 f.—cited by Walvoord; VI, 78—cited by Walvoord; VII, 199—cited by Hamilton; VII, 238.

Waterland:
I, 278—cited by Watson; I, 279—cited by Watson.

Watson, Richard, Theological Institutes (II Volumes); Carlton & Phillips, New York, 1856: I, 135 footnote—citation of Lawson & Newton; I, 143—citation of Leland; I, 144—citation of Dwight; I, 145 f.—citation of Cudworth; I, 146 f.—citation of Paley; I, 147—citation of Locke; I, 147—citation of Howe; I, 147 ff.—citation of Howe; I, 153 f.—citation of Paley; I, 160, 182, 183 f.—citation of Newton; I, 195—citation of Ramsey; I, 195 f., 210—citation of Howe; I, 210 ff., 215—citation of Athanasian Creed; I, 268, 277—citation of Priestley; I, 278—citation of Waterland; I, 278 f.—citation of Priestley; I, 279—citation of Waterland; I, 279 f., 280—citation of Graves; I, 280 f.—citation of Sherlock; I, 281 f., 289—citation of Baxter; I, 299—citation of J. Pye Smith; I, 300 f., 323 f.—citation of Whitaker; I, 331, 346 f., 351—citation of Athanasian and Anglican Creeds; I, 366, 399 ff.; II, 162—citation of Howe; II, 163, 163 f. —citation of Watts; II, 164—citation of Edwards; II, 164 ff., 204—citation of Horsley; II, 206 ff., 208, 208 f.—citation of King; II, 212—citation of Butler; II, 281; III, 182—cited by Shedd; VI, 10—citations of Nicene Creed and Thirty-Nine Articles; VII, 199.

Watts, Isaac:
II, 163 f.—cited by Watson.

Webster, J. H., “Pauline Theology,” International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915: VII, 249.

Weiss:

VII, 159—cited by Hodge.

Werner, H.:
V, 52—cited by Warfield.

Wesley, Charles:
V, 3.

Wesley, John:
II, 275.

Westcott, and Hort:
I, 87—cited by Manly; IV, 370—cited by Thiessen.

Whitaker, John:
I, 323 f.—cited by Watson.

Whitby, Daniel:
IV, 275—cited by Peters; V, 286 ff.; VII, 237.

Williams, Daniel:
III, 70 f.—cited by Alexander.

Wilson, R.:
V, 68—cited by Dale.

Winchester, A. B., God Hath Spoken; Bible Conference Committee, Philadelphia, 1919: I, 339 f.

Witsius:
II, 69—cited by Alexander.

Wolf, Abraham, “Intelligence,” Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed.; New York: II, 193.

Wollaston:
I, 146—cited by Cooke.

Wycliff:
I, 79.

catechisms, creeds, dictionaries, and encyclopaedias

Athanasian Creed:
I, 215—cited by Watson; I, 283—cited by Harris; I, 285—cited by Alexander; I, 351—cited by Watson; I, 400—cited by Watson.

Augsburg Confession:
IV, 279—from Müller, cited by Peters.

Chalcedonian Symbol:
I, 386 f.—in Schaff, cited by Miley.

Creed of the Church of England: I, 351—cited by Watson; I, 400—cited by Watson.

Didache of the Apostles:
IV, 121.

Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed.; Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., New York: I, 159, 171; II, 174, 195; IV, 156, 264.
(For quotations from signed articles, see name of author of article.)

Epistle of Barnabas:

III, 136.

Epistle to Diognetus:
III, 136—cited by Dale.

Evangelium Infantiœ:
V, 173.

Formula Consensus Helvetica: III, 69—cited by Alexander.

International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia; Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915. Now published by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids: V, 45—cited by Walvoord; VI, 50—cited by Walvoord; VII, 249. (For quotations from signed articles, see name of author of article.) Jackson, J. B., Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names; Loizeaux Bros., New York, 1909: I, 265.

Koran:

I, 287—cited by Rice.

New Century Dictionary, 1936 ed.; D. Appleton-Century Co., New York: I, 168.

New Standard Dictionary, 1913 ed.; Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York: I, 158, 171, 172 f., 177 (twice), 178, 217, 251, 382; II, 126, 279; III, 127; VII, 17, 18.

Nicene Creed:

I, 285—cited by Alexander; I, 316—cited by Hodge; I, 400—cited by Watson; VI, 10—cited by Watson.

Smith’s Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible, edited by Samuel W. Barnum; D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1901: II, 17.

Thirty-Nine Articles:

VI, 10—cited by Watson.

Westminster Confession of Faith: I, 188 f., 225, 248, 387; III, 192, 267; V, 7 f.; VI, 10.

Westminster Larger Catechism: I, 283—cited by Harris; II, 227, 262; VII, 173.

Westminster Shorter Catechism: I, 228; II, 275; VII, 219.

Subject Index

A

Abiding: 7.3-7.6
Abraham: 4.47-4.48, 4.288-4.289
    covenant: 4.313-4.314; 7.97
    headship: 4.48
    physical seed in Israel: 4.47-4.48
    prophet: 4.288-4.289
    spiritual seed in faithful: 4.47-4.48
Adam: 7.6-7.9
    apostasy: 7.19
    environment: 2.200-2.202
    N. T. doctrine: 7.7-7.9, 7.113-7.114
    O. T. doctrine: 7.6-7.7
    responsibility: 2.202
    temptation. historicity: 2.204-2.209
        nature: 2.209-2.214
    typical relation to Christ: 7.7-7.9
Adamic nature: 6.183, 6.269-6.275
    relation to Christ's death: 6.276-6.278
Adoption: 3.242-3.243; 7.9-7.11
    human: 7.9
    spiritual: 7.9-7.11
Advocacy: 7.11-7.13
Ages. divine program: 1.xi, 1.xii, 1.xiii, 1.253-1.255
    divine program. Biblical evidence: 1.xi, 1.xii, 1.xiii relation to Systematic Theology: 1.xi, 1.xii, 1.xiii Agnosticism: 1.130, 1.138-1.139, 1.164-1.166
    definition: 1.164-1.165
Amillennialism: 4.281-4.282
Angel. definition: 2.3
Angel of Jehovah: 1.327-1.331; 2.20-2.21; 5.31-5.33; 7.14

deity: 1.327-1.331; 5.31-5.32
one of Trinity: 1.329-1.331
Angelology: 1.xxvi, 1.xxvii, 1.xxviii, 1.xxix; 2.3-2.121; 7.13-7.15
heathen beliefs: 2.4-2.5
history. Middle Ages: 2.4
introduction: 2.3-2.5
relation to reason: 2.3
satanology and demonology: 1.xxvii, 1.xxviii, 1.xxix Angels: 4.5, 4.411, 4.415-4.416; 7.13-7.15
abode: 2.6-2.8, 2.14
apostasy: 7.18-7.19
Biblical evidence: 1.xxvii, 1.37, 1.308; 2.3
cherubim. protectors of God's holiness: 2.17-2.18
classification: 2.6-2.7, 2.16-2.21; 7.14-7.15
cherubim, seraphim, living creatures: 2.17-2.19
elect angels: 2.17
government rulers: 2.16-2.17
creation: 2.11
designated by ministry: 2.20
existence. incorporeal: 2.12-2.13
purpose: 2.11-2.12
fall: 2.28-2.29
Gabriel: 2.20
general facts: 2.6-2.27
governmental rulers. authorities: 2.16-2.17
dominions: 2.16-2.17
powers: 2.16-2.17
principalities: 2.16-2.17
thrones: 2.16-2.17
influence to holiness: 2.30
living creatures. identical with cherubim, seraphim: 2.19
Lucifer, son of the morning: 2.19
Michael: 2.19-2.20
ministry: 2.21-2.24
to Christ: 2.23-2.24
to God: 2.21-2.22

to men: 2.22-2.23
number: 2.6, 2.15
personality: 2.10-2.11
power: 2.15-2.16
progress in knowledge: 2.24-2.26
reality: 2.8-2.9
relation to men: 2.3-2.4, 2.9-2.10
relation to moral problem: 2.28-2.32
relation to redemption: 2.24-2.26
scope of sin: 2.62
self-determinative: 2.29-2.30
seraphim. purifiers and worshipers: 2.18-2.19
spectators of earthly scenes: 2.26-2.27
Animation: 1.120-1.123
characteristics: 1.120-1.121
power: 1.121
vitality: 1.120-1.121
definition: 1.120
relation to believers: 1.122
relation to unbelievers: 1.121-1.122
Annihilationism: 4.420-4.422
Anthropology: 2.125-2.173; 7.15-7.16
introduction: 2.125-2.129
Biblical. contrasts to secular: 2.125
definition: 2.126
secular: 2.126; 7.15
Antichrist: 7.16-7.17
Apostasy: 3.293-3.295; 7.17-7.19, 7.111
definition: 7.17
Archaeology: 1.66
Armageddon: 4.397
Arminianism: 3.182, 3.185, 3.268; 7.137
Ascension: 7.19-7.20
Assurance: 7.21-7.24
basis in Christian experience: 7.21-7.23
basis in Word of God: 7.23-7.24

Astronomy: 2.6
relation to reason: 1.134
Atheism: 1.163-1.164
definition: 1.163-1.164
Atonement: 3.127, 3.135-3.164; 7.25-7.27
N. T. doctrine: 7.26
O. T. doctrine: 7.25-7.26
theological use: 7.26-7.27
theories. commercial: 3.67, 3.137-3.139
identification: 3.142
marturial: 3.141
moral influence: 3.141-3.142
payment to Satan: 3.136-3.137
rectoral or governmental: 3.139, 3.142-3.154
satisfaction: 3.154-3.164
universalism: 3.140-3.141
Authority: 7.27-7.29
civil: 7.29

B

Babylon: 7.29-7.31
commercial and political: 7.31
ecclesiastical: 7.30-7.31
Baptism: 7.32-7.43
Christian. relation to baptism of Christ: 5.69-5.70
meaning of word: 6.138-6.140
meanings of Greek words used: 7.32-7.33
Old Testament: 5.65-5.66; 7.41
relation to faith: 3.381-3.384
ritual: 7.34-7.43
affusion: 7.36
immersion: 7.36-7.37
modes of: 7.35
prepositions used: 7.39-7.40

trine immersion: 7.37
Scriptures involved: 7.39
Spirit: 3.73-3.74, 3.99-3.100, 3.381-3.384
meaning: 2.350
spiritual: 6.138-6.161; 7.32-7.34, 7.36
attributed to Christ: 6.141-6.142
attributed to Holy Spirit: 6.142-6.151
result. new creation: 6.151-6.157
use of the word: 7.38
Baptism of Infants: 7.41-7.42
Baptism of John. Repentance: 5.63
Baptist. John the Baptist: 7.41
Beatitudes: 4.216-4.219; 5.103-5.105
Believers: 1.38-1.40, 1.308
Benedictions: 1.308-1.309
Bible:
attitudes: 1.12-1.15
authority: 1.7, 1.22-1.23, 1.83-1.84, 1.89-1.104
sources: 1.94-1.104
Christ: 1.95-1.98
God-breathed: 1.94
power: 1.102-1.104
prophets: 1.98-1.101
public accreditation: 1.95
Holy Spirit: 1.94, 1.102
canon. formation: 1.89-1.93
canonicity: 1.89-1.104
covenants: 1.41-1.43
Abrahamic: 1.42
Adamic: 1.42
Davidic: 1.43, 1.360-1.361
Edenic: 1.42
Mosaic: 1.42-1.43
new (Church): 1.43
new (Israel): 1.43
Noahic: 1.42

Palestinian: 1.43
difficulties: 1.66-1.67
divisions: 1.36-1.47
dual authorship: 1.72-1.76
evidences. authority: 7.29, 7.45-7.46
continuity: 1.29-1.30
ethics: 1.27-1.29, 1.35
hermeneutics: 7.45, 7.203-7.205
inspiration: 6.28-6.32; 7.45, 7.200-7.201
principal Scriptures: 7.200-7.201
knowledge of content. essential character: 1.vi, 1.114
lifetime study: 1.vi
literary character: 1.31-1.34
N. T. canon. closing: 1.93
formation: 1.91-1.92
N. T. prophets: 3.19-3.20
N. T. revelation. principles of interpretation: 4.296-4.299
O. T. authority. congregation: 1.98
king: 1.98
Levites : 1.99
officials : 1.98-1.99
O. T. canon. closing: 1.92-1.93
formation: 1.90-1.91
O. T. judges: 5.333
O. T. prophets: 3.17-3.19
relation to secular knowledge: 2.126-2.129
revelation. creation: 1.26
God: 1.23-1.24
monotheism: 1.24
prophecy: 1.30-1.31
redemption: 1.26-1.27
sin : 1.26-1.28
Trinity: 1.24-1.26
the Father: 1.25
Holy Spirit: 1.25
the Son: 1.25

typology: 1.31
science and the Bible: 1.34-1.35
supernatural character: 6.30-6.31
supernatural origin: 1.22-1.36
textual criticism: 1.87-1.88
time periods: 1.40-1.47
church: 1.46-1.47
Gentiles : 1.46
humanity: 1.40
kingdom of heaven: 1.44-1.45
prophetic: 1.43-1.44
use and value: 2.333
vivification: 7.45
Bibliology: 1.21-1.125; 7.43-7.46
introduction: 1.21-1.47
Blasphemy: 7.46-7.48
N. T. doctrine: 7.46-7.47
O. T. doctrine: 7.46
Blindness: 7.49-7.52
judicial: 7.49-7.51
physical: 7.49
spiritual: 7.51-7.52
carnal believers: 7.52
unbelievers: 7.51-7.52
Blood: 7.52-7.55
cleansing: 7.53-7.54
sacrificial: 7.52-7.53
Blood covenant: 7.54
Body: 7.55-7.57
human: 7.55-7.57
Bread: 7.58-7.60
general meaning of food: 7.58
typical meaning: 7.58-7.59
symbolic meaning: 7.59-7.60
Bride: 7.60-7.63
Bullingerism. Israel-bride error: 4.127-4.128, 4.130-4.131

Buried: 7.63-7.64

C

Calling, effectual: 3.168, 3.194, 3.210-3.211, 3.236, 3.349-3.350; 6.251-6.253; 7.65-7.68
effectual. Arminian view: 3.276-3.278
Calvinism: 3.184-3.185, 3.267; 7.137
Carnality: 7.68-7.70, 7.107-7.108
character: 7.68-7.69
relation to spiritual life: 7.69-7.70
Catholic Church: 1.14
Cause. first: 1.146-1.147
Causation: 1.143-1.144
Chastisement: 7.70-7.73
divisions: 7.71-7.73
corrective: 7.72
enlarging: 7.72
preventative: 7.71
vindicative: 7.72-7.73
Children. home government: 4.200
Children of God: 3.252-3.253, 3.346-3.347
Christ:
ascension: 1.370; 3.16; 4.118, 4.393; 5.252, 5.261-5.273; 7.19-7.20, 7.81-7.82
clouds of heaven: 5.268-5.273; 7.20
entered heavenly sanctuary: 5.264-5.267
first-fruits: 5.267-5.268
prophecy: 5.269-5.271
resurrection morn: 5.262-5.268; 7.19-7.20
authority: 7.28
baptism: 5.56-5.73; 7.40-7.41, 7.79
baptizer: 5.56-5.59
cup: 5.72-5.73
Holy Spirit: 5.71-5.72

meaning: 3.26, 3.40-3.42
mode: 5.63-5.69
exegetical evidence: 5.66-5.69
philological evidence: 5.64-5.66
purpose. priestly consecration: 5.61-5.63
relation to Christian baptism: 5.69-5.70
theories: 5.59-5.63
identification with Godly remnant: 5.61
John’s baptism unto repentance: 5.60-5.61
separation as Messiah: 5.61
birth: 5.47-5.53
body: 2.158-2.159
burial: 4.393; 7.63-7.64, 7.81
childhood: 5.53-5.55; 7.79
subject to law: 5.53-5.54
commandments of: 7.5-7.6, 7.226
confession of: 7.88-7.89
Creator: 1.342-1.343
death: 1.xvi-1.xvii, 1.306-1.307, 1.370; 3.8-3.9, 3.15-3.16, 3.43-3.54; 4.32-4.33, 4.50, 4.392
attitudes: 3.46-3.47
cross. a stumbling block: 3.43
foolishness: 3.43
not the only saving instrument: 3.193-3.194
crucifixion. crime: 3.45-3.48
prophecy: 5.181-5.188
for whom did He die?: 3.183-3.205
God’s sovereignty: 3.49-3.51, 3.52-3.53, 3.60-3.61
importance: 3.43-3.44, 3.55, 3.131-3.133
judgment: 3.220-3.222, 3.239-3.240, 3.249-3.250
participation of Trinity: 3.53-3.54
responsibility: 3.49-3.51
His own part: 3.50-3.51
part of the Father: 3.51-3.52
part of the Holy Spirit: 3.51
unified action of the three persons: 3.53-3.54

results: 3.55-3.115, 3.355-3.357
blessing on Gentiles: 3.108-3.109
believer’s forgiveness and cleansing: 3.101-3.102
end of law: 3.76-3.86, 3.240-3.241, 3.342-3.345; 4.164-4.165, 4.234-4.251
national salvation of Israel: 3.105-3.108
peace: 3.112-3.113
purification of things in heaven: 3.113-3.115
righteous judgments: 3.102-3.103
spoiling of principalities and powers: 3.109-3.111
substitution: 3.55-3.76, 3.199-3.201
meaning of Greek words 3.56-3.57
taking away of precross sins: 3.103-3.105
testimony of Scripture: 3.201-3.205
universal gospel preaching: 3.194-3.195
types: 3.116-3.126
according to Scriptures: 3.125-3.126
miscellaneous: 3.124-3.125
O. T. general sacrifices: 3.119-3.120
O. T. prescribed sacrifices: 3.120-3.123
unique: 3.133-3.134
value. theories: 3.131-3.152
value to God: 3.51-3.52, 3.134-3.135
Deity: 1.318-1.320, 1.339-1.347, 1.383; 5.7-5.23; 7.78
attributes: 1.340-1.342; 5.17-5.19
eternity: 1.340-1.341; 5.17-5.18
forgives sin: 1.343
immutability: 1.341; 5.18
omnipotence: 1.341; 5.18
omnipresence: 1.341-1.342; 5.19
omniscience: 1.341; 5.18-5.19
centrality: 5.8-5.9
consciousness: 1.391-1.392
denial: 1.278-1.280; 5.8-5.9
objections: 1.345-1.347
prerogatives: 1.342-1.345

relation to Christian life: 1.280
relation to God’s love: 1.279
relation to redemption: 1.278-1.279
triune relationship: 5.22-5.23
works of God: 5.19-5.22
creation: 5.19-5.21, 5.23-5.27
forgiveness of sin: 5.21
judgment: 5.21-5.22
preservation: 5.21, 5.26
resurrection of dead: 5.21
divinity. sonship: 3.30-3.31
exaltation: 4.135-4.136; 5.252, 5.274
genealogy: 5.48, 5.53; 7.166-7.167
Head of Church: 4.48, 4.68-4.78
headship: 1.xxxvi, 1.358-1.359; 7.182
humanity: 1.365-1.372, 1.383-1.384; 2.158-2.159; 5.47-5.48; 7.57
early heresies: 1.265-1.266
essentials of human nature: 1.369
freedom from sin nature: 5.49, 5.77-5.78
limitations: 1.369-1.370
necessity: 5.49
prophecy: 1.367-1.368
New Testament: 1.368
Old Testament: 1.367-1.368
types: 1.367
hypostatic union: 1.72-1.75, 1.339-1.340, 1.365, 1.382-1.396; 5.48-5.49
definition: 1.382
deity: 1.383
deity and humanity preserved without confusion or alteration: 1.384-1.389
humanity: 1.383-1.384
relationships: 1.389-1.396
to believers: 1.395
to fallen angels: 1.392
to the Father: 1.389-1.390
to Himself: 1.390-1.392

to humanity: 1.392-1.393
to sin: 1.393
to sin nature: 1.393
to Spirit: 1.390
to unfallen angels: 1.392
structure of doctrine: 1.383-1.389
impeccability: 1.393-1.395; 5.50-5.51, 5.77-5.78
incarnation: 7.57, 7.78-7.80, 7.194-7.196
interceding: 1.333
Judge: 1.343-1.344
kenosis: 1.373-1.381; 6.257-6.258
condescension: 1.371-1.372, 1.374, 1.377-1.378
controversy: 1.373-1.374
humiliation: 1.371-1.372, 1.374, 1.378-1.379
interpretations: 1.379-1.381
“the form of God”: 1.375-1.377
King: 3.17, 3.30, 3.33; 5.317-5.376; 7.223
Kinsman-Redeemer: 5.83, 5.180
Last Adam: 5.49-5.51
relation to first Adam: 5.49-5.51, 5.77-5.78
life: 1.368-1.370
accusations of blasphemy: 7.47
blasphemed by Jews: 7.47
childhood: 1.391-1.392
human parentage: 1.368-1.369
ministry: 1.306
names: 1.368
obedience: 3.42-3.43
postresurrection ministry: 1.109-1.110
relation to Holy Spirit: 5.80
sufferings: 3.36-3.43
anticipation of death: 3.39-3.43
divine compassion: 3.38-3.39
outraged holiness: 3.37-3.38
washing disciples’ feet: 5.146-5.148
love for believers: 4.135-4.137

Messiahship: 3.39-3.43; 4.300-4.302, 4.323, 4.392; 5.88-5.89, 5.315-5.358
millennial reign: 1.359-1.361
names: 1.332-1.338; 5.9-5.17, 5.28-5.33
Angel of Jehovah: 5.31-5.33
designations of eternal relationship: 5.9-5.12, 5.24
exact image: 5.11
First-Begotten or First-Born: 5.11-5.12, 5.24
image: 5.11, 5.24
Logos: 5.9-5.10
Only-Begotten: 5.10-5.11
Logos: 3.13-3.15, 3.21; 7.227-7.228
Lord Jesus Christ: 1.337-1.338
Messiah: 5.28-5.31; 7.236-7.237
Only-Begotten: 7.245
primary designations of Deity: 5.12-5.17
God: 1.334-1.335; 5.12-5.13
Jehovah: 1.332-1.334; 5.13-5.17
Son of Abraham: 3.33
Son of David: 3.33
Son of God: 1.335-1.336; 3.30-3.31
Son of Man: 1.336-1.337; 3.31-3.32
nativity: 5.47-5.53
virgin birth: 1.354-1.355, 1.359
Person: 1.349-1.354, 1.382; 3.11-3.34
hypostatic union: 3.33-3.34
seven positions: 3.12-3.17
prayers: 5.160-5.161
pre-existence: 1.318-1.331, 1.350-1.351, 1.375; 3.12-3.15; 5.3-5.38; 7.78
Angel of Jehovah: 1.327-1.331
Biblical implications: 5.33
Biblical statements: 5.33-5.38
major passages: 1.322-1.327, 1.374-1.375
present session in heaven: 1.xxxv, 1.xxxvi, 1.xxxvii, 1.110-1.111, 1.370; 5.164-5.165, 5.273-5.279; 7.82, 7.286
advocacy: 5.198, 5.276-5.277; 7.11-7.12, 7.164, 7.247

Bestower of gifts: 5.275-5.276
building: 5.277-5.278
expecting: 5.278-5.279
interceding: 6.235-6.236
preserver: 1.343
Priest: 3.26-3.30
priesthood: 1.xxxvi, 1.xxxvii, 1.357-1.358; 4.64-4.65, 4.300, 4.392; 5.82-5.83; 7.20, 7.256
Advocate: 1.xxxvii
entered heavenly sanctuary: 5.264-5.267
intercessor: 1.xxxvi
prayer: 6.152-6.154
relation to session: 5.273-5.279
spiritual gifts: 1.xxxvi
typology: 5.177-5.178, 5.267
Prophet: 3.17-3.26; 5.93-5.94, 5.95-5.169
sufferings and death: 5.187-5.188
prophetic ministry: 5.95-5.169
raises dead: 1.343
receives worship: 1.344-1.345
relation to Church: 4.45-4.46, 4.50, 4.54-4.143
Bridegroom and Bride: 4.127-4.143, 4.377, 4.396; 7.61-7.63, 7.127, 7.182
Cornerstone and stones of building: 4.61-4.64
Head and Body: 4.68-4.78; 5.219-5.220, 5.252-5.253, 5.256-5.257, 5.274-5.275; 7.33-7.34, 7.57, 7.127, 7.182
High Priest and kingdom of priests: 4.64-4.68
Last Adam and New Creation: 4.79-4.126; 5.143-5.144, 5.256-5.257
Shepherd and sheep: 4.56-4.59
seven figures: 7.60-7.61, 7.129-7.130
vine and branches: 4.59-4.61, 4.99-4.100; 5.148-5.151; 7.4-7.5
relation to Israel: 4.50
resurrection: 1.xvi, 1.xvii, 1.307, 1.359-1.360, 1.370; 3.16, 3.327-3.328; 4.32-4.33, 4.79-4.92, 4.93, 4.117, 4.124-4.126, 4.393; 5.231-5.260; 7.266-7.268
Christ’s prophecies: 5.239-5.241

commemorated by Lord’s Day: 5.253-5.260
Covenant Theology view: 5.231-5.234
dispensational significance: 5.231-5.234
First-Fruits: 7.153-7.154
importance: 4.80
necessary: 4.83-4.84
neglect: 4.79-4.80
neglect by Covenant Theology: 5.231-5.234, 5.253-5.254
N. T. doctrine: 5.238-5.260
O. T. implications: 5.234-5.238
O. T. prophecies: 5.236-5.238
present standard of power: 5.249-5.253
produced new order of being: 5.244-5.245
proof: 4.81-4.83; 5.241-5.243
    Bible statement: 4.83
    disciples’ experience: 4.81-4.82
    early church: 4.82
    empty tomb: 4.81
    eye-witnesses: 4.82-4.83
    God’s program: 4.83
    His truthfulness: 4.81
prophecy of: 4.84-4.85
prophecy, N. T.: 4.85
prophecy, O. T.: 4.84-4.85
purpose: 4.91-4.92
reality: 4.90-4.91; 5.243-5.244, 5.251-5.252
reasons: 4.85-4.90; 5.245-5.249
    become First-Fruits: 4.89-90; 5.249
    become Head of Body: 4.87-4.88
    become Head of Church: 5.248
    bestow life: 4.86-4.87
    empower: 4.87
    fulfill Davidic Covenant: 5.246-5.247
    fulfill prophecy: 4.86
    His Person: 4.85-4.86; 5.245
    result of justification: 5.248-5.249

source of resurrection power: 5.247-5.248
relation to death: 5.231
relation to justification: 4.88-4.89
typology: 5.235-5.236
return for Church: 5.164-5.165, 5.355
rewarder: 1.343
second advent: 1.370
destroy man of sin: 2.71-2.72
session: 3.16, 3.26, 3.328-3.334
Sonship: 1.25, 1.313-1.316; 7.290
theories: 7.152
subjection to Father: 1.363-1.364
sufferings and death: 3.35-3.54; 5.177-5.230; 7.55, 7.80-7.81, 7.105-7.106, 7.115, 7.272, 7.298
Christ's prophecy: 5.187-5.188
Christian's share: 6.275-6.282
contrast between crucifixion and cross: 3.44-3.45
Corinthian Epistles: 5.208-5.212
demonstrate wisdom, power, and sacrifice of God: 3.52-3.53
Epistle to the Hebrews: 5.225-5.229
epistles of Paul: 5.201-5.224
epistles of Peter: 5.224-5.225
First Epistle of John: 5.197-5.198
from men: 3.51
Galatians: 5.212-5.215
Gospel of John: 5.189-5.197
John the Baptist: 5.189-5.191
O. T. prophecy: 5.181-5.188
doctrinal: 5.184-5.185
historical: 5.181-5.184
pastoral epistles: 5.223-5.224
prison epistles: 5.215-5.223
relation to world: 5.189-5.191
relation to Israel: 5.194-5.195
revelation: 5.198-5.201
Romans: 5.201-5.208

synoptic history: 5.188-5.189
Thessalonian Epistles: 5.223
terminology: 3.127-3.130
theories of value: 7.105-7.106
typology: 5.177-5.181
Levitical offerings: 5.178-5.181
tabernacle furniture: 5.178, 5.180
value: 6.292-6.293
value to the Father: 3.51-3.52
vicarious sufferings in general: 3.57-3.61
teaching: 1.xvi
conversations: 5.169
major discourses: 3.24-3.25; 5.96-5.166
parables: 5.166-5.169
temptation: 2.51-2.52, 2.94-2.95; 5.74-5.84; 7.302-7.303
N. T. passages: 5.79
relation to Christian: 5.81-5.84
relation to God’s purpose: 5.80-5.81
relation to Holy Spirit: 5.79-5.81
relation to Satan: 5.81
sphere of humanity only: 5.76
Theanthropic Person: 5.51-5.53, 5.182-5.183; 7.196
transfiguration: 5.85-5.94; 7.305-7.306
divine attestation: 5.93-5.94
importance: 5.86-5.87
purpose: 5.87-5.90
reality: 5.90
relation to Covenant Theology: 5.85
relation to Messianic kingdom: 5.85, 5.86-5.87, 5.88-5.90, 5.91-5.93
relation to premillennialism: 5.85
relation to second advent: 5.86-5.87
typical relation to Adam: 7.7-7.9
virgin birth: 7.196
Christ as advocate: 3.328-3.31
Christ as intercessor: 3.331-3.334; 4.67; 5.276
Christ as mediator: 3.61-3.62; 7.234-7.235

surrender: 5.368-5.376
Christ as prophet: 4.31-4.32, 4.51, 4.289-4.290, 4.299-4.300
Christ as teacher: 5.95-5.169
Christian: 7.73-7.75
abiding in Christ for fruit bearing: 5.148-5.151
bondslave: 6.260-6.261
classifications: 6.169-6.172
cleansing unto unbroken fellowship: 5.146-5.148
dedication of life: 6.254-6.255
new relationship to God: 5.143-5.146
other names for: 7.73-7.74
position in Christ: 4.92-4.100; 5.144-5.146; 6.152
position. sons of God: 6.106-6.107, 6.110-6.111
relation to church leaders: 4.199
relation to *cosmos* world system: 4.195-4.197
relation to erring brother: 4.200-4.201
relation to human government: 4.196-4.197
relation to imputed sin: 2.358
relation to man’s estate under sin: 2.358-2.359
relation to “old man”: 2.348
relation to other believers: 4.197-4.199
relation to Persons of Godhead: 4.195
relation to Satan: 4.195-4.196
relation to unsaved individuals: 4.197
relation to weak brother: 4.201-4.202
responsibility in spiritual life: 6.162-6.298
introduction: 6.162-6.176
self-judgment: 4.403-4.404
sin nature: 2.345-2.358
judgment: 4.403
two natures of: 6.185-6.188
Christian life: 3.248-3.249, 3.355-3.363; 4.28-4.29, 4.94-4.96, 4.186-4.202
Christlike character: 4.193-4.194
divine enablement: 4.188-4.194
superhuman character: 4.186-4.188
opponents: 2.329-2.332; 3.357-3.361

devil: 2.331-2.332
flesh: 2.330-2.331
world: 2.330
provisions: 2.332-2.334
sin: 2.325-2.359
effects: 2.334-2.345
Christianity: 7.75-7.77
Christians: 4.12-4.14, 4.418
Christology: 5.3-5.376; 7.78-7.83
introduction: 4.3-4.7
Church:
apostasy: 7.19
authority as Christ's consort: 4.135
beginning at Pentecost: 4.45-4.46, 4.394
Body of Christ: 1.xiii-1.xx
distinguished from Israel: 1.xiv-1.xix
brides as types: 7.62-7.63
character. a building: 4.43, 4.61-4.64
a new creation: 4.92-4.100
intercalary: 4.40-4.42, 4.385-4.386
organism: 4.36-4.143
Christ's prophecy of: 4.43
distinguished from Israel: 4.29-4.35, 4.47-4.53, 4.127-4.133
exaltation: 4.135-4.136, 4.376-4.377, 4.395
glorification: 4.136, 4.376-4.377, 4.395
last days: 4.374-4.375, 4.394
names and titles: 4.42
nature: 4.365-4.366
N. T. use of word: 4.37-4.40
organism. history of doctrine: 4.36-4.37
present-day sectarianism: 4.54, 4.147-4.149
relation to Christ: 4.54-4.143
Bridegroom and Bride: 4.127-4.143, 4.377, 4.396; 6.81-6.82; 7.61-7.63, 7.127, 7.182
Cornerstone and stones of building: 4.61-4.64
Head and Body: 4.68-4.78; 6.81-6.82; 7.33-7.34, 7.57, 7.127, 7.182

High Priest and kingdom of priests: 4.64-4.68
Last Adam and New Creation: 4.79-4.126; 6.151-6.157
seven figures: 7.60-7.61, 7.129-7.130
Shepherd and sheep: 4.56-4.59
Vine and branches: 4.59-4.61, 4.99-4.100; 6.164; 7.4-7.5
relation to great tribulation: 4.364-4.373
unity of believers: 5.157-5.160
Church government. forms of: 7.131-7.132, 7.177
Cleansing: 7.83-7.85
of Christian: 7.84-7.85, 7.108
of unsaved: 7.84
O. T. doctrine: 7.84
Commandments: 7.85-7.88
Christ: 7.87-7.88
Mosaic: 7.86-7.87
Communion with Christ: 7.3-7.6
Communion with God: 6.163-6.165
Conduct of life. inherent law: 1.xx
systems: 1.xxi-1.xxii
Confession: 7.88-7.91
Confession of sin. New Testament: 7.90-7.91
Old Testament: 7.89-7.90
Conscience: 7.91-7.93
Consecration. relation to faith: 3.384-3.388
Conversion: 7.93-7.94
distinguished from salvation: 7.93-7.94
Israel: 4.320-4.322
Conviction: 7.94-7.96
Cosmos: 2.76-2.90
destruction: 2.89-2.90
impotency: 2.88-2.89
relation to Christian: 2.78-2.79, 2.87-2.88
satanic character: 2.76-2.77, 2.84-2.86
satanic control: 2.77, 2.79, 2.80-2.84, 2.114
satanic development: 2.86-2.87
Cosmological argument. atheistic view: 1.144-1.145

Covenant of redemption: 5.27-5.28
Covenant people. relation to repentance: 3.375-3.376
Covenant Theology: 4.156-4.157, 4.311; 7.96-7.97, 7.122-7.123, 7.176
    view of Christ's resurrection: 5.231-5.234
Covenants: 1.42; 4.49, 4.305-4.306; 5.27-5.28; 7.96-7.99
    Abrahamic: 4.313-4.314; 5.317-5.321; 7.97
        eternal provisions: 5.318-5.321
            nation: 5.318-5.320
            possession of land: 5.320-5.321
    assured Messianic kingdom: 5.317-5.333
    Biblical: 7.97-7.99
    Davidic: 4.314; 5.321-5.333; 7.98
        N. T. prophecies: 5.326-5.333
        O. T. prophecies: 5.321-5.326
        relation to resurrection of Christ: 5.246-5.247
    grace: 1.42; 4.156, 4.229
    Mosaic: 4.314; 7.97-7.98
    new: 7.98-7.99
    new with Israel: 4.314-4.315, 4.325
    Palestinian: 4.317-4.323; 7.98
    redemption: 1.42
    with Israel: 4.313-4.328
    works: 1.42; 4.211-4.212, 4.228-4.229, 4.231-4.233, 4.246-4.247
        annulled: 4.246-4.247
Creation: 1.26, 1.253, 1.305-1.306; 5.19-5.21, 5.23-5.27; 7.99-7.101, 7.108-7.109
    new heavens and earth: 5.365-5.366
    origin in God: 1.143
Creations. two. commemoration: 4.100-4.124
Creeds: 7.101-7.103
    ecumenical: 7.102
    postreformation: 7.102-7.103
Criticism. Biblical: 7.103-7.104
    Biblical. types: 7.103-7.104
Cross: 7.104-7.106
    Christian: 7.106

judgment: 4.402-4.403; 7.214

D

Daniel. prophet: 4.289
Darkness: 7.106-7.108
Day of Atonement: 3.122-3.123; 7.64
Day of Christ: 1.xvii; 4.33; 7.110-7.111
Day of God: 4.401; 7.112
Day of Jehovah: 4.11-4.12, 4.33, 4.383-4.384, 4.398
Day of Lord: 1.xvii; 7.110
Days: 7.108-7.112
Death: 7.112-7.115
character as judgment: 2.153-2.155
judgment for sin: 7.112-7.113
physical: 7.113-7.114
second: 7.114-7.115
spiritual: 7.114
Decrees of God: 1.225-1.259
definition: 1.225, 1.232
divine appointment: 1.232
divine permission: 1.232, 1.236-1.238
eternity: 1.228-1.229
final: 1.237
first cause: 1.228
free: 1.229
immutable: 1.245
manifestations: 1.253-1.257
manifested in creation: 1.253
manifested in grace: 1.257
manifested in miracles: 1.256-1.257
manifested in prayer: 1.256
manifested in preservation: 1.255
manifested in program of ages: 1.253-1.255
manifested in providence: 1.255-1.256

objections: 1.237, 1.248-1.252
objection from God’s justice: 1.249
objection from God’s love: 1.249
objection from human suffering: 1.251-1.252
objection from fatalism: 1.251
objection that incentive curtailed: 1.250
objection that preaching becomes pointless: 1.250-1.251
objection that sin is compulsory: 1.249-1.250
order: 3.178-3.182
Arminian: 3.182, 3.278-3.279
infralapsarian: 3.180-3.181
sublapsarian: 1.246; 3.181
supralapsarian: 1.245; 3.179-3.180
perfection: 1.225-1.226
problem of will: 1.238
relation to election: 1.232
relation to moral agents: 1.230-1.231
relation to predestination: 1.232
relation to retribution: 1.232
relation to sin: 1.226-1.228, 1.232-1.238
relation to sovereignty: 1.226
unconditional: 1.229-1.230
wise: 1.229
Deism: 1.176
definition: 1.176
Demon possession: 2.119-2.121; 7.117-7.118
relation to demon influence: 2.119, 2.121
Demonology: 2.113-2.121; 7.115-7.118
heathen beliefs: 2.37
Demons. activity: 2.117
character: 2.119-2.120; 7.115-7.117
bodiless spirits: 2.119; 7.115-7.116
evil: 2.120
seeking embodiment: 2.119-2.120; 7.116
wicked: 7.116-7.117
classes: 2.114

identity: 2.113-2.114
relation to Christ: 2.121
relation to Satan: 2.113-2.114
relation to spiritism: 2.117-2.118
sin with daughters of men: 2.114-2.117
Depravity: 2.316-2.323; 3.166-3.167, 3.211-3.217, 3.230-3.232, 3.359, 3.366; 6.290-6.291; 7.107, 7.118-7.120, 7.156, 7.241
relation to Christian: 2.358-2.359
remedy: 2.319-2.323
spiritual blindness: 1.107, 1.129, 1.162
Destruction of Jerusalem: 5.118-5.119
Disciples: 7.120-7.121
relation to apostles: 7.120
relation to believers: 7.120-7.121
Dispensations. divine: 4.16-4.21, 4.49, 4.90, 4.100-4.102, 4.154-4.156, 4.205-4.208; 5.98-5.99, 5.254-5.257; 6.100-6.102; 7.121-7.123
Church: 4.18-4.19, 4.113-4.122, 4.180-4.202, 4.205-4.207, 4.368-4.369, 4.386-4.387, 4.393; 5.191, 5.255-5.256; 6.80-6.84
Gentile privilege: 6.83-6.84
intercalary character: 6.81
new divine purpose: 6.81-6.82
relation to evil: 6.83
relation to Israel: 6.83
witnessing: 6.82
conscience: 1.40
definition: 1.40
grace: 1.41
Holy Spirit: 6.123
human government: 1.40-1.41; 7.177
innocence: 1.40
kingdom: 1.41; 4.19, 4.167-4.179, 4.207-4.208; 5.256
law or Mosaic: 1.41; 4.18, 4.102-4.113, 4.113-4.115, 4.158-4.166, 4.205; 5.254-5.255
pre-Mosaic: 4.157-4.158; 5.254
promise: 1.41
terms used: 7.121-7.23

Divine nature. presence: 3.345-3.346
Divine purpose. execution: 3.347-3.351
Divine purposes: 4.47, 4.73-4.74
Dualism: 1.177
    ethical: 1.177
    philosophical: 1.177
    psychological: 1.177
    theological: 1.177

E

Ecclesiology: 4.3-4.251; 7.127-7.130
    divisions: 1.xiii; 4.27-4.29
        Christian life: 4.28-4.29, 4.154-4.251
        the church organically: 4.27-4.28, 4.36-4.143
        the church organizationally: 4.28, 4.55-4.56, 4.144-4.153, 4.352-4.359
    introduction: 4.3-4.35
Elders: 7.130-7.132
    N. T. use of word: 7.131
    types: 7.132
Election: 1.232, 1.244-1.246; 3.165-3.205, 3.268-3.269, 3.347-3.348; 6.91-6.93; 7.132-7.138
    Abraham: 3.169-3.170
    Church: 7.134-7.135
    Cyrus: 3.171
    essential truths: 3.172-3.176
    eternal character: 3.172-3.173, 3.234-3.236
    general doctrine: 7.132-7.133
    immutable: 3.174-3.175
    Israel: 7.133-7.134
    objections: 3.176-3.177; 7.135-7.136
        human will: 7.136
        partiality: 7.135-7.136
    relation to Christ’s death: 3.175-3.176

relation to foreknowledge: 3.173-3.174
relation to mediation: 3.175
relation to redemption: 3.187
relation to retribution: 1.246-1.248
revealed: 3.168-3.172
terms used: 3.167-3.168
universality: 3.165-3.166
views: 3.184-3.185
views of two Calvinist schools: 3.185-3.188
Elective decrees. order: 7.137
Eradicationism: 6.286-6.288
Eschatology: 4.23-4.27, 4.255-4.439; 7.111, 7.138-7.140
introduction: 4.255-4.263
Eternal life: 4.24-4.26, 4.389, 4.400-4.401; 7.142, 7.227
Christian. possession: 4.25-4.26
Mosaic. inheritance: 4.24-4.25
Eternal security: 3.267-3.370
Arminian view: 3.273-3.312
appeal to Scriptures: 3.290-3.312
emphasis on human experience and reason: 3.286-3.290
major soteriological doctrines: 3.275-3.285
Arminius' view: 3.271
Augustine's view: 3.270
basis: 3.316-3.339
baptism of Holy Spirit: 3.337-3.338
Christ's advocacy: 3.328-3.331
Christ's death: 3.326-3.327
Christ's intercession: 3.331-3.334
Christ's resurrection: 3.327-3.328
God's love: 3.321-3.323
God's omnipotence: 3.320-3.321
God's response to Christ's prayer: 3.323-3.324
God's sovereign purpose: 3.316-3.319
indwelling by Holy Spirit: 3.336-3.337
regeneration by Holy Spirit: 3.335-3.336
sealing of Holy Spirit: 3.338-3.339

Calvinistic view: 3.313-3.339
consummating Scripture: 3.340-3.355
introduction: 3.267-3.272
Lutheran view: 3.271
Eternal state: 4.389, 4.400-4.401, 4.413-4.439
classes of persons: 4.415-4.418
spheres of existence: 4.418-4.420
theories: 4.420-4.426
Eternity: 7.140-7.142
definition: 7.141
relation to time: 7.141-7.142
Evangelism: 7.142-7.146
definition: 7.143-7.145
N. T. method: 1.ix
N. T. purpose: 7.143-7.144
Evangelist. N. T. use of word: 7.145-7.146
Evil. character in church age: 6.83
problem of origin: 2.28, 2.31-2.32
Evolution: 1.166-1.170; 2.130-2.135; 7.99, 7.146, 7.149
atheistic: 1.166, 1.169
definition: 1.166
man: 1.157
naturalistic: 2.131
theistic: 1.166; 2.131
theory: 1.168
Expiation: 3.127

F

Faith: 1.11; 7.146-7.148
essential character: 6.293-6.294
gift of God: 7.147
meanings of word: 7.148
relation to baptism: 3.381-3.384
relation to confessing Christ: 3.378-3.380

relation to knowledge: 7.147
relation to repentance: 3.372-3.378
relation to restitution: 3.388
relation to special pleading: 3.389-3.392
relation to surrender: 3.384-3.388
relation to works: 3.297-3.302
Fall from grace: 3.310-3.311
Fall of man: 1.105; 2.215-2.223; 7.16, 7.19, 7.149-7.150
Arminian view: 3.279-3.280
results: 2.215-2.216; 7.16, 7.150
depravity: 2.218-2.222
physical death: 2.222-2.223
spiritual death: 2.217-2.218
subject to Satan: 2.217
Fellowship with God. loss of: 3.309-3.310
Filioque controversy: 6.10-6.12
First-fruits: 7.153-7.155
Christ: 7.153-7.154
early Christians: 7.154
first believers in locality: 7.154
Holy Spirit: 7.154
Israel: 7.154
Kingdom believers: 7.154-7.155
Flesh: 7.155-7.157
evil character: 7.156
N. T. uses of word: 6.183, 6.269
relation to Christian: 7.155-7.157
secret of victory: 6.188-6.194
Foreknowledge: 1.230; 7.158-7.160
relation to decree: 7.160
relation to foreordination: 7.158
relation to omniscience: 7.158
Foreordination: 7.160-7.161
relation to predestination: 7.161
Forgiveness. human obligation: 7.165

Forgiveness of sin: 2.270-2.273; 3.62-3.72, 3.128, 3.238-3.239, 3.328-3.331; 4.21-4.22; 5.21; 6.50-6.51; 7.74, 7.89-7.91, 7.161-7.166
basis: 2.271; 4.21
Christian: 3.101-3.102, 3.238-3.239, 3.328-3.331; 5.146-5.148, 5.197-5.198; 6.50-6.51, 6.236-6.250; 7.84-7.85, 7.163-7.164
human requirement: 4.21-4.22
Messianic kingdom: 7.164-7.165
New Testament: 2.272
Old Testament: 2.271-2.272
O. T. doctrine: 7.162
unsaved: 7.84, 7.162-7.163
Freedom of the will: 1.238-1.244; 7.136, 7.310
Free will in systems of theology: 1.231
Friends, society of: 1.13
Future life. theories concerning: 4.420-4.426
Future punishment: 4.427-4.433; 7.260-7.262
Future state of wicked: 7.108, 7.114-7.115

G

Genealogy: 7.166-7.168
Christ: 7.166-7.167
General N. T. warnings: 3.305-3.306
Gentile times. limits: 7.170-7.172
Gentiles: 1.37-1.38; 4.5-4.6, 4.72-4.73, 4.329-4.344, 4.379-4.381, 4.388, 4.416; 6.83-6.84; 7.168-7.170
national judgment: 4.5-4.6, 4.341-4.344, 4.379-4.381
N. T. warnings: 3.306
origin: 7.168
times of: 4.330-4.344, 4.379-4.381; 7.170-7.172
Gifts, spiritual: 4.68-4.69, 4.70-4.71; 6.215-6.220
definition: 6.216
purpose: 6.217-6.220
Glorification: 3.364-3.370; 4.122-4.126; 6.283-6.284
Glory: 7.172-7.173

God: 7.173-7.175
absolute character: 1.138-1.139
anthropomorphisms: 1.181-1.182
authority by creation: 7.27-7.28
being and attributes:: 1.147-1.149, 1.156, 1.158, 1.187-1.224
agent and obejct required:: 1.291-1.293
constitutional:: 1.212-1.224
eternal activity:: 1.216-1.217, 1.291; 7.141
freedom:: 1.209
glory: 7.173-7.174
goodness: 1.206-1.207
grace: 7.178
holiness: 1.202-1.203; 7.107, 7.188
infinity: 1.215-1.216; 7.199-7.200
immutability: 1.217-1.219
justice: 1.203-1.205; 7.218
love: 1.205-1.206; 7.230-7.232
mercy: 7.235
omnipotence: 1.209-1.212; 7.243
omnipresence: 1.219-1.222; 7.243-7.244
omniscience: 1.192-1.200; 7.244-7.245
Arminian view: 3.280-3.281
personality: 1.191-1.212
righteousness: 7.270
self-sufficiency: 1.293
sensibility: 1.200-1.208
simplicity: 1.213-1.214
sovereignty: 1.222-1.223
Arminian view: 3.281-3.282
truth: 1.207-1.208
uncreated: 1.146
unity: 1.214-1.215
will: 1.208-1.212; 7.309
Biblical doctrine: 1.23-1.24
blasphemy against: 7.47
Creator: 1.146-1.147

definition: 1.187; 7.173-7.174
Fatherhood: 1.25, 1.311-1.317; 4.50; 7.151-7.153
believers: 1.316-1.317; 7.22, 7.152
creation: 1.312-1.313; 7.153
intimate relationship: 7.152
Jews: 1.313
Lord Jesus Christ: 1.313-1.316; 7.151-7.152
headship: 7.182
knowledge of: 1.139, 1.179
names and titles: 1.260-1.271; 7.174-7.175
Adonai: 1.261, 1.262, 1.268-1.269; 7.175
Adonai Jehovah: 1.261, 1.269
Almighty: 1.261
compounds with El: 1.261; 7.174
compounds with Jehovah: 1.261
Elohim: 1.261-1.262, 1.264-1.268
El Elyon: 1.261, 1.269
El Olam: 1.261, 1.269
El Shaddai: 1.56, 1.261, 1.269
full N. T. title. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: 1.261, 1.270
God of Hosts: 1.261
Jehovah: 1.261-1.264; 7.174-7.175, 7.207-7.208
Jehovah Elohim: 1.261, 1.269
Jehovah-jireh: 1.269
Jehovah-nissi: 1.269
Jehovah-raah: 1.269
Jehovah-rapha: 1.269
Jehovah Sabaoth: 1.261, 1.269
Jehovah-shalom: 1.269
Jehovah-shammah: 1.269
Jehovah-tsidkenu: 1.269
O. T. epithets: 1.269
Second Person. Lord Jesus Christ: 1.261-1.262
the First Person: 1.262
the Second Person: 1.262
the Third Person: 1.262

the Spirit of Christ: 1.270
the Spirit of God: 1.270
Person: 1.179-1.186
plurality. trinitarian: 1.294-1.295
saving work: 3.206-3.266
Spirit: 1.181-1.182
trinitarian name: 6.7-6.19
baptismal formula: 6.9
Goodness. benevolence: 1.206
complacency: 1.206
grace: 1.206-1.207, 1.257
mercy: 1.206-1.207
Gospel: 7.175-7.176
types: 7.175-7.176
everlasting: 7.176
grace of God: 7.175-7.176
kingdom: 7.175
Government: 7.177-7.178
human: 7.177
Grace: 3.225-3.266; 7.178-7.179
age of: 4.180-4.202
Arminian view: 3.282-3.285
basis. Christ's death: 3.225-3.228, 3.229-3.230
character in God: 3.59-3.60
common: 6.88
definition: 3.50-3.51
distinguished from Kingdom teachings: 4.213-4.225, 4.243-4.246
distinguished from law: 4.180-4.181, 4.203-4.233
distinguished from love: 7.178
distinguished from mercy: 7.178
divine enablement to fulfill standards: 4.188-4.194, 4.233
precepts of: 4.184-4.185
relation to Christians: 4.16
relation to Israel: 4.15, 4.181-4.182
relationships: 4.195-4.202
riches of: 5.191

character: 3.232-3.234
deliverance from power of darkness: 3.247-3.248
extent: 3.234-3.265
heavenly citizenship: 3.251-3.252, 3.365
inheritance: 3.261-3.262
sons of God: 3.252-3.253, 3.346-3.347
second work of: 6.122
superhuman standards of conduct: 4.186-4.188
teachings of: 4.183, 4.185, 4.186-4.194
universal manifestation: 4.182-4.183
Guidance: 6.225-6.228, 6.259-6.260
Guilt: 2.279-2.281; 3.128; 7.179-7.180

H

Hades: 7.180-7.182
N. T. doctrine: 7.181-7.182
O. T. doctrine: 7.180-7.181
Headship: 7.182-7.183
Healing: 7.183-7.185
errors of divine healers: 7.183-7.185
relation to Christ’s death: 7.183-7.184
Heart: 7.185-7.186
Heaven: 4.418-4.419, 4.433-4.439; 7.186-7.187
abode of God: 7.187
divisions: 7.186
purification: 3.113-3.115
Hell: 4.427-4.433
Heresy: 7.17-7.18
Hermeneutics: 1.7, 1.8, 1.69, 1.114-1.119
definition: 1.115
principles: 1.115-1.119
context: 1.117
objectivity: 1.119
purpose of Bible: 1.115

purpose of each book: 1.116
recipients of message: 1.116-1.117
thorough exegesis: 1.118-.1.119
total induction: 1.117-1.118
Holiness: 7.188
Holy Spirit: 1.25, 1.397-1.414; 7.291-7.292
activity in millennium: 6.60-6.62
attributes of God: 6.23-6.26
eternity: 6.23
faithfulness: 6.24-6.25
holiness: 6.25-6.26
love: 6.24
omnipotence: 6.23-6.24
omnipresence: 6.24
omniscience: 6.24
truthfulness: 6.25
blasphemy against: 1.401-1.402; 7.47-7.48, 7.165-7.166
character: 1.413
convicting work: 1.108, 1.412
deity: 1.399-1.402; 6.3-6.4, 6.7, 6.22-6.46
associated with God: 1.399-1.401
attributes of God: 1.401
called God: 1.399
denied: 1.280-1.281
relation to Christian life: 1.280-1.281
descriptive titles: 6.19-6.21
fruit of: 3.361-3.362; 6.199-6.215
faithfulness: 6.212-6.213
gentleness: 6.210-6.211
goodness: 6.211-6.212
humility: 7.190
joy: 6.207-6.208
long-suffering: 6.208-6.210
love: 6.202-6.206; 7.230-7.232
meekness: 6.213-6.214
peace: 6.208

self-control: 6.214-6.215
gifts: 6.215-6.220
governmental work: 1.404-1.407
grieved by sin: 6.234-6.235
name: 5.7-5.21
neglect: 6.4-6.6
N. T. evidence: 1.410-1.411
O. T. Abraham to Christ: 6.70-6.79
O. T. Adam to Abraham: 6.66-6.70
O. T. doctrine: 6.66-6.79
O. T. evidence: 1.402-1.410
O. T. relation to individuals: 1.407-1.410
personality: 1.397-1.399; 6.7, 6.9, 6.22
procession of: 6.10-6.12
prophecies of: 6.60-6.65
quenched by resisting: 6.250-6.251
relation to Christian: 1.413; 6.100-6.161
introduction: 6.100-6.103
relation to the Church: 4.45-4.46, 4.50, 4.188-4.194, 4.372-4.373
relation to creation: 1.403-1.404
relation to devil: 1.412-1.413
relation to Father: 1.411
relation to flesh: 1.412
relation to Israel: 4.50
relation to prophecy: 6.57-6.65
author: 6.57-6.60
relation to Son: 1.411-1.412
relation to world: 1.412
relation to world system: 6.85-6.99
relationships: 1.411-1.413
resistance to: 6.253
titles: 1.411
types and symbols: 6.47-6.56
Abraham’s servant: 6.55-6.56
dove: 6.53-6.54
fire: 6.52

oil: 6.47-6.50
water: 6.50-6.51
wind: 6.52-6.53
work. advocate: 7.12-7.13
anointing or indwelling: 6.40, 6.51, 6.74, 6.122-6.137, 6.158-6.159, 6.235
baptizing: 3.72, 3.73, 3.337-3.338; 5.144; 6.40-6.41, 6.51, 6.74, 6.138-6.161, 6.278-6.280; 7.32-7.34, 7.36, 7.193-7.194
baptizing Christ: 5.71-5.72
convicting: 3.210-3.224; 5.152-5.154; 6.33-6.34, 6.88-6.99; 7.94-7.96, 7.145
creating: 6.27-6.28, 6.66-6.68
earnest: 6.46, 6.54
empowering: 3.361-3.63
filling: 6.42, 6.74-6.75, 6.124, 6.159, 6.173-6.176
fruit bearing: 5.148-5.151
generating Christ: 5.49-5.50; 6.32-6.33
illuminating: 1.109-1.113; 3.212, 3.214, 3.217-3.223; 5.154-5.157; 6.36-6.38, 6.221-6.225; 7.45
indwelling or anointing: 1.109, 1.111-1.112; 2.333-2.334; 3.263-3.264, 3.336-3.337, 3.345-3.346; 4.188-4.194, 4.247; 5.148-5.149, 5.151-5.152; 6.40, 6.51, 6.74, 6.122-6.137, 6.158-6.159, 6.235; 7.22
inspiring of Scriptures: 6.28-6.32, 6.75-6.79
interceding: 5.162-5.163; 6.42-6.45, 6.229-6.230; 7.202
leading: 6.225-6.228, 6.259-6.260
O. T. sovereign enduement: 6.70-6.74, 6.130-6.131
outpouring in millennium: 6.62-6.65
paraclete: 5.151-5.152; 6.38-6.39; 7.247
power for spiritual life: 6.195-6.197
praise and thanksgiving: 6.220-6.221
regenerating: 3.241-3.242, 3.335-3.336; 5.144; 6.35-6.36, 6.104-6.21, 6.158
restraining evil: 1.412; 2.71; 4.372-4.373; 6.34-6.35, 6.85-6.88
revealing truth: 6.69-6.70
revealing future: 7.138

sanctifying: 6.45-6.46
sealing: 3.338-3.339; 6.41-6.42, 6.54-6.55, 6.74, 6.136-6.137
security: 7.286
striving: 6.28, 6.68
teaching: 1.111-1.113; 5.154-5.157; 6.221-6.225
witnessing: 6.39-6.40
world-wide character: 6.84
works of God: 6.26-6.46
Hope: 7.189
Horn: 7.189
Human conduct. systems of: 5.98-5.99
Humanity. divisions according to Paul: 6.165-6.166
Humility: 7.190

I

Idealism: 1.172-1.173
definition: 1.172-1.173
Idols. blasphemy against: 7.47
Illumination: 1.vi, 1.9, 1.10, 1.105-1.113
Holy Spirit: 1.109-1.113
relation to inspiration: 1.50-1.51
relation to revelation: 1.50-1.51
Immortality: 2.152-2.153, 2.155; 7.190-7.191
definition: 7.190-7.191
Imputation: 2.296-2.315; 7.191-7.194
Adam’s sin to human race: 7.7-7.9, 7.16, 7.113-7.114, 7.191-7.192
Christ’s righteousness to believer: 3.72, 3.74, 3.219-3.220, 3.243-3.44; 5.143-5.144, 5.201-5.203; 6.96-6.97, 6.154-6.156; 7.75, 7.192-7.194, 7.220, 7.270
man’s sin to Christ: 3.68-3.72; 7.192
theories: 2.310-2.312
Inability: 3.211-3.217, 3.385-3.386; 6.89-6.91, 6.104-6.106, 6.290-6.291; 7.43-7.44, 7.51-7.52, 7.100, 7.144-7.145

Incarnation: 1.306, 1.348-1.364; 3.15; 4.30-4.31, 4.392; 5.39-5.176; 7.57, 7.78-7.80, 7.194-7.196
importance: 5.42
introduction: 5.39-5.46
Messianic purpose: 4.30-4.31
method: 1.354-1.355
O. T. anticipation: 5.42-5.46, 5.54-5.55
implications: 5.42-5.46
prophecies: 5.44-5.45
types: 5.43-5.44
prophesied: 4.304-4.305, 4.382-4.383
purposes: 1.xv, 1.355-1.364; 7.195-7.196
destroy works of Satan: 1.358
faithful High Priest: 1.357-1.358
Head of New Creation: 1.358-1.359
Kinsman Redeemer: 1.361-1.364
reveal God: 1.355-1.357
reveal man: 1.357
sit on David’s throne: 1.359-1.361
redemptive purpose: 4.31
relation to revelation: 1.58-1.59, 1.355-1.357
scope: 5.39
the seed: 4.302
Infant salvation: 7.196-7.199
relation to election: 7.199
Infinity: 7.199-7.200
Inheritance: 7.200
Innocence: 7.200
Inspiration: 1.7, 1.22, 1.61-1.88, 1.307
Biblical claims: 1. 62-1.63, 1.67, 1.84-1.85
character: 1.61-1.63
definition: 1.61
doctrine opposed: 1.61-1.62, 1.64-1.68
dual authorship: 1.72-1.76
importance: 1.63-1.64
key passages: 1.76-1.85

objections: 1.64-1.66
relation to illumination: 1.50-1.51
relation to revelation: 1.49-1.50
theories: 1.68-1.72
concept: 1.69
degrees: 1.69
dictation: 1.68
mystical: 1.70-1.71
natural: 1.70
partial: 1.68-1.69
verbal, plenary: 1.71-1.72
verbal, plenary. objections: 1.85-1.88
Intercession: 7.201-7.202
Intermediate state: 2.156; 4.23, 4.413-4.15; 7.56-7.57, 7.202-7.203
body of: 4.414-4.415
distinguished from soul sleep: 4.414
locality: 4.413-4.414
Interpretation: 1.114-119; 7.45, 7.203-7.205
rules of: 7.203-7.205
Intuition: 1.130-1.132
character: 1.131
definition: 1.130
relation to theology: 1.130
relation to tradition: 1.132-1.133
Israel: 4.311-4.313, 4.381-4.382, 4.387, 4.390-4.391, 4.397, 4.399; 6.83; 7.205-7.206
apostasy: 7.19
blessings: 4.315-4.328
eternal king: 4.323
eternal kingdom: 4.324-4.325
eternal land: 4.317-4.323
eternal nation: 4.315-4.317
eternal throne: 4.323-4.324
calling: 7.65
covenants: 4.313-4.328
Abrahamic: 4.313-4.314

Davidic: 4.314
Mosaic: 4.314
new: 4.314-4.315, 4.325
Palestinian: 4.317-4.323
dispersions: 7.123-7.327
Assyrian and Babylonian: 7.124-7.125
Egypt: 7.124
world-wide: 7.125
distinguished from Church: 4.29-4.35, 4.127-4.133
election: 4.310, 4.316-4.317
judgment of: 4.131-4.133, 4.317-4.318
national conversion: 3.105-3.108; 4.320-4.322
relation to Jehovah. apostate wife: 4.128-4.129
servants: 4.52
repentance: 4.318
restoration: 3.3-3.5; 4.318-4.320; 5.290-5.291, 5.337-5.338; 7.125-7.127

J

Jerusalem: 7.208-7.210, 7.312
destiny: 7.209, 7.312
new city of God: 5.366-5.368
Jesus: 7.210
Jews: 1.38; 4.6-4.12, 4.416-4.418
covenants: 4.7
history: 1.46
N. T. warnings: 3.302-3.305
restoration: 1.106; 5.117-5.118, 5.136-5.140; 7.50
spiritual blindness: 1.105-1.7
John the Baptist: 5.56-5.59
forerunner of Messiah: 5.57-5.59
ministry: 3.27
prophesied: 5.57
Nazarite: 5.57
priest: 5.59

prophet: 4.290-4.294, 4.391-4.392; 5.57-5.59
supernatural birth: 5.57
Judaism: 4.40, 4.158-4.166, 4.234-4.251, 4.269-4.270; 7.76, 7.137-7.138, 7.211-7.213
annulled: 4.248-4.249
distinguished from Christianity: 1.28-1.29; 7.211-7.212
divine disposition of: 4.269-4.270
Judgment: 4.402-4.412; 5.21-5.22, 5.110-5.111; 6.97-6.98; 7.213-7.217
angels: 4.411; 7.216
Christian: 4.377, 4.403-4.406; 6.240-6.243
chastisement: 7.70-7.73, 7.214
self-judgment: 7.71, 7.214
works: 7.215
cross: 4.402-4.403
Gentiles: 5.134-5.140; 6.84; 7.168-7.169, 7.215-7.216
great white throne: 4.401, 4.411-4.412; 5.363-5.365; 7.216-7.217
Israel: 4.131-4.133, 4.397, 4.399, 4.406-4.409; 5.110-5.111, 5.128-5.133; 6.83; 7.215
blindness: 7.49-7.51
Israel's oppressors: 4.322-4.323, 4.391, 4.399-4.400, 4.409-4.411
Satan: 7.96, 7.214
sin nature: 3.96-3.101; 6.188-6.191; 7.36, 7.64, 7.156, 7.214, 7.289
Judgment day: 7.111
Just, the: 7.217
Justice: 7.218
Justification: 3.128-3.129, 3.245-3.246, 3.325; 5.143; 7.218-7.222
Biblical doctrine: 2.273-2.278
definition: 7.219-7.220
relation to forgiveness: 2.275, 2.278
relation to imputed righteousness: 2.274-2.278
relation to resurrection: 4.88-4.89
rests upon Christ's death: 7.222
work of God: 7.218-7.219

K

King: 7.223
Kingdom: 7.223-7.225
of Christ: 4.26-4.27, 4.33-4.34, 4.378; 5.359-5.376; 7.83
of God: 4.26-4.27; 5.315-5.317; 7.223
of heaven: 1.44-1.45; 5.315-5.317; 7.187, 7.223-7.225
forms of: 5.333-5.358
forms. consummate: 5.354-5.358
Davidic kingdom: 5.333
Judges: 5.333
mystery: 5.349-5.354
offered: 5.340-5.347
Knowledge of Scriptures: 1.v, 1.vi, 1.vii

L

Law: 7.225-7.226
deliverance: 3.342-3.345
inherent: 3.78
Life: 7.226-7.227
Logos: 1.58-1.59, 1.72-1.73; 5.9-5.10; 7.227-7.228
Lord’s Day: 4.113-4.122; 5.257-5.260; 7.109-7.110, 7.228-7.229
appointed under grace: 4.115-4.116
blessed of God: 5.258-5.259
day of grace: 5.258
distinguished from the Day of the Lord: 4.116
indicated by events: 4.116-4.119
individually committed: 5.259
prophecy of: 4.115-4.116; 5.257-5.258
testimony of church fathers: 4.120-4.122
testimony of church history: 4.122
willingly observed: 5.259
Lord’s Supper: 7.229
Lost. estate: 3.230-3.232
Love: 7.230-7.232
divine. character. eternal: 6.204

character. sacrificial: 6.204-6.205
superhuman: 6.206
unrequited and pure: 6.205
objects. Church: 6.204
Israel: 6.204
world of men: 6.203

M

Man: 1.156-1.157; 7.15-7.16
constitution: 2.144-2.145
creation: 1.3-1.6
in image of God: 1.180-1.185; 2.161; 7.15
headship: 7.183
immaterial nature: 1.156-1.157; 2.160-2.199; 7.15
character: 2.161-2.173
conscience: 2.197-2.199, 2.261-2.262
constitution: 2.180-2.192
dichotomous or trichotomous?: 2.180-2.192
flesh: 2.188-2.191
heart: 2.187-2.188
mind: 2.191-2.192
soul: 2.182-2.184
spirit: 2.184-2.187
creationism: 2.174-2.177
intellect: 2.163, 2.193-2.194
moral character: 2.163-2.166, 2.202-2.203
origin: 2.160-2.161
original innocence: 2.162-2.163, 2.200-2.214
pre-existence: 2.173-2.174
sensibility: 2.194
Traducianism: 2.177-2.179
will: 2.194-2.197
indwelt by God: 1.307-1.308
limitations: 1.129

material nature: 1.156; 7.15
at creation: 2.144-2.159
effect of fall: 2.148-2.149
eschatology: 2.149-2.157
meaning of the word *body*: 2.157-2.158
relation to sin: 2.157-2.158
structure: 2.145-2.149
origin: 2.130-2.143; 7.15
creation: 2.135-2.138
evolutionary theory: 2.130-2.135
revelation: 2.135-2.138
time: 2.138-2.143
resurrection: 1.307
taught of God: 1.48
unsaved. relation to Satan: 2.64-2.65, 2.97-2.98, 2.99-2.101, 2.323-2.324
Man of sin: 2.40, 2.70-2.71, 2.95-2.97; 4.346-4.351, 4.397; 5.122, 5.296-5.297; 6.85-6.86; 7.16-7.17, 7.232-7.233
Marriage: 4.130, 4.199; 7.233-7.234
Materialism: 1.144-1.145, 1.171-1.172
definition: 1.171
Mediation: 7.234-7.235
Mercy: 7.235
seat: 7.236
Messiah: 5.28-5.31; 7.236-7.237
Deity: 5.28-5.31
Messianic kingdom: 4.167-4.179, 4.207-4.208, 4.264-4.284, 4.290-4.294, 4.324-4.325, 4.378, 4.383-4.384, 4.389, 4.400; 5.315-5.358; 7.61-7.62, 7.82-7.83, 7.89, 7.91, 7.111, 7.237-7.238
announced: 4.290-4.294
assured by covenants: 5.317-5.333
Christ’s teaching: 4.176-4.179, 4.214-4.224
entrance requirements: 5.136-5.140
inhabitants of: 4.52, 4.219; 5.136-5.140, 5.337-5.339
offered: 4.265-4.266; 5.340-5.347
postponement of: 4.8-4.10, 4.174-4.176, 4.266-4.267; 5.89-5.90, 5.91-5.93, 5.347-5.349

illustrated: 4.9-4.10
prayer: 4.221-4.222
prophecy: 4.168-4.179, 4.265
New Testament: 4.172-4.174, 4.176-4.179
Old Testament: 4.168-4.172, 4.265
prophesied character. centered at Jerusalem: 5.336-5.337
earthly: 5.336
established by returning king: 5.339
heavenly: 5.335-5.336
Israelitish: 5.337-5.338
spiritual: 5.339-5.340
theocratic: 5.334-5.335
world-wide: 5.338-5.339
prophecy of: 5.333-5.340
realized: 5.354-5.358
rejected: 4.266-4.267; 5.347-5.349
Millennium: 1.xvii
Gentile participation: 3.108-3.109
Millennium and Millenarianism: 7.237-7.238
amillennialism: 7.237-7.238
antimillennialism: 4.281-4.282
Church Fathers: 4.270-4.277
history: 4.264-4.284
N. T. teaching: 4.257, 4.267-4.270
original meaning: 4.264-4.265
postmillennialism: 7.237
postreformation consideration: 4.279-4.284
premillennialism: 4.282-4.284; 7.238
Reformation. partial restoration: 4.277-4.279
Whiteby’s theory: 4.280-4.281
Minister. authority: 1.307
Ministry: 7.238-7.239
training: 1.ix, 1.x; 4.69
Miracles: 1.56, 1.256-1.257; 5.170-5.176; 7.239
New Testament: 5.171-5.172
Old Testament: 5.171

Miracles of Christ: 5.170-5.176
purpose: 5.172-5.173
terms used: 5.174-5.176
Missions. Biblical teaching: 4.50
Monism: 1.177
Monotheism: 1.24
Mosaic institutions. offerings: 3.121-3.122
Mosaic Law: 3.77, 3.78; 4.51, 4.158-4.166, 4.234-4.251; 7.86-7.87, 7.225-7.226
annulled: 4.234-4.243
application to Israel: 4.165-4.166, 4.236
beginning at Sinai: 4.162-4.164
Christ's interpretation: 5.105-5.108
contrasts to kingdom teachings: 4.213
purpose: 4.159, 4.161-4.162, 4.239-4.242; 6.105, 6.273-6.274
received by choice: 4.162-4.164
relation to time of reign: 4.160-4.165
similarity to kingdom teachings: 4.211-4.213
terminated with death of Christ: 4.164-4.165, 4.236
Moses. prophet: 4.289
Mysteries. Biblical: 4.75-4.77, 4.251, 4.385-4.386
Mystery: 7.239-7.240
Mysticism: 1.12-1.14
Biblical: 1.14
Christian: 1.13-1.14

N

Name: 7.240
Natural man: 7.241
Natural theology: 1.137-1.161
anthropological argument: 1.155-1.158
argumentum a posteriori: 1.141, 1.142-1.158, 1.161
argumentum a priori: 1.141-1.142, 1.158-1.161
cosmological argument: 1.142-1.149

ontological argument: 1.158-1.160
teleological argument: 1.149-1.155
Nirvana: 4.426
Numbers: 7.241-7.242

O

Obedience: 7.242-7.243
“Old man” in the Christian: 2.348
Olivet Discourse: 3.24-3.25; 5.114-5.140
relation to prophetic scope: 5.116
Omnipotence: 7.243
Omnipresence: 7.243-7.244
Omniscience: 1.192-1.200; 7.244-7.245
Archetypal: 1.193-1.194
Clarke’s view: 1.195
definition: 1.192, 1.195
extent: 1.192-1.193
practical effect: 1.197-1.198
relation to foreknowledge: 1.192
relation to God’s freedom: 1.197
relation to moral agents: 1.194-1.195, 1.196
relation to sin: 1.197
relation to wisdom: 1.198-1.200
Only-begotten: 7.245
Ontology. definition: 1.158
Ordain: 7.245-7.246
Ordinances: 4.150-4.151; 7.246
baptism: 7.34-7.43
Lord’s Supper: 7.229
Organized church: 4.144-4.153
government: 4.150
forms of: 4.150
group of local assemblies: 4.152-4.153
local assembly: 4.146-4.152

importance: 4.144
N. T. teaching: 4.145-4.146
order: 4.151-4.152
ordinances: 4.150-4.151
postmillennialism: 4.144
Roman concept: 4.144
service: 4.149-4.150
without reference to locality: 4.153

P

Pantheism: 1.173-1.176, 1.220-1.221
Buddhism: 1.173-1.174
definition: 1.173
Parables of Christ: 5.166-5.169, 5.351-5.354
kingdom parables: 4.44
purpose: 5.166-5.168
types. general: 5.168-5.169
Messianic: 5.168
Paraclete: 7.247
Paradise: 7.247-7.248
Parousia: 7.248
Partnership with Christ: 3.254-3.257
Passover: 3.120-3.121
Pauline Theology: 7.248-7.249
revelation: 4.3-4.4
doctrine of church: 4.4
salvation by grace: 4.3-4.4
Peace: 3.112-3.113; 7.249
Pentecost: 4.45-4.46, 4.393-4.394
Perfection: 6.282-6.284; 7.250
Bible use of word: 6.283
positional: 6.283
ultimate: 6.283-6.284
Persecution: 7.17-7.18

Philosophy and Christianity: 1.162-1.163
Pluralism: 1.178
Pneumatology: 6.3-6.298
    scope: 6.3
Polygenism: 2.142
Polytheism: 1.172
    definition: 1.172
Positivism: 1.176-1.177
Postmillennialism: 4.280-4.281
Power: 7.251
Praise: 7.252
Prayer: 1.256; 3.257; 6.107-6.108; 7.22-7.23, 7.252-7.254
    basis of: 4.22-4.23
    Christ's high priestly: 6.152-6.154
    intercessory: 4.67; 7.201-7.202
    the kingdom prayer: 5.108-5.109
    new ground in Christ: 5.160-5.164
    relation to filling of Spirit: 6.232-6.233
Prayers of Christ: 5.160-5.161
Preaching: 7.254-7.255
Pre-adamitism: 2.142
Predestination: 1.232, 1.244-1.248; 3.168, 3.235-3.236, 3.347-3.351; 7.255-7.256
    relation to election: 1.232, 1.244-1.246
    relation to retribution: 1.232, 1.244, 1.246-1.248
Premillennialism: 4.282-4.284
Preservation: 1.55-1.56, 1.124-1.125, 1.255
Priesthood: 7.256-7.257
    N. T. doctrine: 7.257
    Old Testament: 4.65-4.68
    O. T. system: 7.256
Priesthood of believers: 3.251; 4.65-4.68
Profession of faith: 3.295-3.297
Prolegomena: 1.3-1.17
Prophecy: 1.xxxii, 1.xxxiii, 1.xxxiv, 1.xxxv, 1.30-1.31; 5.44-5.45; 7.138-7.140, 7.257-7.258

Biblical concept: 4.285-4.295
character. forth-telling: 4.285-4.286
predictive: 4.285-4.286
classification: 4.294-4.295
events in order: 4.390-4.401
extent: 4.256
fulfilled: 1.xxxiv
history: 4.288-4.295
major highways: 4.296-4.378
apostate Christendom: 4.352-4.359
Christ: 4.296-4.309
Church: 4.374-4.378
Gentiles: 4.329-4.344
Israel's covenants: 4.310-4.328
Satan, evil, man of sin: 4.345-4.351
great tribulation: 4.360-4.373
Messianic: 4.7-4.9, 4.296-4.309
two advents: 4.302-4.309, 4.382-4.383
neglect by theologians: 4.255-4.256
N. T. themes: 4.385-4.389
Olivet Discourse: 4.116
O. T. themes: 4.379-4.384
primary emphasis: 4.257
relation to Christian life: 4.261
relation to covenants: 4.288
relation to eschatology: 1.xxxiv
relation to God's decree: 4.261-4.263
relation to hermeneutics: 4.258-4.259
relation to Holy Spirit: 4.57-4.65
tested by fulfillment: 4.287-4.288
unfulfilled: 1.xxxiv, 1.xxxv
Prophet: 4.285-4.286
election: 4.287
message: 4.286-4.287
New Testament: 4.286
Old Testament: 4.286

power: 4.287
Prophets: 1.99-1.101
Abraham: 4.288-4.289
Daniel: 4.289
false: 4.294
John the Baptist: 4.290-4.294
Moses: 4.289
Propitiation: : 3.93-3.96, 3.190-3.193, 3.237-3.238, 3.389-3.392; 5.197-5.198; 7.258-7.260
N. T. doctrine: 7.259-7.260
O. T. doctrine: 7.258-7.259
Protestantism: 1.15
Providence: 1.54-1.55, 1.255-1.256, 1.308
definition: 1.54
determinative: 1.255-1.256
directive: 1.255
permissive: 1.255
preventative: 1.255
Providence and government of God: 3.348-3.351; 7.177, 7.260
Punishment: 2.360-2.364; 7.260-7.262
relation to Christian: 2.360-2.361
chastisement: 2.360-2.361
scourging: 2.361
retribution: 2.361-2.364
Purgatory: 4.426
Purification. heaven: 3.113-3.115

Q

Quietism: 1.13, 1.14

R

Rationalism: 3.268
Arminian emphasis: 3.286-3.290

Realism: 1.172-1.173
definition: 1.173
Reason: 1.133-1.135
achievements: 1.134-1.135
value: 1.133-1.134
Reconciliation: 3.91-3.93, 3.129, 3.190-3.193, 3.237; 5.209-5.211, 5.221-5.223; 7.26, 7.262-7.263
Redemption: 1.26, 1.27, 1.361-1.364; 5.212-5.215; 7.263-7.264
Biblical teaching: 3.66-3.67, 3.86-3.91, 3.129, 3.190-3.193, 3.236-3.237
extent: 3.183-3.205
Arminian: 3.185
dispensational aspects: 3.188-3.190
extreme limited: 3.184
F. W. Grant: 3.185
moderate limited: 3.184
moderate unlimited: 3.184-3.185
N. T. doctrine: 7.264
O. T. doctrine: 7.263-7.264
Redemption of body: 7.56
Regeneration: 3.72, 3.73, 3.241-3.242, 3.335-3.336; 6.104-6.121; 7.74-7.75, 7.264-7.265
acquisition of nature of God: 6.109-6.110
based on faith: 6.113-6.121
God’s purpose: 6.111-6.113
impartation of life: 6.106-6.109
necessity of: 6.104-6.106
results. divine compassion for lost world: 6.108-6.109
knowledge of God: 6.107
new reality in prayer: 6.107-6.108
new reality in reading Bible: 6.108
recognition of God’s family: 6.108
Religion. contents: 4.14
Repentance: 7.265-7.266
Israel: 4.318
meaning: 3.372-3.373
relation to believing: 3.373-3.375

Restitutionism: 4.423-4.426
Resurrection: 4.23-4.24, 4.124-4.126; 5.21; 7.8, 7.266-7.268
    Biblical doctrine: 2.149-2.157
    Christian: 4.124-4.126, 4.375-4.376, 4.394-4.395
Retribution: 1.232, 1.244, 1.246-1.248
Revelation: 1.48-1.60, 1.135-1.136; 7.44-7.45, 7.100-7.101, 7.268
    character: 1.51-1.52, 1.60
    definition: 1.48
    direct communication: 1.56-1.57
    extent: 4.47
    modes: 1.53-1.60
    progressive character: 4.203-4.204
    relation to illumination: 1.50-1.51
    relation to inspiration: 1.49-1.50
    relation to reason: 1.48-1.49
    relation to theology: 1.135
Revelation and nature: 1.53-1.54
Reward. loss of: 3.307-3.309
Rewards: 7.269
    Christian: 4.396, 4.405
Righteousness: 7.270
Romanism: 1.14-1.15
    error respecting the cross: 3.48

S

Sabbath: 4.102-4.113; 5.254-5.257;7.109, 7.270-7.271
    annulled in church age: 5.255-5.256
    creation: 4.102-4.103
    God’s creative rest: 5.254
    institution as law: 5.254-5.255
    Jewish. character: 4.105-4.106
        Christ’s teaching: 4.106-4.107
        prophecy of: 4.111-4.112
        sign of Mosaic age: 4.104-4.107

teaching in Acts: 4.108
teaching in epistles: 4.108-4.111
unknown before Moses: 4.103-4.104
reinstituted in kingdom: 5.256
Sabellianism: 4.14-4.16
Sacrifice. O. T.: 3.104-3.105, 3.129; 7.271-7.272
Saint: 7.272-7.273
Salvation: 7.273-7.274
basis: 3.8-9, 3.54, 3.208-3.209, 3.371-3.393
gift of God: 6.291-6.292
God's motive: 3.7-3.8
importance: 3.9-3.10
meaning: 3.5-3.6
means: 3.54
Old Testament: 3.3-3.5, 3.105-3.108
doctrine: 4.73, 4.75
results. deliverance from sin and human limitations: 3.355-3.363
presented faultless: 3.364-3.370
scope: 3.6
source: 3.6-3.7, 3.206-3.207
terms: 3.371-3.393
believe and be baptized: 3.381-3.384
believe and confess Christ: 3.378-3.380
believe and confess sin: 3.388
believe and pray: 3.389-3.393
believe and surrender to God: 3.384-3.388
repent and believe: 3.372-3.378
thirty-three miracles: 3.234-3.265
trinitarian participation: 3.206-3.266
Sanctification: 1.308; 6.45-6.46, 6.284-6.285; 7.188, 7.220, 7.274-7.284
Bible use of word: 6.284
experimental and progressive: 6.284-6.285
positional: 3.244-3.245; 6.284
ultimate: 4.122-4.123; 6.285
Satan: 7.118, 7.284-7.285
authority over the *cosmos*: 2.80-2.84

Biblical evidence: 2.50-2.52
New Testament: 2.51-2.52
Old Testament: 2.50-2.51
career: 2.39-2.61
character: 2.62-2.75
ambitious pride: 2.63-2.64
antigod: 2.62
antitruth: 2.62
murderer: 2.65-2.66
sinfulness: 2.72-2.75
the lie: 2.68-2.69
untruth: 2.64-2.72
control of men: 1.107-1.108
creation: 2.41-2.42
fall: 2.35-2.36, 2.42-2.44
final revolt: 5.360-5.61
his doctrine: 2.106-2.111
his sin: 1.239
importance: 2.33-2.34
judgment: 3.109-3.110, 3.359-3.360; 4.345-4.346, 4.388-4.389, 4.399, 4.400, 4.403
in cross: 2.53-2.57
final: 2.43-2.44, 2.57-2.61, 2.208
bound at second advent: 2.60-2.61
cast into lake of fire: 2.61
cast out of heaven: 2.58-2.60
miracles: 5.170
names and titles: 2.33
opposition to Christian: 3.359-3.360
original estate: 2.40-2.42
original sin: 2.44-2.50
character: 2.30-2.31, 2.43-2.44, 2.47-2.50, 2.93-2.94, 2.243-2.245
motive: 2.94, 2.97
personality: 2.34-2.35
present abode: 2.45-2.46
rebellion: 6.255-6.256

relation to Adam: 2.203-2.204
relation to believer: 2.36, 2.101-2.103, 2.330; 4.195-4.196; 6.194-6.197, 6.266-6.268
relation to religious cults: 2.110-2.111
relation to unsaved: 2.323-2.324; 6.90
release at end of millennium: 5.360
temptation of Christ: 5.80-5.81
Satanology: 2.33-2.12
introduction: 2.33-2.38
objections: 2.37-2.38
satanic *cosmos*: 2.76-2.90
Satan's method: 2.99-2.112
Satan's motive: 2.91-2.98
Scriptures. Arminian interpretation: 3.290-3.312
attitudes: 13.12
Second advent: 1.370; 3.16-3.17; 4.51, 4.305-4.309, 4.318, 4.354, 4.377-4.378, 4.389, 4.398-4.399; 5.124-5.140, 5.280-5.314; 7.82, 7.248
certainty of fulfillment: 5.126-5.128
distinction of comings: 5.288-5.314, 5.355
events involved: 4.306-4.307
false theories: 5.282-5.287
judgments of: 5.128-5.140, 5.290-5.314
manner: 5.125-5.126
N. T. prophecies: 5.289-5.314
O. T. prophecies: 5.289-5.314
preview. transfiguration: 5.86-5.87, 5.91-5.93, 5.303-5.305
return for Church: 4.367-4.368, 4.375-4.377; 5.164-5.165, 5.288-5.289
uncertainty of time: 5.128-5.133, 5.305-5.306
Security: 7.285-7.286
Sensibility: 1.200-1.208
definition: 1.200
demonstrated in nature: 1.201
goodness: 1.206-1.207
holiness: 1.202-1.203
justice: 1.203-1.205
love: 1.205-1.206

modes: 1.202-1.208
truth: 1.207-1.208
Separation: 7.287
Sermon on the Mount: 4.216-4.224; 5.97-5.114
beatitudes: 5.103-5.105
criticism: 5.102
distinctive character: 5.102-5.113
postponement of application: 5.113-5.114
primary application in kingdom: 5.99
setting: 5.99-5.102
Servant of Jehovah: 5.184-5.185
Sin: 1.26, 1.233-1.238; 3.218-3.219; 4.346, 4.402-4.403; 6.95-6.96, 6.184-6.185; 7.287-7.289
anticipated by God: 2.236-2.242
Biblical doctrine: 2.224-2.273
Biblical terms: 2.267-2.269
Christian: 1.xxiv, 1.xxv, 1.xxxvii
effect upon God: 2.342-2.345
effect upon self: 2.334-2.342
prevention: 2.332-2.334; 6.235-6.236
Bible: 6.235
Christ interceding: 6.235-6.236
Holy Spirit indwelling: 6.235
remedy: 2.325-2.359; 6.236-6.250
chastisement: 2.360-2.361; 6.241-6.243
cleansing: 6.236-6.240
confession and repentance: 6.243-6.250
self-judgment: 6.240-6.241
confession of: 7.89-7.91
disposition: 2.365-2.373
divine remedy: 2.269-2.270
eradication: 6.286-6.288
essential nature: 1.234-1.235
final triumph over all sin: 2.365-2.373
forgiveness of, for unregenerate: 2.326-2.327
God’s permission: 1.236-1.238; 2.91-2.93, 2.229-2.233; 3.36

reasons: 2.231-2.233
God’s prevention: 1.234
imputed: 2.296-2.312
divine remedy: 2.312-2.315
relation to Christian: 2.358
theories of imputation: 2.310-3.312
major demonstrations: 2.227-2.228
meaning of word: 6.271-6.273
nature: 2.66-2.68, 2.224-2.227, 2.246-2.248, 2.250-2.254
always sinful: 2.326
definitions: 2.254-2.255
offense to God’s Person: 2.255-2.260
offense to God’s laws: 2.260-2.267
transgression of law: 2.260-2.267
uncreated: 1.234
origin. anticipation in God’s foreknowledge: 2.236-2.242
heaven: 2.242-2.243
human: 2.248-2.250
original: 2.278-2.279, 2.283-2.295
divine remedy: 2.292-2.295
Arminian view: 3.279-3.280
relation to Christian: 2.345-2.358
relation to depravity: 2.285-2.392
transmitted: 2.284-2.285
personal: 2.235-2.282
definition: 2.254-2.267
forgiveness: 2.270-2.273
guilt: 2.279-2.281
origin: 2.235-2.251
person who first sinned: 2.243-2.245
relation to justification: 2.273-2.278
terms. classifications: 2.267-2.269
purpose in universe: 1.235-1.236
redemption from: 3.86-3.90
responsibility: 1.237
relation to evil: 2.228-2.229, 2.242

relation to free choice: 2.231
relation to holy life: 2.328-2.329
relation to “old man”: 2.348
relation to retribution: 2.361-2.364
universality: 2.281-2.282
unpardonable: 7.47-7.48, 7.165-7.166
Sin unto death: 7.166
Sins of saved and unsaved contrasted: 2.326
Socinianism: 3.273, 3.278-3.279
Son of Man: 3.31-3.32
Sonship: 7.290
Soteriology: 3.3-3.396
introduction: 3.3-3.10
Soul and spirit: 7.290-7.291
Spiritual darkness. forms: 1.105
Spiritual gifts: 5.275-5.276
evangelism: 7.143
Spiritual life: 5.148-5.151; 6.42, 6.123, 6.157, 6.162-6.298; 7.3-7.6, 7.107-7.108, 7.130, 7.280-7.284, 7.292-7.293
accomplished by Holy Spirit: 6.177-6.178
basis. sin nature judged: 3.96-3.101
carnality: 1.108
communion: 4.60-4.61
conditions to filling of Spirit: 6.232-6.268
conditions. negative: 6.234-6.261
grieve not Holy Spirit of God: 6.234-6.250
quench not Spirit: 6.250-6.261
walk in Spirit: 6.261-6.268
yieldedness: 6.253-6.256
dependence upon Holy Spirit: 6.167-6.168, 6.261-6.268
descriptive terms: 6.173-6.176
example of Christ: 6.256-6.259
index. attitude to Bible: 6.168-6.172
life of faith: 6.228-6.229
methods: 1.xxiii, 1.xxiv
motive: 1.xxii

necessity: 1.113
opponents: 6.178-6.197, 6.265-6.268
flesh: 6.183-6.194, 6.265-6.266; 7.155-7.157
Satan: 6.194-6.197, 6.266-6.268
world: 6.179-6.182, 6.265
related doctrines: 6.269-6.289
relation to Mosaic Law: 6.166-6.167
relation to surrender: 6.172-6.173
results. power to do good: 6.198-6.231
power to overcome evil: 6.177-6.197
standards: 1.xxiii
unceasing conflict: 6.178-6.179
Spirituality: 7.292-7.293
Standards of conduct. O. T.: 4.154-4.166
Standing and state: 7.293
Stewardship: 7.293-7.295
Stone: 7.295-7.296
Sublapsarianism: 1.246
Substitution: 7.296-7.297
Suffering: 7.71, 7.297-7.300
Supralapsarianism: 1.245-1.246
Symbolism. Biblical. blindness: 7.49
Biblical. bread: 7.59-7.60

T

Tabernacle and temple: 7.300-7.301
Teleology. etymology: 1.149
Temptation: 7.301-7.303
God: 5.75-5.76
meaning: 5.74-5.75
solicit to evil: 5.74-5.75
test to prove virtue: 5.74-5.75
sources of: 3.357-3.361
the devil: 3.359-3.360

the flesh: 3.359
the world: 3.358-3.359
Ten Commandments: 4.208-4.11
Theism: 1.137-1.178
definition: 1.136-1.137
divisions: 1.139
Biblical: 1.139-1.140, 1.179-1.271
naturalistic: 1.139-1.142
relation to Theology Proper: 1.137
Theologians: 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.21
Theological education. curricula: 1.viii
curricula. English Bible: 1.vii
exegesis: 1.vii
purpose: 1.vii
task: 1.ix-1.x
Theology. classifications: 1.4, 1.5
etymology: 1.3
science of. essential requirements: 1.7-1.12
Systematic. abridged: 1.x-1.xi
definitions: 1.x, 1.6
divisions: 1.15-1.16
modern decline: 1.v
relation to Bible: 1.viii
relation to missions: 1.ix-1.x
unabridged: 1.11-1.12
uses of the word: 1.3-1.6
Theology Proper: 1.129-1.414
antitheistic theories: 1.162-1.178
definition: 1.129
introduction: 1.129-1.136
Theophanies: 5.31-5.33
Throne: 7.303
Tithing: 7.304
Tongues: 7.304-7.305
Tradition: 1.14, 1.15, 1.132-1.333
relation to intuition: 1.132-1.333

types: 1.132-1.333
present: 1.132
remote: 1.132
Transfiguration: 7.305-7.306
N. T. use: 5.85-5.86
Transmigration and reincarnation: 4.420
Tribulation: 7.306-7.307
Tribulation. great: 4.10-4.11, 4.360-4.373, 4.383, 4.388, 4.396-4.397; 5.114-5.115, 5.120-5.125; 7.108, 7.307
nature: 4.364-4.365
relation to the church: 4.364-4.33
Trinitarianism: 1.272-1.414
definition: 1.136, 1.282
denial of Christ's Deity: 1.278-1.280
error of Sabellianism: 1.276
error of tritheism: 1.275-1.276
introduction: 1.272-1.288
proofs: 1.289-1.310
reason: 1.289-1.297
revelation: 1.297-1.310
New Testament: 1.302-1.310
Old Testament: 1.298-1.302
relation to Christ: 1.278
relation to Holy Spirit: 1.280
relation to Judaism: 1.287
relation to Mohammedanism: 1.287
relation to Scriptures: 1.281-1.282
relation to Unitarians: 1.287
term *person*: 1.276-1.277
true emphasis: 1.286-1.288
Trinity: 1.24-1.26, 1.172, 1.272; 5.22-5.23; 4.8; 7.307
analogies: 1.274-1.275
assumed in Scripture: 1.297-1.298
equality of members: 6.12
essential elements: 1.283
general definition: 1.282-1.286

mystery: 1.273-1.274, 1.288, 1.290
N. T. doctrine: 6.18
N. T. evidence. attributes of God: 1.304-1.305
names of God: 1.303-1.304
works of God: 1.305-1.308
worship of God: 1.308-1.310
objected as unreasonable: 1.274
O. T. evidence. Deity ascribed to several: 1.299-1.300
Elohim: 1.298-1.299
O. T. implications: 6.16-6.18
Tritheism: 6.16
Typology: 1.xxix, 1.xxxii, 1.31; 3.116-126; 4.46, 4.64-4.65, 4.119-4.120, 4.136-4.141; 5.43-5.44, 5.77-5.81; 6.47-6.56; 7.7-7.9, 7.19-7.20, 7.53-7.54, 7.58-7.59, 7.62-7.63, 7.64, 7.84, 7.193, 7.236, 7.296-7.297, 7.300, 7.308-7.309
Christ: 1.xxx
Kinsman Redeemer: 1.361-1.364
Church. Eve: 4.137-4.139
Rebekah: 4.139-4.141
death of Christ: 5.77-5.81
definition: 1.xxx
meaning: 3.116-3.118
O. T. sacrifices: 3.119-3.123
principles: 1.xxx-1.xxxi
scope: 3.118-3.119

U

Unbelievers. children of disobedience: 2.65
Understanding. human. limitations: 1.233-1.234
Union with Christ: 3.72-3.76, 3.228-3.229, 3.239-3.240, 3.243-3.45; 4.60-4.61, 4.92-4.100; 6.152, 6.156-6.157, 6.163-6.165, 6.278-6.280; 7.3, 7.33-7.34
Unitarianism: 6.14
Universalism: 4.422-4.423

Universe. destruction of: 5.362-5.363
preservation of: 5.21, 5.26
theories of its cause: 1.142
Upper Room Discourse: 1.110-1.111; 3.25; 5.140-5.166

V

Virgin birth: 5.47-5.53

W

Walk. relation to spiritual life: 1.xx, 1.xxvi Will: 1.208-1.212; 7.309-7.310
characteristics: 1.209-1.212
definition: 1.208
free: 1.209
man’s consciousness of it: 1.241-1.243
omnipotence: 1.209-1.212
Witness-bearing: 4.70; 6.82
Woman: 7.310-7.311
World: 3.358-3.359; 7.311-7.312
N. T. uses of word: 6.180
Satan-controlled: 6.179
secret of victory: 6.181-6.182

Z

Zion: 7.312